U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: Camino-Terrace

HEROS Number: 900000010448265

Start Date:

Estimated End Date:

Actual End Date:
Project Location: Camino Real, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Additional Location Information:
Camino Terrace (referred to hereafter as the Project) is located north of Limonite Avenue and east of Camino Real in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California (see Exhibits 1-3). The 5.88-acre site consists of two parcels, APNs 185-470-001, and -002. The site is currently vacant with steep terrain, contains sparse vegetation and is immediately surrounded by vacant land to the north, single-family residential uses to the east and west, and commercial uses to the south/southwest. Canyon Terrace Drive is an existing east/west roadway located along the Project's northern site boundary, and Camino Real is an existing north/south roadway located along the western site boundary.

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
The applicant proposes the construction of a multi-family affordable housing project consisting of six (6) two- to three-story apartment buildings with a total of 80 residential units consisting of 28 supportive housing units, 51 affordable housing units, one manager's unit, and a 2,560-square-foot community building providing onsite supportive services for tenants including, but not limited to, community rooms, case management offices, computer rooms, and community kitchens (see Exhibit 4). The Project also provides private drive aisles with two entrances/exits along Canyon Terrace Drive. The site is designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 General Residential. The Project's residential density is 13.6 DU/AC and the current land use designation allows for a density of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). The Applicant submitted an application for a ''density bonus'' under Chapter 9.300 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and agreed to make 79 units available to low income households at affordable rents, thus entitling the applicant to an 80% density bonus. At 5.88 acres, the Project is currently entitled to 48 units under the R-3 zone. With an 80% density bonus of 39 units added to the base density of 48 units, the Project could have up to 87 units. The Jurupa Valley City Council approved the Project, including the density bonus, on March 19, 2026.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name	
PBV1-25-001	Public Housing	Housing Choice Voucher Program	$16,914,240.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: $16,914,240.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: $72,085,151.00

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	Traffic and circulation requirements will be addressed in the City's Conditions of approval and in Appendix I Traffic Analysis Report.
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. An official species list was procured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that fulfills section 7(c) requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The species list (Appendix B) identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species and critical habitat that may occur within the Project boundaries and/or may be affected by the proposed Project. A total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species were listed as having the potential to occur on the Project site.' 1. Burrowing Owl Surveys To mitigate potential impacts to burrowing owl, two pre-construction surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFW protocol. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to ground disturbance, and the second shall occur within 24 hours of the initiation of ground disturbance activities for any phase of development on the Project site. * If no owls are detected during those surveys, ground disturbance may proceed without further consideration of this species, assuming there is no lapse between the surveys and construction,

	because the protocol states ''time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance.'' * If burrowing owls are detected during the surveys, avoidance and minimization measures shall be required. Avoidance and minimization measures may include establishing a buffer zone, installing a visual barrier, implementing burrow exclusion and/or closure techniques, in conformance with CDFW protocol. 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season (early February through August), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted within thirty (30) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey should document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities should stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer is expanded to 500 feet. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities can occur. Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to destroy any bird's nest or any bird's eggs that are protected under the MBTA. Further, any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (Birds of Prey, such as hawks and owls) are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 which makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy their nest or eggs. Consultation with CDFW might be required prior to the removal of any raptor nest on the project site, if found.
Other Factors 1	The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as

	specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertently during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional responsibilities for the undertaking.
Other Factors 2	A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations.
Permits, reviews, and approvals	Building Permit Mechanical Permit Electrical Permit Plumbing Permit Letter of Determination

Project Mitigation Plan

Mitigation Measures include Mitigation Plan and monitoring text.

Determination:

☐	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
☐	Finding of Significant Impact

Preparer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name / Title/ Organization: Annjanette Aguilar Barreras / / RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Certifying Officer Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name/ Title: _____

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

Project Information

Project Name: Camino-Terrace

HEROS Number: 900000010448265

Start Date: 01/16/2025

Responsible Entity (RE): RIVERSIDE COUNTY, 3403 Tenth St. Suite 300 Riverside CA, 92501

RE Preparer: Annjanette Aguilar Barreras

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Karen Spiegel, Chair

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable): Terra Nova Planning And Research, Inc.

