



NEGATIVE DECLARATION

JURUPA VALLEY INCORPORATION

Prepared for | George Spiliotis
Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
3850 Vine Street, Suite 100
Riverside, California 92507-4277

Prepared by | Joan Patronite Kelly, AICP, Managing Principal
BonTerra Consulting
151 Kalmus Drive, Suite E-200
Costa Mesa, California 92626
T: (714) 444-9199 F: (714) 444-9599

November 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1.0 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Purpose of the Initial Study.....	1-1
1.2 Summary of Findings.....	1-1
1.3 Project Approval	1-1
1.4 Organization of the Initial Study.....	1-2
Section 2.0 Project Location and Environmental Setting.....	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Environmental Setting.....	2-1
2.2.1 Land Use.....	2-1
2.3 Background.....	2-2
2.3.1 Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission	2-2
Section 3.0 Project Description	3-1
3.1 Project Characteristics.....	3-1
3.1.1 Incorporation Scenario.....	3-1
3.1.2 Revenue.....	3-2
3.1.3 General Fund Revenues.....	3-4
3.1.4 Road Fund Revenues.....	3-5
3.1.5 Structural Fire Fund Revenues.....	3-5
3.1.6 CSA and L & LMD Fund Revenue	3-6
3.2 Fiscal Feasibility	3-6
3.2.1 Neutrality Not Addressed.....	3-6
3.3 Discretionary Approvals.....	3-7
Section 4.0 Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study.....	4-1
4.1 Agency Determination	4-1
Section 5.0 Document Preparers and Contributors	5-1
Section 6.0 References	6-1

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Current and Future Municipal Services Plan.....	3-3
2	Current and Future Jurupa Valley Utilities & Service Providers	4-26

EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>		<u>Follows Page</u>
1	Regional Vicinity.....	2-1
2	Local Vicinity	2-1
3	Proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation Boundary.....	2-1
4	Land Use Map.....	2-2

APPENDIX

A	Jurupa Valley Incorporation Study Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis Administrative Draft Report	
---	---	--

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

The purpose of this Initial Study (IS) is to describe the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation located in unincorporated northwestern Riverside County, California, and to provide an evaluation of potential environmental effects associated with the incorporation of a new city. The IS has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended (*California Public Resources Code* §21000 et seq.) and in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the *California Code of Regulations* [CCR] §15000 et seq.).

Pursuant to §15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is the lead agency for the project. The lead agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant effect upon the environment. LAFCO, as lead agency, has the authority to approve the project approval and to certify of the accompanying environmental documentation.

1.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the environmental checklist form prepared for the project and supporting environmental analysis (provided in Section 4), the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would have no impact in the following environmental impact areas: aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, noise, cultural resources, public services, transportation and traffic, mineral resources, population and housing, recreational, and utilities and service systems.

The Jurupa Valley has been primarily characterized by a mixture of low and high density residential development, with small portions of commercial development (see Section 2.2, Environmental Setting). Agricultural activities, including dairies, field crops and ranches have been the primary land use in the area, though these activities have been giving way to more urban types of development, particularly residential and commercial development. . Because the proposed project consists of the incorporation of the Jurupa Valley community as a new city, physical impacts that would typically be experienced during site preparation (changes in topography, loss of natural habitat, changes in drainage courses, etc.) would not occur with the proposed project.

According to the CEQA Guidelines, it is appropriate to prepare a Negative Declaration (ND) for the proposed project because no environmental impacts would occur as a result of the Jurupa Valley Incorporation.

1.3 PROJECT APPROVAL

This IS and proposed ND has been submitted to the potentially affected agencies and individuals. Notices of availability for the IS and proposed ND have been posted for review and comment both in the *Riverside Press Enterprise* newspaper and at the LAFCO offices. The environmental documentation is available at LAFCO for review.

A 30-day public review period has been established for the IS and the proposed ND in accordance with §15073 of the CEQA Guidelines. In reviewing the IS and ND, affected public agencies and the interested public should focus on the adequacy of the document in identifying and analyzing the potential impacts on the environment and ways in which the potentially

significant effects of the project area are to be avoided or mitigated. Comments on the IS and analysis contained herein may be sent to the following:

Mr. George Spiliotis
Executive Officer
Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission
3850 Vine Street, Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507-4277

Following receipt and evaluation of comments from agencies, organizations, and/or individuals, LAFCO will determine whether any substantial new environmental issues have been raised. If so, further documentation, such as an environmental impact report (EIR) or an expanded IS, may be required. If not, the project and the environmental documentation are tentatively scheduled to be submitted to the Commission for consideration at a future meeting.

1.4 **ORGANIZATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY**

The IS is organized into the following sections

- **Section 1 – Introduction.** This section provides an overview of the conclusions of the IS.
- **Section 2 – Project Location and Environmental Setting.** This section provides a brief description of the project location and describes the existing environmental setting of the project site and vicinity.
- **Section 3 – Project Description.** This section provides a description of the proposed project and includes necessary discretionary approvals.
- **Section 4 – Environmental Checklist Form and Initial Study.** The completed environmental checklist form provides an overview of the potential impacts that may or may not result from project implementation. The environmental checklist form also includes “mandatory findings of significance” required by CEQA and contains an analysis of impacts identified in the environmental checklist. It also includes standard conditions of approval (SC).
- **Section 5 – Report Preparers.** This section lists the authors, including staff from the LAFCO, who assisted in preparation and review of the IS.
- **Section 6 – References.** This section identifies the references used in preparation of the IS.

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The community of Jurupa Valley is located in western Riverside County, California, in a region of Southern California known as the Inland Empire (see Exhibit 1, Regional Vicinity). Jurupa Valley is bordered by San Bernardino County to the north and northwest, the cities of Riverside and Norco to the south, and the unincorporated community of Eastvale to the southwest. The Los Angeles County line is approximately 10 miles northwest of Jurupa Valley, and the Orange County line is approximately 10 miles to the southwest (see Exhibit 2, Local Vicinity). The proximity of these last two heavily urbanized counties and the fact that Jurupa Valley is located close to multiple area freeways—including Interstate 15 (I-15) and California State Routes (SR) 91, 60, and 71—has made Jurupa Valley a convenient residential location. The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would include areas on both sides of the I-15 (see Exhibit 3, Proposed Incorporation Boundary).

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Land uses found in the Jurupa Valley area include residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural uses. Agricultural activities, including dairies, field crops and ranches, have been the primary land uses in the area, though these activities have been giving way to more urban types of development, predominantly residential and commercial. The Jurupa Valley Plan area is primarily characterized by high- and low-density residential development with small pockets of commercial development.

The topography of the western portion of Jurupa Valley is primarily flat, with gentle rolling foothills. The area north of SR-60 includes the sloping terrain of the Jurupa Mountains. The remaining areas of Jurupa Valley are predominantly characterized as a slightly undulating flatland, which contains fewer natural open space features than is the case with most of the area plans within Riverside County.

Located along the southern boundary of Jurupa Valley, the Santa Ana River represents a significant watershed, recreational, habitat, and a visual resource (Riverside County 2003a). The 2,650-square mile Santa Ana River Watershed is the focus of extensive habitat conservation and restoration efforts, some of which are occurring near the southern boundary of the proposed incorporation boundary of Jurupa Valley.

Jurupa Valley is unique because of its large number of distinct communities, each with a strong local identity. The seven communities are Rubidoux, Sunnyslope, Belltown, Glen Avon, Indian Hills, Pedley, and Mira Loma. Although they vary in size, character and focus, they share a universal strength of commitment to their uniqueness and identity (Riverside County 2003b). These communities are shown on Exhibit 3 and are described in further detail in Section 2.2.1 below.

2.2.1 LAND USE

The Jurupa Valley area is approximately 60 square miles in size; land uses found in this area include a mix of high and low density residential, rural farming and other agricultural activities, and a mix of commercial, public uses, and industrial, uses. As indicated above, there are seven distinct communities within Jurupa Valley. The community of Rubidoux is the largest and most densely developed with a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and public uses. Land uses within the Sunnyslope community consist of low density single family

residences and mobile homes. The Belltown community consists of low density single-family residential, industrial and scattered commercial uses. Glen Avon is largely a rural community with scattered commercial, industrial, and higher intensity residential. The Indian Hills community is a golf course oriented residential area. Pedley contains a variety of rural and suburban style residential neighborhoods and a commercial district along Limonite Avenue. Industrial uses are located along the Santa Ana River. The Mira Loma community is largely rural with several equestrian trails. A large area of land in northwest Mira Loma near the I-15/SR-60 intersection is converting from dairy to industrial, warehousing, and truck distribution land uses.

Agricultural activities, including dairies, field crops and ranches, have been the primary land use in the area, though these activities have been giving way to more urban types of development, particularly residential and commercial development (refer to Exhibit 4, Land Use Map). The conversion from predominantly agricultural to predominantly urban land uses will likely continue for the foreseeable future. Development on both sides of the I-15 north of Bellegrave Avenue is intermittent; parcels identified as light industrial and/or commercial are interspersed with undeveloped land that is designated rural-desert in the General Plan (Riverside County, 2003a). The southern portion of Study Area 4, which is a part of all three proposed incorporation areas, as discussed below in Section 3.1.1, is within a commercial overlay zone that is not developed (see Exhibit 4, Land Use Map).

2.3 BACKGROUND

Jurupa Valley has recently begun to experience the same rapid growth that has been affecting the cities that adjoin it within greater northwestern Riverside County. Growth is projected to continue and accelerate as the area continues to benefit from the competitive position of the Inland Empire (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties) relative to the more urbanized counties of Los Angeles and Orange (Riverside County 2003a).

These development trends have led to discussions within the Jurupa Valley community about potential governance changes for the area. The proposed incorporation of Jurupa Valley as a new city has been under discussion in the community for some time. LAFCO has received an application requesting incorporation of the Jurupa Valley community and its related minor organizational changes. In their effort to facilitate the proposed project, Winzler & Kelly has prepared a Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis (CFA) dated September 23, 2009, in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH) and Riverside LAFCO policies regarding incorporations.

2.3.1 RIVERSIDE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Riverside LAFCO is responsible for reviewing and approving the proposed jurisdictional boundary changes, including annexations and detachments of territory to and/or from cities and special districts; incorporations of new cities; formations of new special districts; and consolidations, mergers, and dissolutions of existing districts in Riverside County. In addition, LAFCO must review and approve contractual service agreements and determine spheres of influence for each city and district. They may also initiate district consolidation proposals, subsidiary district establishment, dissolutions, mergers, and reorganizations (and/or any combination of these jurisdictional changes). LAFCO's decisions strive to balance the competing needs for affordable housing, economic opportunity, and conservation of natural resources in California. Riverside LAFCO has jurisdiction over changes in local government organization occurring within Riverside County.

SECTION 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation, if approved by LAFCO, would submit to registered voters the question of whether or not the community of Jurupa Valley, California, should become a general law city. Municipal decisions would pass from the County of Riverside to the newly formed city; no development is associated with the proposed project.

Section 57376 of the *California Government Code* requires a new city to immediately adopt and continue county ordinances for 120 days or until superseding ordinances are adopted, whichever occurs first. This guarantees continuation of the current zoning since it is adopted by ordinance. A General Plan is typically adopted by city resolution since it is not a regulatory document. It is not uncommon for new cities to keep a county zoning ordinance and the General Plan in effect for at least a year or more until they have the time and funds to prepare and certify a new city zoning ordinance and General Plan. The applicable portions of the current Riverside County zoning ordinance would be adopted and its General Plan would be adopted until a new General Plan and zoning ordinance can be prepared for the proposed new city.

Incorporation would have no identifiable financial impact upon residents or businesses; the proposed incorporation would not increase taxes or other government fees. Property, utility, transient occupancy taxes, other taxes, assessments, fees, and parcel charges currently levied would remain the same. All or a portion of the revenue from these taxes and parcel charges would be transferred to the new city and the city would be responsible for providing services supported by these revenues. By law, an incorporating city must be financially feasible. A majority vote of the electorate would be required to impose, extend, or increase any general tax. A two-thirds vote is required for a special tax (see Section 3.2, Revenue, below).

The County of Riverside provides services to the community of Jurupa Valley that have been documented via fiscal studies using County of Riverside departmental budgets. The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would contract with the County of Riverside or other public or private entities for most of these services, including sheriff and fire. No services would be lost following incorporation by the new city. Incorporation would transfer certain functions and services from the County of Riverside to the City of Jurupa Valley (i.e., municipal government).

Once the proposed project is approved and the incorporation takes place, a number of public services could increase from the current condition if revenues are available. These services would be designed by the residents of the new city and could include parks, youth programs, senior programs, beautification projects, extra policing, or partnerships with other agencies.

3.1.1 INCORPORATION SCENARIO

Because of the conflict of potential incorporation boundaries that have been designated by the Jurupa Valley Incorporation Research Committee (JVIRC) and the Eastvale Incorporation Committee for analysis of each competing proposal, LAFCO and Riverside County reached agreement to conduct fiscal, demographic, and development data collection and analysis by creating six distinct study areas to ensure consistency of data application (Winzler & Kelly, 2009). As detailed in the CFA, the proposed incorporation of Jurupa Valley includes three boundary alternatives as shown in Exhibit 3. Each alternative is described below:

- **Alternative 1** encompasses all of Study Area 6. This area includes all unincorporated territory east of Wineville Avenue, and is generally bound by the City of Riverside to the

east, the cities of Riverside and Norco to the south, and San Bernardino County to the north.

- **Alternative 2** encompasses all of Study Areas 4, 5, and 6. This area includes all unincorporated territory east of the I-15 freeway, and is generally bound by the city of Riverside to the East, the cities of Riverside and Norco to the South, and San Bernardino County to the north.
- **Alternative 3** encompasses all of Study Areas 2, 4, 5 and 6. This area includes all unincorporated territory east of Hamner Avenue (north of Limonite Avenue, and East of the I-15 freeway south of Limonite Avenue, and is generally bound by the city of Riverside to the east, the cities of Riverside and Norco to the south, and San Bernardino County to the north.

Although the CFA has analyzed three alternative scenarios, the environmental analysis of the alternatives will not be included in the body of this ND. Rather, this ND will analyze the potential for impacts directly related to the environment as a result of the proposed incorporation of the community of Jurupa Valley.

3.1.2 REVENUE

As stated above in Section 3.1, a community in the process of incorporating must be able to demonstrate fiscal viability. Table 1 illustrates the current and proposed municipal services plan for the proposed City of Jurupa Valley. Sources of revenue can be divided into four categories: (1) general fund revenues; (2) road fund revenues; (3) structural fire fund revenues; and (4) County Service Area (CSA) and Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (L & LMD) funds revenues. Each of these categories is discussed below with examples and explanations of specific revenues from where the proposed City of Jurupa Valley incorporation would draw.

**TABLE 1
CURRENT AND FUTURE MUNICIPAL SERVICES PLAN**

Service	Current Provider	Proposed Provider
Animal Services	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Building & Safety	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Code Enforcement	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Domestic Water	Jurupa Community Services District, Rubidoux Community Service District, Western Municipal Water District, Santa Ana River Water Company	No Change
Electric and Gas	Private Utility Companies	No Change
Engineering	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Fire Protection/EMS/Fire Protection Planning	County of Riverside Fire Department	New City (Contract with County)
Flood Control	County of Riverside Flood Control and Water Conservation District	No Change
General Government	County of Riverside General Fund	New City
Land Use Planning	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Law Enforcement	County of Riverside General Fund	New City (Contract with County)
Library	County of Riverside Library System	No Change
Parks and Recreation	Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District	No Change
Public Works	County of Riverside General Fund and Road Funds	New City (Contract with County or Private Firm)
Solid Waste Collection	County of Riverside (contract with Waste Management)	Private Hauler (franchise agreement)
Solid Waste Disposal	County of Riverside	No Change
Telecommunications	Private Utility Companies	No Change
Traffic Control & Accident Investigation	County of Riverside General Fund (California Highway Patrol [CHP] for Traffic)	New City (Contract with County)
Wastewater	Jurupa Community Services District, Rubidoux Community Service District, Western Municipal Water District	No Change
CHP: California Highway Patrol EMS: emergency medical services Source: Winzler & Kelly 2009.		

As shown in Table 1, many of the current service providers are projected to remain unchanged. These include private service providers (e.g., electric, gas, and telecommunications) and separate agencies (e.g., flood control and water districts). The Riverside County Library is assumed to continue to provide library services.

The proposed new City of Jurupa Valley is projected to take direct responsibility for general government services, including the creation of a city council and other legislative and administrative functions. In addition, there are two Community Service Districts (Jurupa Community Services District and Rubidoux Community Services District) and one Recreation and Parks District (Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District). The CFA assumes that these three independent special districts would not be dissolved as a result of incorporation and that

they would continue to provide the services they currently provide and to retain all revenues that they currently receive. Given the relatively small population of the new city, the CFA analysis assumes that the new city would contract with the County of Riverside or a private firm for a number of services including animal services, law enforcement, fire protection, traffic control/accident investigation, and road maintenance (Winzler & Kelly 2009).