Point of Contact: Kelly Clark

40 CFR 1506.5(b)(4): The lead agency or, where appropriate, a cooperating agency shall prepare a disclosure statement for the contractor's execution specifying that the contractor has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the action. Such statement need not include privileged or confidential trade secrets or other confidential business information.

- ✓ By checking this box, I attest that as a consultant, I have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the undertaking assessed in this environmental review.

Project Location: Camino Real, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

Additional Location Information:
Camino Terrace (referred to hereafter as the Project) is located north of Limonite Avenue and east of Camino Real in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California (see Exhibits 1-3). The 5.88-acre site consists of two parcels, APNs 185-470-001, and -002. The site is currently vacant with steep terrain, contains sparse vegetation and is immediately surrounded by vacant land to the north, single-family residential uses to the east and west, and commercial uses to the south/southwest. Canyon Terrace Drive is an existing east/west roadway located along the Project's northern site boundary, and Camino Real is an existing north/south roadway located along the western site boundary.

Direct Comments to:

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
The applicant proposes the construction of a multi-family affordable housing project consisting of six (6) two- to three-story apartment buildings with a total of 80 residential units consisting of 28 supportive housing units, 51 affordable housing units, one manager's unit, and a 2,560-square-foot community building providing onsite supportive services for tenants including, but not limited to, community rooms, case management offices, computer rooms, and community kitchens (see Exhibit 4). The Project also provides private drive aisles with two entrances/exits along Canyon Terrace Drive. The site is designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 General Residential. The Project's residential density is 13.6 DU/AC and the current land use designation allows for a density of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). The Applicant submitted an application for a ''density bonus'' under Chapter 9.300 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and agreed to make 79 units available to low income households at affordable rents, thus entitling the applicant to an 80% density bonus. At 5.88 acres, the Project is currently entitled to 48 units under the R-3 zone. With an 80% density bonus of 39 units added to the base density of 48 units, the Project could have up to 87 units. The Jurupa Valley City Council approved the Project, including the density bonus, on March 19, 2026.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:
The purpose of the Project is to provide affordable housing opportunities in compliance with the established guidelines under the Housing Choice Project Based Voucher program, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program, and other applicable programs.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The Project site is vacant, undeveloped and contains native vegetation including several trees, grasses and coastal sage scrub. The site contains steep terrain with a 30-40% grade. The site is in an urbanized area surrounded by a vacant lot to the north with single-family residential beyond, residential to the east and west, and commercial uses to the south. Camino Real and Limonite Avenue are existing 4-lane divided roadways that run along the site's western and southern border, respectively. Canyon Terrace Drive is an existing 2-lane roadway that borders the northern site boundary in an east/west direction.

Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:

2b Site Visit Feb 20 2025.docx
1_Wakeland Camino Terrace NEPA_Regional Location Map 5_29_26.pdf
2_Wakeland Camino Terrace Vicinity Map 5_29_26.pdf
3_Wakeland Camino Terrace Site Aerial 5_29_26.pdf
4_Wakeland Camino Terrace Site Plan 5_29_26.pdf

Determination:

✓	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

Approval Documents:

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
PBV1-25-001	Public Housing	Housing Choice Voucher Program	$16,914,240.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: $16,914,240.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: $72,085,151.00

Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	☐ Yes ☑ No	From the Project site, the nearest civilian airports are the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport, located 9,500 feet south and 10,500 feet east, respectively. There are no military airports in the Project vicinity. The image (Airport Radius Map) attached depicts the location of the two airports in relation to the Project site (Camino Terrace), with a 2,500-foot project radius. The Project site is located within Zone E and immediately south (40 feet) of the Height Review Overlay Zone (HROZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Map. The Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan Policy document does not provide land use restrictions or environs specific to Zone E. The HROZ is defined as areas of land in the vicinity of an airport where the ground lies above a Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 (FAR 77) surface (navigable airspace) or less than 35 feet beneath such surface. Within the HROZ, an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review is required for any proposed object taller than 35 feet above the ground. The Project is not within the HROZ and proposes building heights up to 35 feet, not to exceed 35 feet, and would therefore not be considered a potential airport hazard. Project development shall conform to the

		requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of Riverside County, and the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	☐ Yes ☑ No	This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	☐ Yes ☑ No	According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C0702H, the Project site is not located within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project site and surrounding area is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (unshaded Zone X).
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	☐ Yes ☑ No	The Project is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) within the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) jurisdictional boundaries. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified six air pollutants as being of concern both on a nationwide and statewide level: ozone (O3); carbon monoxide (CO); nitrogen dioxide (NO2); sulfur dioxide (SO2); lead (Pb); and particulate matter (PM), which is subdivide into two classes based on particulate size: PM equal to or less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10) and PM equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5). With the exceptions of ozone, PM10 and PM2.5, the SCAB, including the Project location, is in attainment for all federal air pollutant standards Regional Federal Attainment Status - Project Location within the SCAB Criteria Pollutant Attainment Status Ozone (O3) Nonattainment -Extreme Carbon Monoxide (CO) Attainment Fine

		Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Nonattainment - Serious Particulate Matter (PM10) Maintenance - Serious Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) Attainment Lead (Pb) Attainment Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Attainment Source: EPA Green Book. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.epa.gov/green-book Buildout of the Project will result in air quality impacts during construction and operation. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2022.1 was used to project air quality emissions that will be generated by the Project (Appendix A). As shown below, project emissions will not exceed the Federal de minimis thresholds for O3 (NOx or ROG), PM10, PM2.5 or the SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Federal De Minimis Thresholds (tons per year) O3 Extreme Nonattainment PM10 Serious Maintenance PM2.5 Serious Nonattainment Annual Maximum Emissions NOx ROG Construction 1.34 0.40 0.31 0.16 Operation 0.28 0.62 0.51 0.13 De Minimis Thresholds 10 70 70 Exceeds? No No No Emission Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1. (Appendix A) De Minimis Threshold Source: EPA website accessed May 2026. https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables SCAQMD Criteria Pollutant Emission Thresholds (pounds per day) Daily Maximum Emissions CO NOx ROG SO2 PM10 PM2.5 Construction 30.06 29.23 6.71 0.04 9.13 5.13 SCAQMD Thresholds 550 100 75 150 150 55 Exceeds? No No No No No No Operation 16.54 1.57 3.70 0.03 2.95 0.78 SCAQMD Thresholds 550 55 55 150 150 55 Exceeds? No No No No No No Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1 (output tables provided in Appendix A). Attached: Appendix A ''Camino Terrace

		Detailed Report'' CalEEMod Version 2022.1. prepared May 28, 2026. Sources: ''Camino Terrace Detailed Report'' CalEEMod Version 2022.1. prepared May 28, 2026. ; EPA Green Book. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.epa.gov/green-book; De Minimis Threshold Source: EPA website accessed May 2026. https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables.
Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	☐ Yes ☑ No	The Project site is located in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California. As shown in the Coastal Zone Boundary Maps by the California Coastal Commission, below, the Project site is located 30+/- miles northeast from the nearest Coastal Zone.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	☐ Yes ☑ No	A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Project by Verdantas, Inc (June 30, 2026) pursuant to the processes prescribed in ASTM International (ASTM) Standards E1527-21, recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical RECs (HRECs), or controlled RECs (CRECs) in connection with the site. The Phase I ESA produced the following findings: * No REC, HREC, or CRECs were found on-site * The site is not listed on local or regional environmental regulatory agency records, including DTSC Envirostor, CalGEM Well Finder, SCAQMD FINDS, NPMS, and SWRCB GeoTracker databases. * The environmental database search indicated no adjoining or nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. A review of the DTSC Envirostor, SWRCB GeoTracker, SCAQMD FINDS, CalGEM Well Finder and NPMS (pipelines) databases revealed no nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. The reconnaissance of adjoining properties revealed no evidence indicating they