3.1.3 GENERAL FUND REVENUES

Property Tax (General Purpose)

Incorporation would not allow the newly formed Jurupa Valley City Council to increase the property tax rate. Beginning with Proposition 13 (June 6, 1978), the State constitution, State legislation, and court cases have greatly restricted and controlled this revenue source and its distribution. Property tax estimates are based on a projection of real property assessed value multiplied by a local public agency's share of the one percent property tax, called a tax allocation factor (TAF). The property tax rate is limited to one percent of a property's assessed value, plus rates imposed to fund indebtedness approved by the voters (e.g., local bond issues).

In most cases, the TAF for a new city upon incorporation is based on the services transferred from existing public agencies to the new city. If a service is transferred, then property tax revenue to fund that service is transferred as well. For TAFs dedicated to specific services (such as for a library or fire district), the entire TAF is transferred to the City if the service responsibility is transferred. Relative to a County's general fund TAF, only a portion is transferred because, while the county transfers some services to the new city (such as law enforcement), it retains other services such as the courts.

Redevelopment Project Area "Pass Through" Property Tax

The proposed city would normally be eligible to receive a portion of the 1996 amended Jurupa Valley Redevelopment Project Area Property Tax increment in accordance with formulas prescribed by California law. This tax increment, commonly referred to as "pass through", is only a fraction of the amount of normal property tax that the new city would receive under incorporation if the Redevelopment Project Area did not exist. The "pass through" is derived from determining the total tax increment available for the applicable fiscal year and deducting 20 percent for affordable housing set aside. Then, 25 percent of the remaining increment is calculated and distributed to all entities receiving property tax shares within the project area at their respective tax rates. However, State law allows the existing Redevelopment Agency to deduct the costs of the improvement projects that would be funded with the property tax increment until these project costs are recovered. In the case of the Jurupa Valley incorporation area, all "pass through" increment available is 100 percent offset by annual costs.

Off-Highway Vehicle License Fees

The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would receive a nominal revenue subvention from the State for fees associated with off-highway vehicles. This revenue is collected on a per capita basis.

Property Transfer (Documentary) Taxes

Property transfer tax revenues are estimated using the cumulative estimates of real estate market value and the holding period assumptions discussed in the property tax section above. Upon incorporation, the new City of Jurupa Valley would receive a property transfer tax in the amount of \$0.55 per \$1,000 of assessed real property value transferred each year.

Sales and Use Taxes

Sales tax is the most important source of revenue beyond property tax revenue. The incorporated City of Jurupa Valley, through its city council, would be allowed to adopt a sales tax (in accordance with State laws, which control the minimum and maximum rate). However, a locally dedicated sales tax is subject to voter approval.

Motor Vehicle License Fees

The proposed city would be eligible to receive Motor Vehicle In-Lieu Fees (VLF) which are subvention fees collected by the State Department of Motor Vehicles and allocated to cities on a per capita basis. All Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax revenues authorized for cities by the *California Streets and Highways Code* (§§2105, 2106, and 2107) are calculated and allocated to the proposed city on a per capita basis. For the first five years after incorporation, population for purposes of this of this revenue allocation is calculated based on a downward annual sliding scale starting at 150 percent of the City's population, fixed annually by the State Department of Finance for each year. In the sixth and subsequent years, the city population is used.

3.1.4 ROAD FUND REVENUES

Measure A Sales Tax

Measure A is a one-half cent local sales tax that is restricted to road infrastructure projects and maintenance, and is administered by the Riverside County Transportation Commission.

Proposition 42 Sales Tax

Proposition 42 provides for a portion of the State sales tax on gasoline to be dedicated to local and statewide road infrastructure projects, including road maintenance. Each city is allocated a portion of this revenue on an annual basis based on population.

3.1.5 STRUCTURAL FIRE FUND REVENUES

Structural Fire Fund revenues are restricted Property Tax revenues received for the provision of Fire Protection services. As such, they are carried out in a separate fund and then allocated to the General Fund on an annual basis at a level not to exceed the cost of providing fire protection services. Structural Fire Property Tax revenues cannot be used for any other General Fund purpose.

Structural Fire Property Tax

The new City of Jurupa Valley would receive 100 percent of the Structural Fire Property Tax collected from within the new city boundaries.

Inter Fund Transfer from General Fund

Insufficient Structural Fire Property Tax is allocated to the City to fully cover the cost of fire protection services. As such, the CFA assumes that an Inter-Fund Transfer from the General Fund to the City's Structural Fire Fund would be necessary on an annual basis to fully fund Fire Protection Services.

3.1.6 CSA AND L & LMD FUND REVENUE

CSA fund and L & LMD fund revenues are restricted property tax and special assessment revenues received for provision of street lighting services. They are carried in separate individual funds and cannot be used for any other purpose.

CSA 72, CSA 73, and L & LMD 89-1-C

There are two CSAs within the Jurupa Valley area that would dissolve once incorporation takes place and the responsibility would be transferred to the City of Jurupa Valley. CSA 72 provides street lighting services to a small portion of the Rubidoux area near Market Street and Hall Avenue. CSA 73 provides street lighting services to the Crestmore area near Rubidoux Boulevard and Tarragona Drive. All revenues derived within these two CSAs would transfer to the new City of Jurupa Valley.

Inter Fund Transfer from Road Fund

Each CSA is funded exclusively with a separate Property Tax allocation. Therefore, it may be necessary over time to augment the CSAs with additional revenue.

3.2 FISCAL FEASIBILITY

In accordance with Section 56720 of the *California Government Code*, fiscal feasibility is the most critical finding that must be made by LAFCO for approval of a new city incorporation. However, fiscal feasibility is predicated on certain determinations to be made by LAFCO with respect to other aspects of the incorporation. These include:

- Boundaries of the new city;
- Timing of the incorporation;
- Detachments, consolidations, and other governmental boundary changes;
- Property tax transfer determinations; and
- Revenue neutrality mitigation determinations.

3.2.1 NEUTRALITY NOT ADDRESSED

In 1992, the State enacted legislation designed to lessen the negative fiscal impacts that incorporations would have on counties and other affected agencies. Revenue neutrality requires the incorporation to result in a “similar exchange” of both revenue and service responsibility among the proposed city, the affected county, and any other affected agency. LAFCO can only approve the proposed incorporation of the new City of Jurupa Valley by demonstrating that the incorporation would not have a negative fiscal impact on an affected agency, or receiving the approval of that agency. An agency that is negatively affected by incorporation can, for example, negotiate payments from and participate in tax sharing agreements with the new city.

In the County of Riverside, revenue neutrality is calculated based on recurring General Fund costs and revenues for the base year (Fiscal Year 2007–2008). The County of Riverside would lose revenue, but would also realize a reduction in service costs in the Jurupa Valley area. If the revenues transferred exceed the costs of services within the incorporation scenario boundaries, the County of Riverside would realize a negative long-term fiscal impact; however, the analysis performed in the CFA has demonstrated that the County would realize a positive fiscal impact under Alternative 3 but not with Alternatives 1 and 2.

3.3 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

This IS/ND is intended to serve as the primary environmental document for all actions associated with the incorporation of the City of Jurupa Valley within the County of Riverside, including all discretionary approvals requested or required to implement the project.

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND INITIAL STUDY

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

4.1 AGENCY DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to be the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except 'No Impact' answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A 'No Impact' answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A 'No Impact' answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. 'Potentially Significant Impact' is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more 'Potentially Significant Impact' entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) 'Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated' applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from 'Potentially Significant Impact' to a 'Less Than Significant Impact.' The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, 'Earlier Analyses,' may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are 'Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,' describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

Questions A through D – No Impact. The proposed project involves the incorporation of the community of Jurupa Valley into a general city within the County of Riverside. Project implementation would not affect the aesthetics or viewscape of the community from its current condition. Rather, project implementation would transfer municipal authority away from the County of Riverside to the newly formed city. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt all zoning ordinances and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those related to aesthetics, until such time that the city develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly formed city would continue Jurupa Valley’s compliance with the Policies and Goals of the Riverside County General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element. This would include Policy OS 21.1 for conserving the skylines, view corridor, and outstanding scenic vistas within Riverside County as well as Policy OS 22.1 for encouraging the balance of objectives and design development with the maintenance of scenic resources. As such, there would be no impact related to aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – Would the project:				
<i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.</i>				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Questions A through C – No Impact. As stated above, implementation of the proposed project would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a city. The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. It would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract, or involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt all zoning ordinances and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those related to agricultural resources, until such time that the city develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly formed city would continue Jurupa Valley’s compliance with the Policies and Goals of the County of Riverside General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element. This would include Policies OS 7.2 and OS 7.3, which require municipalities to cooperate with individual farmers, farming organizations, and farmland conservation organizations to improve the viability of farms and ranches, thereby ensuring the long-term conservation of productive agricultural operations within Riverside County. As such, there would be no impact to agricultural resources.

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

Questions A through E – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not have any direct physical impacts related to air quality because the proposal does not involve the movement of earth. The incorporation of the community of Jurupa Valley into a city would involve the transfer of specific municipal authorities and services from the County of Riverside to the newly formed City of Jurupa Valley. The proposed transfer of municipal authorities would not

affect current air quality regulations delineated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The newly incorporated City of Jurupa Valley would be part of the South Coast Air Basin and would continue to be subject to current State and federal regulations related to air emissions. As such, there would be no impact related to air quality.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Questions A through F – No Impact. As stated throughout this document, the proposed project would not involve any direct physical impacts to the environment. The project proposes the incorporation of the community of Jurupa Valley into a city, which would transfer municipal governance to the new city. Currently, the unincorporated community of Jurupa Valley participates in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), and would continue to do so following project implementation. The Western Riverside MSHCP is a comprehensive, multi-jurisdictional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that focuses on conservation of species and their associated habitats in Western Riverside County. This plan is one of several large, multi-jurisdictional, habitat-planning efforts in Southern California; its overall goal is to maintain biological and ecological diversity within a rapidly urbanizing region. The proposed incorporation of Jurupa Valley would not impact its participation in the MSHCP, nor would it impact the community's physical environment.

Additionally, the proposed incorporation would demonstrate compliance with the County of Riverside General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element Policy OS 18.1, which calls for the preservation of multi-species habitat resources in the County of Riverside through enforcing the provision of applicable MSHCPs. As such, there would be no impact related to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Questions A through D – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would transfer municipal services from the County of Riverside to the City of Jurupa Valley. Project implementation would not initiate any physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would have no potential to impact any cultural resources.

The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt the County of Riverside Zoning Ordinance and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those pertaining to cultural resources, until such time that the City develops its own General Plan. A major thrust of the multipurpose open space system is for the preservation of ecosystem and landscape components that embody the historic character and habitat of the County. The proposed incorporation would move forward with that goal.

The newly formed city would continue to be compliant with the following policies of the County of Riverside General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element:

- OS 19.1: Make available programs that educate students about the rich natural and manmade environment of the County, and offer them to local schools.
- OS 19.2: Review all proposed development for the possibility of archaeological sensitivity.
- OS 19.4: Require a Native American Statement as part of the environmental review process on development projects with identified cultural resources.
- OS 19.6: Enforce the Historic Building Code so that historical buildings can be preserved and used without posing a hazard to public safety.
- OS 19.9: This policy requires that when existing information indicates that a site proposed for development may contain paleontological resources, a paleontologist shall monitor site grading activities, with the authority to halt grading to collect uncovered paleontological resources, curate any resources collected with an appropriate repository, and file a report with the Planning Department documenting any paleontological resources that are found during the course of site grading.

As such, there would be no impact to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

Questions A through E – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would transfer governance from the County of Riverside to the City of Jurupa Valley; there would be no physical changes to the environment, and the incorporation would have no impact on geologic resources. However, it should be noted that earthquake risk is very high in the most heavily populated western portion of the county and the Coachella Valley due to the presence of three of California’s most active faults: the San Andreas, San Jacinto, and Elsinore Faults. Most of Southern California shares this risk, they affect widespread areas; they trigger many secondary effects; and they can overwhelm the ability of local jurisdictions to respond.

In Riverside County, earthquake-triggered geologic effects include ground shaking, fault rupture, landslides, liquefaction, and subsidence all of which are discussed in the Riverside County General Plan’s Safety Element. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt the zoning ordinance and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside*

General Plan and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan* pertaining to the prevention and mitigation of geologic hazards until the city develops its own *General Plan*. The newly formed city would continue to be compliant with the County of Riverside *General Plan's* Multipurpose Safety Element Policies. This would include compliance with the following Policies delineated in the *General Plan Safety Element*:

- S 2.1: Minimize fault-rupture hazards through enforcement of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act provisions.
- S 2.2: Require geological and geotechnical investigations in areas with potential for earthquake-induced liquefaction, land-sliding, or settlement as part of the environmental and development review process.
- S 2.3: Require that a State-licensed professional investigate the potential for liquefaction in areas designated as underlain by "Susceptible Sediments" and "Shallow Ground Water" for all general construction projects.
- S 2.4: Require that a State-licensed professional investigate the potential for liquefaction in areas identified as underlain by "Susceptible Sediments" for all proposed critical facilities projects.
- S 2.5: Require that engineered slopes be designed to resist seismically induced failure.
- S 2.6: Require that cut-and-fill transition lots be over-excavated to mitigate the potential of seismically-induced differential settlement.
- S 2.7: Require a 100 percent maximum variation of fill depths beneath structures to mitigate the potential of seismically induced differential settlement.
- S 2.8: Encourage research into new foundation design systems that better resist the County's climatic, geotechnical, and geological conditions.
- S 3.2: Require that stabilized landslides be provided with redundant drainage systems. Provisions for the maintenance of subdrains must be designed into the system.
- S 3.3: Before issuance of building permits, require certification regarding the stability of the site against adverse effects of rain, earthquakes, and subsidence.
- S 3.4: Require adequate mitigation of potential impacts from erosion, slope instability, or other hazardous slope conditions, or from loss of aesthetic resources for development occurring on slope and hillside areas.
- S 3.5: During permit review, identify and encourage mitigation of on-site and off-site slope instability, debris flow, and erosion hazards on lots undergoing substantial improvements.
- S 3.6: Require grading plans, environmental assessments, engineering and geologic technical reports, irrigation and landscaping plans including ecological restoration and re-vegetation plans, as appropriate, in order to assure the adequate demonstration of a project's ability to mitigate the potential impacts of slope and erosion hazards and loss of native vegetation.
- S 3.7: Support mitigation on existing public and private property located on unstable hillside areas.
- S 3.8: Require geotechnical studies within documented subsidence zones, as well as zones that may be susceptible to subsidence prior to the issuance of development permits.
- S 3.9: Develop a liaison program with all County water districts to prevent water extraction-induced subsidence.
- S 3.10: Encourage and support efforts for long-term, permanent monitoring of topographic subsidence in all producing groundwater basins, regardless of past subsidence.

Because the proposed City of Jurupa Valley would continue to be in compliance with the *General Plan Policies* listed above and because it proposes only the transfer of municipal services and governance from the County to a new city without the physical impact of development, there would be no geologic impacts as a result of project implementation.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?				X
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Questions A through G – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a city. The proposed project would transfer municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to a newly formed city; there would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation.

The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt the current zoning ordinance and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan* related to hazards and hazardous materials until such time that the City develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly incorporated city would continue to be in compliance with the Policies and Goals in the County of Riverside General Plan’s Safety Element. In the area of hazardous materials, compliance with Policy S 6.1 enforcing the policies, siting criteria, and implementation of the programs identified in the *County of Riverside Hazardous Waste Management Plan* would ensure that no impacts would occur.

Much of Riverside County is rated as a potential wildland fire area by both the State of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and the Riverside County General Plan Safety

Element (Riverside County 2003a). Policies have been developed to minimize the threat of wildfire hazards. The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would comply with Policy S 5.1 because it would develop and enforce construction and design standards that ensure that proposed development incorporates fire prevention features through the following standard conditions of approval:

- All proposed construction would meet minimum standards for fire safety, as defined in the County Building or Fire Codes, by County zoning, or as dictated by the Building Official or the Transportation Land Management Agency based on building type, design, occupancy, and use.
- In addition to the standards and guidelines of the Uniform Building Code and Uniform Fire Code fire safety provisions, continue additional standards for high-risk, high-occupancy, dependent, and essential facilities where appropriate under the *Riverside County Fire Protection Ordinance*.
- Proposed development in Hazardous Fire areas would provide secondary public access, unless determined otherwise by the County Fire Chief and would use single-loaded roads to enhance fuel modification areas, unless otherwise determined by the County Fire Chief.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would also be in compliance with Safety Element Policy S 5.5, which requires municipalities to conduct and implement long-range fire safety planning, including stringent building, fire, subdivision, and municipal code standards; improved infrastructure; and improved mutual aid agreements with the private and public sector. As such, the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would have no impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) 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 uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) 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?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Question A – No Impact. Riverside County includes four major watershed areas in which river systems, numerous lakes and reservoirs, and natural drainage areas are located. The County’s supply of water is limited by its arid climate, agricultural practices, projected population growth and associated demand from development and dependence on imported water. The availability of imported surface water has been reduced due to changing regulations, despite an ever-increasing water demand. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a city, and would transfer municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to a newly formed City. There would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation. Water is currently provided to the community of Jurupa Valley by the Jurupa Community Services District. Once the proposed incorporation is complete, the City of Jurupa Valley would continue to contract and receive its water from the Jurupa Community Services District. As such, project implementation would have no impact on water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would occur.