		have likely created a REC on the Site. * A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations. No further environmental investigations were recommended. In general, observations should be made during future Site development for areas of possible contamination such as, but not limited to, the presence of underground facilities, railroads, buried debris, waste drums, and tanks, stained soil or odorous soils. Should such materials be encountered, further investigation and analysis may be necessary at that time. Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Verdantas, Inc. June 30, 2026 (Appendix E)
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	☑ Yes ☐ No	This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. An official species list was procured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that fulfills section 7(c) requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The species list (Appendix B) identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species and critical habitat that may occur within the Project boundaries and/or may be affected by the proposed

		Project. A total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species were listed as having the potential to occur on the Project site.' 1. Burrowing Owl Surveys To mitigate potential impacts to burrowing owl, two pre-construction surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFW protocol. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to ground disturbance, and the second shall occur within 24 hours of the initiation of ground disturbance activities for any phase of development on the Project site. * If no owls are detected during those surveys, ground disturbance may proceed without further consideration of this species, assuming there is no lapse between the surveys and construction, because the protocol states ''time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance.'' * If burrowing owls are detected during the surveys, avoidance and minimization measures shall be required. Avoidance and minimization measures may include establishing a buffer zone, installing a visual barrier, implementing burrow exclusion and/or closure techniques, in conformance with CDFW protocol. 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season (early February through August), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted within thirty (30) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey should document a negative survey with a brief letter report

		indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities should stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer is expanded to 500 feet. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities can occur. Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to destroy any bird's nest or any bird's eggs that are protected under the MBTA. Further, any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (Birds of Prey, such as hawks and owls) are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 which makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy their nest or eggs. Consultation with CDFW might be required prior to the removal of any raptor nest on the project site, if found.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	☐ Yes ☑ No	There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. A Phase 1 ESA was prepared for the Project site (Appendix E) that searched the underground storage tank (UST) database for registered USTs in the Project area. The data was sourced from the State Water Resources Control Board?s Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database. A review of the

		EDR radius map report (Appendix D of the Phase I ESA) revealed there are 5 listed sites within 0.4 miles of the project site, including 2 USTs within approximately 175 feet of the site associated with a nearby 7-Eleven. No evidence of current or former aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) or USTs containing hazardous substances or petroleum products was observed on the Site.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	☐ Yes ☑ No	The site is currently vacant and not being used or designated for agricultural uses. According to the California Important Farmlands mapping, the Project site is designated as ''Other Land.'' The Project site is designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 (General Residential). No impacts to farmland would occur.
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	☐ Yes ☑ No	According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C0702H, the Project site is not located within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project site and surrounding area is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (unshaded Zone X). According to the FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report (Appendix F), the Project site is not located within a FFRMS floodplain.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	☑ Yes ☐ No	Section 106 Consultation The County conducted Section 106 consultation pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800. The 15 tribes within the County of Riverside listed in the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT), as well as Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, were contacted via Certified Mail on 6/11/2024 and 7/3/2024, respectively. The 30-day period ended: 7/11/2024, 8/2/2024, and 8/8/2024. According to the County of Riverside, only Cahuilla, Morongo, and Soboba requested consultation and

		recommended that a Soboba tribal monitor be present during ground disturbing activities, and the Cahuilla and Morongo tribes requested monitoring. The County forwarded the information to the Project manager who has since contacted the tribes to discuss monitoring. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertently during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural

		Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional responsibilities for the undertaking.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	☐ Yes ☑ No	National Transportation Noise Impacts A review of the National Transportation Noise Map by the U.S. Department of Transportation indicates that the Project site is located outside of the mapped noise contours associated with road and airport travel. Local Noise Impacts The Project site is located immediately west of Camino Real and north of Limonite Avenue, both of which are classified as major arterial roadways and primary sources of traffic noise. According to the City of Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan, Figure 7-6 Noise Contour Map (Future 2035 conditions), the 70 CNEL noise contour encroaches only slightly into the western and southern portions of the site immediately adjacent to the roadways. The Project incorporates building setbacks that further reduce noise exposure, including a minimum 25-foot setback from Camino Real and more than a 300-foot setback from Limonite Avenue. As a result, the majority of the site falls within the 60-65 CNEL range, and no portions of the site are exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 70 CNEL. HUD considers exterior noise levels of 65 dB DNL (or equivalent CNEL) or less as Acceptable. Levels above 65 dB but not exceeding 75 dB are Normally Unacceptable and require appropriate mitigation. For this Project, the effective exterior exposure

		across the developable portions of the site remains at or below the upper end of the Acceptable range (or low end of Normally Unacceptable at the immediate roadway edges), and well below the Unacceptable threshold of 75 dB. The Jurupa Valley City Council approved the Project on March 19, 2026. The approving resolution explicitly requires that the Project conform to all requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, applicable State laws, and City ordinances, pursuant to Section 9.240.330(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This includes full compliance with the California Building Code (Title 24), which mandates that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable. Standard construction practices for residential development, combined with the provided setbacks, are expected to achieve the required noise level reduction. Where needed, enhanced measures such as upgraded glazing, sealed construction, or mechanical ventilation (allowing windows-closed conditions) will be implemented to ensure interior levels remain at or below 45 dB. Adherence to these mandatory, code-enforced requirements will effectively mitigate potential noise impacts to acceptable levels. No additional project-specific noise abatement beyond standard compliance is required. Airport Noise Compatibility The Project site is located outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport 55-65 CNEL noise contours. The Project would not experience significant levels of airport-related noise. Sources: Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document, Adopted March 2005. https://rcaluc.org/sites/g/files/aldnop421/files/migrated/Portals-13-

		PDFGeneral-plan-newplan-20--20Vol.-201-20Riverside-20Municipal.pdf; National Transportation Noise Map, accessed May 2026.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	☐ Yes ☑ No	Review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) indicate the project site does not contain any streams, riparian habitat, marshes, protected wetlands, vernal pools, or sensitive natural communities protected by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No impact would occur.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	☐ Yes ☑ No	There are no rivers located on the Project site. The nearest ''Wild and Scenic River'' is Deep Creek located approximately 26 miles northeast of the Project site. The nearest ''Nationwide River'' is Little Creek, South Fork located approximately 17.5 miles north of the Project site. There are no ''Study Rivers'' in the Project vicinity according to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System database. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]