Questions B through J – No Impact. The Jurupa Community Services District provides water service to the Jurupa Valley community and would continue to do so after incorporation. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt the zoning ordinance and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan and Jurupa Area Land Use Plan* related to hydrology and water quality until such time that the City develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly incorporated city would continue to be in compliance with the Policies and Goals of the Riverside County General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space. Policies in this section seek to protect and enhance the water resources in the county. These policies address broad water planning issues and the relationship of land use decisions to water issues.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would be in compliance with water resource policies governing water supply, water conservation, water quality, groundwater recharge, floodplain and riparian area management, and wetlands. These would include the following policies:

- OS 1.1: Balancing consideration of water supply requirements between urban, agricultural, and environmental needs.

- OS 2.1: Encouraging the installation of water-conserving systems such as dry wells and gray water systems where feasible.
- OS 3.1: Encouraging innovative and creative techniques for wastewater treatment.
- OS 4.1: Supporting efforts to create additional water storage.
- OS 5.1: Substantially altering floodways or implementing other channelization only as a “last resort”.
- OS 6.1: Ensuring compliance with the Clean Water Act’s Section 404 in terms of wetlands mitigation policies and policies concerning fill material in jurisdictional wetlands.
- OS 6.2: Ensuring the preservation of buffer zones around wetlands where feasible and biologically appropriate.

As stated in Section VI., Geology and Soils, the proposed project would also continue to be in compliance with Riverside County General Plan’s Safety Element Policies. These would include Policy S 3.9 to develop of a liaison program with all County water districts to prevent water extraction-induced subsidence and Policy S 3.10 to encourage and supporting efforts for long-term, permanent monitoring of topographic subsidence in all producing groundwater basins regardless of past subsidence.

Implementation of the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not have any direct physical impacts. Therefore, the project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area; it would not create or contribute runoff water; it would not substantially degrade water quality; and it would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project is located in the Inland Empire, which is land-locked and located more than 30 miles from the ocean. Because of this, it would not be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact would occur.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Questions A through C – No Impact. Jurupa Valley is a developing, unincorporated community located in Riverside County, north of the cities of Norco and Riverside. The topography of the western portion of Jurupa Valley is primarily flat, with gentle rolling foothills. The area north of SR-60 includes the more sloping terrain of the Jurupa Mountains. The remaining areas of Jurupa Valley are predominantly characterized as a slightly undulating flatland that contains fewer natural open space features than is most other areas within Riverside County. Land uses found in the Jurupa Valley area include residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural uses. Agricultural activities, including dairies, field crops and ranches, have been the primary land uses in the area, though these activities have been giving way to more urban types of development, predominantly residential and commercial uses. The Jurupa Valley Plan area is primarily characterized by high-

and low-density residential development, with small pockets of commercial development.

The conversion from predominantly agricultural to predominantly urban land uses will likely continue for the foreseeable future. The community is bisected by I-15 and is bordered by San Bernardino County to the north and northwest, the cities of Riverside and Norco to the south, and the unincorporated community of Eastvale to the southwest. The Los Angeles County line is approximately ten miles northwest of the proposed western boundary of the proposed city of Jurupa Valley, and the Orange County line is approximately ten miles to the southwest.

As identified in Section 2.2.1 above, the Jurupa Valley area is approximately 60 square miles in size and land uses include a mix of high- and low-density residential; rural farming and other agricultural activities; and a mix of commercial, public uses, and industrial uses. As indicated above, there are seven distinct communities within Jurupa Valley. The community of Rubidoux is the largest and most densely developed with a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and public uses. Land uses within the Sunnyslope community consist of low density single-family residences and mobile homes. The Belltown community consists of low density single-family residential, industrial, and scattered commercial uses. Glen Avon is largely a rural community area with scattered commercial, industrial, and higher intensity residential. The Indian Hills community is a golf course oriented residential area. Pedley contains a variety of rural and suburban style residential neighborhoods and a commercial district along Limonite Avenue. Industrial uses are located along the Santa Ana River. The Mira Loma community is largely rural with several equestrian trails. A large area of land in northwest Mira Loma near the I-15/SR-60 interchange is converting from dairy to industrial, warehousing, and truck distribution land uses.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not divide an established community. It would likely adopt the policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan* related to land use until the City develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly incorporated city would continue to be in compliance with the *County of Riverside General Plan*; it would continue to focus on preserving the numerous unique features in the area; and, at the same time, would guide the accommodation of future growth. No impact would occur.

The community of Jurupa Valley is located in unincorporated Riverside County. As such, the project site is currently subject to the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP), which governs the unincorporated areas of Riverside County and oversees regional planning programs, including compliance with the General Plan and Western Riverside MSHCP. The project area is also currently subject to the *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, a component of the *County of Riverside General Plan*.

The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, including the MSHCP. The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would likely adopt the policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those related to land use, until the City develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly incorporated city would continue to be in compliance with the Policies and Goals of the Riverside County General Plan's Land Use Element. The policies have been designed to address many levels of issues and policies (i.e., land use administration, efficient use of land, community design, project design, provision for infrastructure and public facilities and services, land use compatibility, economic development, and open space, habitat and natural resource preservation).

Standard Conditions of Approval for the proposed project would require that, once incorporated, the proposed City of Jurupa Valley must immediately adopt all existing Riverside County ordinances, including the zoning ordinance. These ordinances would remain in effect for a minimum period of 120 days or until superseding ordinances are enacted, whichever occurs first

(LAFCO 2009).

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would be in compliance with the following policies of the Riverside County General Plan's Land Use Element:

- *LU 1.4:* Require that annexations allow the County to maintain a sufficient tax base or other revenue base to pay for their necessary services.
- *LU 1.6:* Coordinate with local agencies, such as LAFCO, service providers and utilities, to ensure adequate service provision for new development.
- *LU 2.1:* Accommodate land use development in accordance with the patterns and distribution of use and density depicted on the General Plan Land Use Map and the Area Plan Land Use Maps, in accordance with the following:
 - a) Provide a land use mix at the countywide and area plan levels based on projected need and supported by evaluation of impacts to the environment, economy, infrastructure, and services;
 - b) Accommodate a range of community types and character, from agricultural and rural enclaves to urban and suburban communities;
 - c) Provide for a broad range of land uses, intensities, and densities, including a range of residential, commercial, business, industry, open space, recreation, and public facilities uses;
 - d) Concentrate growth near community centers that provide a mixture of commercial, employment, entertainment, recreation, civic, and cultural uses to the greatest extent possible;
 - e) Concentrate growth near or within existing urban and suburban areas to maintain the rural and open space character of Riverside County to the greatest extent possible.;
 - f) Site development to capitalize upon multi-modal transportation opportunities and promote compatible land use arrangements that reduce reliance on the automobile; and
 - g) Prevent inappropriate development in areas that are environmentally sensitive or subject to severe natural hazards.
- *LU 4.1:* Require that new developments be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade, the character of the surrounding area through consideration of the following concepts:
 - a) Compliance with the design standards of the appropriate area plan land use category;
 - b) Require that structures be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the County's zoning, building, and other pertinent codes and regulations;
 - c) Require that an appropriate landscape plan be submitted and implemented for development projects subject to discretionary review;
 - d) Require that new development utilize drought-tolerant landscaping and incorporate adequate drought-conscious irrigation systems;
 - e) Pursue energy efficiency through street configuration, building orientation, and landscaping to capitalize on shading and facilitate solar energy, as provided for in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code;
 - f) Incorporate water conservation techniques, such as groundwater recharge basins, use of porous pavement, drought tolerant landscaping, and water recycling, as appropriate;
 - g) Encourage innovative and creative design concepts;
 - h) Encourage the provision of public art;
 - i) Include consistent and well-designed signage that is integrated with the building's architectural character;
 - j) Provide safe and convenient vehicular access and reciprocal access between adjacent commercial uses;
 - k) Locate site entries and storage bays to minimize conflicts with adjacent residential neighborhoods;

- l) Mitigate noise, odor, lighting, and other impacts on surrounding properties.
 - m) Provide and maintain landscaping in open spaces and parking lots;
 - n) Include extensive landscaping;
 - o) Preserve natural features, such as unique natural terrain, drainage ways, and native vegetation, wherever possible, particularly where they provide continuity with more extensive regional systems;
 - p) Require that new development be designed to provide adequate space for pedestrian connectivity and access, recreational trails, vehicular access and parking, supporting functions, open space, and other pertinent elements;
 - q) Design parking lots and structures to be functionally and visually integrated and connected;
 - r) Site buildings access points along sidewalks, pedestrian areas, and bicycle routes, and include amenities that encourage pedestrian activity;
 - s) Establish safe and frequent pedestrian crossings; and
 - t) Create a human-scale ground floor environment that includes public open areas that separate pedestrian space from auto traffic or where mixed, it does so with special regard to pedestrian safety.
- *LU 5.1:* Ensure that development does not exceed the ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services, such as libraries, recreational facilities, transportation systems, and fire/police/medical services.
 - *LU 7.1:* Accommodate the development of a balance of land uses that maintain and enhance the County’s fiscal viability, economic diversity, and environmental integrity.
 - *LU 8.1:* Provide for permanent preservation of open space lands that contain important natural resources, hazards, water features, watercourses, and scenic and recreational values.

Section 57376 of the *California Government Code* requires that, once incorporation takes place, a newly formed city must immediately adopt all existing County zoning ordinances for a period of 120 days or until superseding ordinances are enacted, whichever occurs first. The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would use the Riverside County General Plan and Zoning Code as its foundation until the newly formed City would develop its own general plan and zoning code. As such, no impact would occur.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Questions A and B – No Impact. Mineral extraction is an important component of Riverside County’s economy. There are extensive deposits of clay, limestone, iron, sand, and aggregates throughout the area. The non-renewable characteristic of mineral deposits necessitates the careful and efficient development of land with mineral resources in order to prevent the unnecessary waste of these deposits due to careless exploitation and uncontrolled urbanization. Management of these mineral resources would protect not only future development of mineral deposit areas, but would also guide the extraction of mineral deposits so that adverse impacts

caused by mineral extraction will be reduced or eliminated. According to the *Jurupa Area Plan*, few mineral resources exist within the community of Jurupa Valley. However, the proposed project is the incorporation of a new city and would have no potential for impact for any of the mineral resources that exist.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would transfer municipal services from the County of Riverside to the City of Jurupa Valley and would not initiate any physical changes to the environment. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt the zoning ordinance and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those pertaining to mineral resources until the City develops its own General Plan. Policies seek to conserve areas identified as containing significant mineral deposits and oil and gas resources for potential future use; they also promote the reasonable, safe, and orderly operation of mining and extraction activities within areas designated for such use and where environmental, aesthetic, and adjacent land use compatibility impacts can be adequately mitigated. The proposed project would be in compliance with the following Riverside County General Plan’s Multipurpose Open Space Element Policies:

- OS 14.1: Require that the operation and reclamation of surface mines be consistent with the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) and County Development Code provisions.
- OS 14.2: Restrict incompatible land uses within the impact area of existing or potential surface mining areas.
- OS 14.3: Restrict land uses incompatible with mineral resource recovery within areas designated Open Space-Mineral Resources.
- OS 14.4: Impose conditions as necessary on mining operations to minimize or eliminate the potential adverse impact of mining operations on surrounding properties, and environmental resources.
- OS 14.5: Require that new non-mining land uses adjacent to existing mining operations be designed to provide a buffer between the new development and the mining operations. The buffer distance shall be based on an evaluation of noise, aesthetics, drainage, operating conditions, biological resources, topography, lighting, traffic, operating hours, and air quality.

No impact would occur.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Questions A through F – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a City, and would transfer municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to this newly formed city. There would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation.

The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt all ordinances and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those related to noise until the City develops its own General Plan. Therefore, the newly incorporated city would continue to be in compliance with the Policies and Goals of the Riverside County General Plan’s Noise Element. The General Plan Noise Element is a mandatory component of the General Plan (Government Code §65302 [f]). The element must recognize the guidelines adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to the *California Health and Safety Code* (§46050.1). It also can be utilized as a tool for compliance with the state’s noise insulation standards. The Noise Element provides a systematic approach to identifying and appraising noise problems in the community; quantifying existing and projected noise levels; addressing excessive noise exposure; and planning for the regulation of noise. This element includes policies, standards, criteria, programs, diagrams, a reference to action items, and maps related to protecting public health and welfare from noise.

The proposed project would be in compliance with the following Riverside County General Plan’s Noise Element Policies:

- *N 1.1:* Protect noise-sensitive land uses from high levels of noise by restricting noise-producing land uses from these areas. If the noise-producing land use cannot be relocated, then noise buffers such as setbacks, landscaping, or block walls shall be used.
- *N 1.3:* Consider the following uses noise-sensitive and discourage these uses in areas in excess of 65 CNEL:
 - a) Schools;
 - b) Hospitals;
 - c) Rest Homes;
 - d) Long-Term Care Facilities;
 - e) Mental Care Facilities;
 - f) Residential Uses;
 - g) Libraries;
 - h) Passive Recreation Uses; and
 - i) Places of worship.
- *N 1.4:* Determine if existing land uses will present noise compatibility issues with proposed

projects by undertaking site surveys.

- *N 1.5:* Prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure on the residents, employees, visitors, and noise-sensitive uses of Riverside County.
- *N 2.2:* Require a qualified acoustical specialist to prepare acoustical studies for proposed noise-sensitive projects within noise impacted areas to mitigate existing noise.
- *N 3.3:* Ensure compatibility between industrial development and adjacent land uses. To achieve compatibility, industrial development projects may be required to include noise mitigation measures to avoid or minimize project impacts on adjacent uses.
- *N 4.6:* Establish acceptable standards for residential noise sources such as, but not limited to, leaf blowers, mobile vendors, mobile stereos and stationary noise sources such as home appliances, air conditioners, and swimming pool equipment.
- *N 7.4:* Check each development proposal to determine if it is located within an airport noise impact area as depicted in the applicable Area Plan's Policy Area section regarding Airport Influence Areas. Development proposals within a noise impact area shall comply with applicable airport land use noise compatibility criteria.
- *N 8.5:* Employ noise mitigation practices when designing all future streets and highways, and when improvements occur along existing highway segments. These mitigation measures will emphasize the establishment of natural buffers or setbacks between the arterial roadways and adjoining noise-sensitive areas.
- *N 11.1:* Utilize natural barriers such as hills, berms, boulders, and dense vegetation to assist in noise reduction.

No changes in the noise environment would occur; therefore, no noise impacts would occur as a result of the incorporation.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Question A – No Impact. Jurupa Valley is a developing community. Population estimates for the alternative scenarios would be as follows at incorporation: Alternative 1 – 86,810, Alternative 2 – 87,818, and Alternative 3 – 92,356 (Winzler & Kelly 2009). The area encompasses approximately 60 square miles and, over the last two decades, has been transitioning from a predominantly rural residential area to a more mixed use suburban community.

Development Projections

Annual projections for future new commercial development were provided to Winzler & Kelly by

Riverside County's Planning Department, while residential housing growth estimates were provided by Riverside County's Demographics Department. These projections were assumed in the Jurupa Valley Public Review Draft CFA prepared by Winzler & Kelly (September 2009). Projects in process identified by the County total approximately 7,000 residential units; 1,020,000 square feet (sf) of commercial retail; and 5,700,000 sf of combined commercial office and industrial development, which includes the 267,900 sf Pedley Shopping Center located on Pedley Road south of SR-60 (Winzler & Kelly 2009). The County's new development projections also assume minimal activity until Fiscal Year 2011–2012 with increasing activity as the economy recovers.

Commercial Trends and Projections

Commercial development has been increasing as a result of the strong residential market in Jurupa Valley. The path of development has proceeded north along I-15 and is concentrated at highway interchanges. Typical of many developing communities, some Jurupa Valley residents have had to shop outside their community for many basic needs, resulting in the loss of local sales tax revenue. The development of the Eastvale Gateway Retail Gateway has served to capture local revenue and to localize retail expenditures.

Based on the information above, it is not expected that the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure). As stated throughout this document, the proposed project would redirect municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to the proposed City of Jurupa Valley. Regional growth in the Jurupa Valley area would occur with or without the approval of the proposed project. As such, no impact would occur.

Question B and C – No Impact. Project implementation would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, nor would it displace a substantial number of people which would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would transfer governance and municipal services from the County of Riverside to the proposed City of Jurupa Valley. As such, no impact would occur.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

Question A – No Impact. Municipal services are local public services typically provided to developed areas by cities, counties, special districts, and private utilities. Common types of public services include public safety (law enforcement, fire protection), parks, and schools.

Fire Protection

Fire protection in the community of Jurupa Valley is currently provided by the Riverside County Fire Department. Fire protection and paramedic services for the Jurupa Valley area is provided primarily from Station #16 (Pedley – 1 Paramedic Assessment Engine), Station #17 (Glen Avon – 1 Paramedic Assessment Engine and 1 Ariel Ladder Truck), and Station #18 (West Riverside – 1 Paramedic Assessment Engine). The proposed City of Jurupa Valley would contract with the Riverside County Fire Department for fire protection services.

The Fire Department responds to emergency medical calls with certified paramedics. Emergency medical transport (ambulance) services are provided under a contract with American Medical Response (AMR). Dispatch services are provided through a consolidated County dispatch center that is dedicated solely to fire services in the County. The County Fire Department also has special use staff, facilities, and equipment that provide services throughout its service area and to other fire departments, as necessary. Contract costs are based on providing the same staffing currently provided through the Riverside County Fire Department.

The Fire Department has indicated that, after incorporation, the proposed city would be expected to absorb the full cost of one planned new station (Lakeside) for Alternative 1, and two planned new stations (Lakeside and Landon) for Alternatives 2 and 3. The Landon Station is anticipated to be operational in Fiscal Year 2014–2015 and the Lakeside station operational in Fiscal Year 2018–2019. Construction of any station is predicated on availability of funds and development trends affecting servicing; therefore, exact timing of the new stations cannot be determined.

Project implementation would not change municipal services in the area of fire protection in that the proposed City of Jurupa Valley would continue to contract with the County of Riverside Fire Department for services. As such, no impact would occur in the area of fire protection.

Police Protection

Administrative functions of the Riverside County Sheriff are provided from its main facility in the City of Riverside at 4095 Lemon Street. The Jurupa Valley station at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Riverside provides sheriff patrol services to the Jurupa Valley community. The number of deputies patrolling in the Jurupa Valley community at any given time varies depending on service demands in other unincorporated areas.

Project implementation would not change municipal services in the area of police protection in that the proposed City of Jurupa Valley would continue to contract with the County of Riverside Sheriff's Department for services, or they would create their own city police department at some point in the future. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) currently provides traffic control and enforcement for unincorporated Jurupa Valley. The proposed incorporation of Jurupa Valley would allow the new city to contract services with either the Riverside County Sheriff's Department or they would create their own city traffic enforcement department at some point in the future. This would represent a change from the current condition. Contracting traffic control services from the Riverside County Sheriff's Department instead of from the CHP would not have the potential to impact traffic control because the newly formed city would be contracting for the same kind of services. Should the newly formed city decide to create their own city traffic control services, the same would be true. There would be no interruption in traffic control services. The cost factor to implement a new city service would be analyzed by the City of Jurupa Valley prior to

its creation; this analysis assumes that the new city would make a fiscally responsible choice between contracting for traffic control services or not.

The cost to serve the service population in the first year (Fiscal Year 2012–2013) of incorporation would be approximately \$12.8 million per year. Figure 9 in Appendix A shows the projected costs for Jurupa Valley to contract with Riverside County for police services. Based on projected needs in Fiscal Year 2020–2021, the annual cost to provide police services for Jurupa Valley is approximately \$16.2 million dollars per year.

No impact is expected in the area of police protection since the current service levels would be maintained and because the total estimated contract costs are comparable to other cities served by the Sheriff with similar staffing ratios. These contract costs would be paid for by revenues collected by the proposed new city.

Schools

The Jurupa Unified School District currently serves the proposed project area. In addition, the Corona-Norco Unified School District and the Alvord Unified School District also provide K–12 public education to a small portion of Jurupa Valley. Community college education is provided by the Riverside Community College District.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would create a new city that would transfer municipal services from the County of Riverside to the City of Jurupa Valley. A newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would continue to receive school services from all three school districts for the foreseeable future. As such, project implementation would have no impact on public services related to schools in the proposed City of Jurupa Valley.

Parks

Park and recreation services are provided by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District. The district provides 18 facilities, including active sports parks, community centers, pools, and gymnasiums. Although LAFCO has the authority to consider dissolution of this District as a result of incorporation with revenue and service responsibility transferring to the new city, the CFA assumes this function would remain with the District. Management of these parks and fields would remain unchanged.

Since the incorporation would not induce population growth or result in an increase in use of the existing parks within the region, no impact would occur.

Other Public Facilities

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to form a city and would transfer municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to a newly formed city. At the present time, land use planning and regulation in Riverside County is provided through the Planning, Building & Safety, and Code Enforcement divisions. It is anticipated that the business plan for the proposed City of Jurupa Valley would include a development services department that would provide land use planning and regulation services. The department would use contract staff for some positions, particularly in the initial years following incorporation. Cost recovery rates would be assumed at a conservative level and, as such, no impact would occur.

In summary, the newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt all ordinances and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa*

Area Land Use Plan including those pertaining to public facilities and service provisions until the City develops its own General Plan. In order to ensure the correlation between growth and service provisions and to minimize capital and service costs, development would only occur where adequate public facilities and services are available or are planned. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would be in compliance with Riverside County General Plan’s Land Use Element, Infrastructure, Public Facilities and Service Provision Policy LU 5.1; this policy ensures that development does not exceed its ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services. Policy LU 5.2 calls for monitoring the capacities of infrastructure and services in coordination with service providers. Since the Jurupa Valley Incorporation would comply with these policies, no impact would occur.

XIV. RECREATION				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Questions A and B – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a city, and would transfer municipal services and governance from the County of Riverside to a newly formed city. There would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation. Implementation of the Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not have a direct impact on recreational services in that it would not:

- Result in an increase in demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks;
- Result in an increase in demand of other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or accelerate;
- Include the development of recreational facilities;
- Require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

As indicated above, park and recreation services are provided by the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District and this would remain unchanged with the incorporation of Jurupa Valley. The newly formed City of Jurupa Valley would adopt all ordinances and would likely adopt current policies and goals delineated in the *County of Riverside General Plan* and *Jurupa Area Land Use Plan*, including those pertaining to recreation, until the city develops its own General Plan. In order to ensure the correlation between growth and service provisions and to minimize capital and service costs, development would only occur where adequate public facilities and services are available or are planned. The proposed project would be in compliance with the Riverside County General Plan’s Land Use Element, Infrastructure, Public Facilities, and Services Provision LU 5.1, which ensures that development does not exceed the ability to adequately provide supporting infrastructure and services such as recreational facilities. As such, no impact would occur.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Questions A through G – No Impact. Like all of Riverside County, unincorporated Jurupa Valley has experienced rapid growth over the last 20 years. Linking areas of concentrated growth requires an integrated system of mobility that includes vehicular, pedestrian, transit, equestrian, bicycle, and air transportation options. The intent of new growth patterns and the new mobility systems is to accommodate the transportation demands created by future growth and to provide mobility options that help reduce the need to utilize the automobile. The County of Riverside supports three transportation plans and programs that are necessary to manage current traffic demands in and plan for the County’s future development needs. Implementation of the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would support the following plans and programs:

- **Community Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process:** Due to the importance of the circulation and mobility systems, the Community Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP) was created as one of the three planning efforts in Riverside County. CETAP incorporates three levels of effort: identification of transportation corridors, development of the General Plan Circulation Element, and exploration of options to transit system development in Riverside County.
- **Congestion Management Program:** The Riverside Congestion Management Program (CMP) is updated every two years in accordance with the California Constitution Article 13b, Government Spending Limitation. The CMP was established in the State of California to more directly link land use, transportation, and air quality and to prompt reasonable growth management programs that would more effectively utilize new and existing transportation

funds, alleviate traffic congestion and related impacts, and improve air quality.

- **Regional Transportation Plan:** The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a multi-modal, long-range planning document prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in coordination with federal, State, and other regional, subregional, and local agencies in Southern California. The RTP includes programs and policies for congestion management, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, roadways, freight, and finances. The RTP is prepared every three years and reflects the future horizon based on a 20-year needs projection. The RTP's primary use is as a regional long-range plan for federally funded transportation projects. It also serves as a comprehensive, coordinated transportation plan for all governmental jurisdictions within the region. Each agency responsible for transportation (such as local cities, the County, and Caltrans) has different transportation implementation responsibilities under the RTP. The RTP relies on the plans and policies governing circulation and transportation in each County to identify the region's future multi-modal transportation system.

The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would utilize the transportation directives and programs described above. Additionally, the proposed project would be in compliance with the following County of Riverside General Plan's Circulation Element Policies:

- C 1.5: Evaluate the planned circulation system as needed to enhance the highway network to respond to anticipated growth and mobility needs.
- C 1.6: Cooperate with local, regional, state, and federal agencies to establish an efficient circulation system.
- C 2.1: Maintain the following countywide target Levels of Service: LOS "C" along all County-maintained roads and conventional state highways. As an exception, LOS "D" may be allowed in Community Development areas, only at intersections of any combination of Secondary Highways, Major Highways, Urban Expressways, conventional state highways or freeway ramp intersections. LOS "E" may be allowed in designated community centers to the extent that it would support transit-oriented development and walkable communities.
- C 3.6: Require private developers to be primarily responsible for the improvement of streets and highways service access to developing commercial, industrial, and residential areas. These may include road construction or widening, installation of turning lanes and traffic signals, and the improvement of any drainage facility or other auxiliary facility necessary for the safe and efficient movement of traffic or the protection of road facilities.
- C 3.24: Provide a street network with quick and efficient routes for emergency vehicles, necessary street widths, turn-around radius, and other factors as determined by the Transportation Department in consultation with the Fire Department and other emergency service providers.
- C 3.25: Restrict on-street parking to reduce traffic congestion and improve safety in appropriate locations such as General Plan roadways.
- C 3.26: Plan off-street parking facilities to support and enhance the concept of walkable and transit-oriented communities.
- C 3.27: Evaluate proposed highway extensions or widening projects for potential noise impacts on existing and future land uses in the area. Require that the effects of truck mix, speed limits, and ultimate motor vehicle volumes on noise levels are also explored during the environmental process.
- C 7.5: Partner with government agencies and authorities to provide for improvements and alternative transportation corridors to Orange County.
- C 7.6: Support the development of a new internal East-West CETAP Corridor in conjunction with a new Orange County CETAP connection. Such corridor(s) would be constructed simultaneously to avoid further congestion on the I-15 Freeway. Or, in the alternative, the East-West Corridor would be constructed simultaneously with major capacity enhancements

on the State Route 91, between Pierce Street and the Orange County line, and the capacity improvement of the I-15 (north) to westbound State Route 91 overpass.

As stated throughout this document, the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would allow the community of Jurupa Valley to incorporate into a city, and would transfer municipal services and governance from, the County of Riverside to a newly formed city. There would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation. Implementation of the Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not have a direct impact on transportation and traffic in that it would not (1) cause an increase in traffic that would be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load; (2) exceed a level of service standard; (3) result in a change in air traffic patterns; (4) substantially increase hazards due to a design feature; (5) result in inadequate emergency access; (6) result in inadequate parking capacity; or (7) conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. As such, no impact to transportation would occur.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) 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?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Questions A through G – No Impact. Municipal services are local (not countywide) public services typically provided to developed areas by cities, counties, special districts, and private utilities. Jurupa Valley currently receives municipal services from the County of Riverside and several private utilities and companies. Implementation of the proposed project would involve the incorporation of Jurupa Valley into a city and would implement the transfer of municipal services from the County of Riverside to the newly formed city. Current and future utilities and service providers are listed in Table 2 below.

**TABLE 2
CURRENT AND FUTURE JURUPA VALLEY UTILITIES & SERVICE PROVIDERS**

Service	Current Provider	Proposed Provider	Status
Electric & Gas	Private Utility Companies	Private Utility Companies	No Change
Flood Control	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	No Change
Libraries	County	County	No Change
Solid Waste Collection	County (Waste Management)	County (Waste Management)	No Change
Solid Waste Disposal	County	Private hauler (franchise agreement)	Private hauler (franchise agreement)
Telecommunications	Private Utility Companies	Private Utility Companies	No Change
Water & Wastewater	Jurupa Community Services District	Jurupa Community Services District	No Change

Implementation of the proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not facilitate a significant change in the utilities and service system providers. Service would not be affected by the incorporation of Jurupa Valley. Implementation of the Jurupa Valley Incorporation would not have a direct impact on utilities and service systems in that (1) it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; (2) it would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities; and (3) it would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. This is because there would be no physical impacts as a result of incorporation. The Jurupa Community Services District would continue water service to residents regardless of the incorporation. While the solid waste disposal provider would change from the County to a private hauler via a franchise agreement, the proposed incorporation would not have a direct impact on a landfill as it would not contribute to the capacity past the current condition. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would be in compliance with all local statutes and State and federal mandates related to solid waste. As such, no impact to utilities and service providers would occur.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ('Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

Questions A and B – No Impact. The proposed Jurupa Valley Incorporation would transfer the governance of municipal services from the County of Riverside to the new City of Jurupa Valley. The proposed incorporation would not affect sensitive biological resources, habitat, or species located on a project site, nor would it affect known important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory on a project site because there are no physical impacts associated with the proposed incorporation. As such, the proposed incorporation would not result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable and no impact would occur.

Question C – No Impact. All project-level impacts associated have been determined to have no impact. The project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. No impact would occur.

SECTION 5.0 DOCUMENT PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

Executive Director George J. Spiliotis

BonTerra Consulting (Environmental Document Preparation)

Managing Principal.....Joan Patronite Kelly, AICP
Project Manager.....Julie A. Cho
Technical Editor Julia Smith
Word Processing..... Sheryl Kristal
GIS/Graphics..... Johnnie Garcia
William Dochnahl

SECTION 6.0 REFERENCES

- California Office of Administrative Law. 2009. *California Code of Regulations* (Title 14, Natural Resources; Division 6, Resources Agency; Chapter 3, Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act). Sacramento, CA: the State of California. <http://government.westlaw.com/linkedslice/default.asp?Action=TOC&RS=GVT1.0&VR=2.0&SP=CCR-1000>.
- California Senate. 2008. Senate Bill No. 301 (Chapter 375, Romero). Sacramento, CA: the State. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/sen/sb_0301-0350/sb_301_bill_20080927_chaptered.pdf.
- California, State of. 2009a. *California Government Code* (Sections 56000 et seq., Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=gov&codebody=&hits=20&site=sen>.
- . 2009b. *California Government Code* (Sections 56720–56724, Proceedings for Cities: Incorporation). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=56001-57000&file=56720-56724>.
- . 2009c. *California Government Code* (Sections 57375–57385, Effect of Incorporation). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=57001-58000&file=57375-57385>.
- . 2009d. *California Government Code* (Sections 65300-65303.4, Authority for and Scope of General Plans). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=65001-66000&file=65300-65303.4>.
- . 2009e. *California Health and Safety Code* (Sections 46050–46050.1, Noise Control Act: Duties of the Office). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=hsc&group=46001-47000&file=46050-46050.1>.
- . 2009f. *California Public Resources Code* (Sections 21000 et seq., California Environmental Quality Act). Sacramento, CA: California Resource Agency. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=prc&codebody=&hits=20&site=sen>.
- . 2009g. *California Streets and Highways Code* (Sections 2100–2128.1, Highway Users Tax Fund). Sacramento, CA: the State. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=shc&group=02001-03000&file=2100-2128.1>.
- Dudek and Associates, Inc. (Dudek). 2003. Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (Prepared for the Riverside County Integrated Project). Encinitas, CA: Dudek. http://www.wrc-rca.org/Permits_Docs.html.
- Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). ERAF and the 1998-98 State Budget (prepared by M. O'Malley, with contributions from M. Newman, under the supervision of M. Taylor). Sacramento, CA: LAO. http://www.lao.ca.gov/1997/061897_eraf/eraf_and_the_1997-98_state_budget_pb061897.html.
- Riverside, County of. 2003a (October). *County of Riverside General Plan*. Riverside, CA: the County.

- . 2003b (October). *County of Riverside General Plan: Jurupa Area Plan*. Riverside, CA: the County.
- . 2003c (October). *General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report* (Prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. and Transcore). Riverside, CA: the County.
- Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). 2009 (April 15). Personal communication. Email from G. J. Spiliotis, Executive Director (LAFCO) to J. Kelly, Principal (BonTerra Consulting).
- Winzler & Kelly. 2009 (September). *Proposed Incorporation City of Jurupa Valley Public Review Draft Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis*. [Anaheim], CA: Winzler & Kelly.

Appendix A

**Jurupa Valley Incorporation Study Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis
Administrative Draft Report**

September 23, 2009