Impact Codes: An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.
(1) Minor beneficial impact
(2) No impact anticipated
(3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The site is designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 General Residential. The Project's residential density is 13.6 DU/AC and the current land use designation allows for a density of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). The Applicant submitted an application for a ''density bonus'' under Chapter 9.300 of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and agreed to make 79 units available to low income households at affordable rents, thus entitling the applicant to an 80% density bonus. At 5.88 acres, the Project is currently entitled to 48 units under the R-3 zone. With an 80% density bonus of 39 units added to the base density of 48 units, the Project could have up to 87 units. The Project proposes 80 units, consistent with the site's allowable density with the added bonus. The proposed multi-family residential development is consistent with the intent of the MHDR designation with regard to urban design and scale. The Project site is located within Zone E and immediately south (40 feet) of the Height Review Overlay Zone (HROZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Map. The Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan Policy document does not provide land use restrictions or environs specific to Zone E. The HROZ is defined as areas of land in the vicinity of an airport where the ground lies above a Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 (FAR 77) surface (navigable airspace) or less than 35 feet beneath such surface. Within the HROZ, an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review is required for any proposed object taller than 35 feet above the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		ground. The Project is not within the HROZ and proposes building heights up to 35 feet, not to exceed 35 feet, and would therefore not be considered a potential airport hazard. Project development shall conform to the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of Riverside County, and the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	The applicant is required to provide a site-specific geotechnical investigation report prior to approval and issuance of grading permits. The geotechnical report will assess subsurface soil conditions, slope stability and provide recommendations for grading, site design, and construction, ensuring the site is suitable for construction. The Project will be required to prepare and implement (throughout all construction activities) a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Fugitive Dust (PM10) Management Plan to reduce impacts from soil erosion and storm water runoff. One stormwater retention basin is located at the southeast corner. Onsite retention has been designed to retain stormwater flows from a 100-year storm event per City requirements. According to the Project Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix H) the site is generally underlain by granodiorite and gabbro bedrock mantled by residual soils. Residual soils encountered on site generally consisted of loose to moderately dense silty clayey sand. The upper portion of residual soils are considered moderately compressible. Complete removal/recompaction of residual soils beneath the proposed improvements is recommended to reduce the potential for adverse total and differential settlement of the proposed improvements. Collapse potential refers to the potential settlement of a soil under existing stresses upon being wetted. Based on the Geotech Investigation's recommendation to remove potentially compressible residual soils onsite and replace with compacted fill to design grades, the hydro-collapse potential is considered negligible. Onsite near-surface soils are expected to have a very low expansion potential. According to the Geotechnical Investigation,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		near-surface soil sample was tested during this investigation and two samples by Byerly (2017) for soluble sulfate content. These tests indicated sulfate contents of less than 0.1 percent by weight, indicating negligible sulfate contents (Exposure Class S0). Recommendations for concrete in contact with the soil are provided in Appendix H.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	Hazardous Materials The Project includes 80 affordable multi-family residences and is not expected to be hazardous in nature. Routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials - beyond what is typically associated with household, kitchen or office use - is not anticipated and therefore will not pose a risk to the public or residential environment. The Phase I ESA (Appendix E) indicated there are no adjoining or nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. Airport Hazards The Project site is located within Zone E and immediately south (40 feet) of the Height Review Overlay Zone (HROZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Map. The Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan Policy document does not provide land use restrictions or environs specific to Zone E. The Project is not within the HROZ and proposes building heights up to 35 feet, not to exceed 35 feet, and would therefore not be considered a potential airport hazard. Noise The Project shall conform to all requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, applicable State laws, and City ordinances, pursuant to Section 9.240.330(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. Where needed, enhanced measures such as upgraded glazing, sealed construction, or mechanical ventilation (allowing windows-closed conditions) will be implemented to ensure interior levels remain at or below 45 dB. The Project site is located outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport 55-65 CNEL noise contours. The Project would not experience significant levels of airport-related noise. Fire Hazards According to the CalFire Fire Hazard Severity Zone map viewer, the site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone. All proposed construction, including the Project, is required to meet minimum standards for fire safety as	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		defined in the City Building or Fire Codes, or by City zoning, or as dictated by the Building Official or the Transportation Land Management Agency based on building type, design, occupancy, and use. This standard requirement ensures fire hazards are minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map (See worksheet) Geological Hazards The Project site is located in a seismically active region. According to the Project Geotechnical Report (Appendix H), the nearest fault to the Project site is the San Jacinto Fault locate 10.9 miles northeast. There are no faults directly beneath the site, therefore fracturing is not an applicable hazard. Fault Hazards Map (See worksheet) According to Figure 8-5 of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan Liquefaction Susceptibility in Jurupa Valley), the Project site is not located within a liquefaction susceptibility zone.The Geotechnical Investigation confirms this. Based on the dense nature of the underlying bedrock and the absence of shallow groundwater, the subsurface materials are not considered susceptible to liquefaction. Liquefaction Hazards Map (See worksheet) According to Figure 8-6 of the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan (Landslide Susceptibility), the site is not within a landslide susceptibility zone. The applicant shall submit a site-specific geotechnical investigation report, prepared by a qualified licensed professional prior to approval and issuance of grading permits. The report must evaluate subsurface conditions and provide recommendations for grading, foundation design, site preparation, drainage, and construction methods to confirm the site's suitability for the proposed development. Landslide Susceptibility Map (See worksheet) Flood Hazards Map (See worksheet) According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C0702H, the Project site is not located within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project site and surrounding area is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (unshaded Zone X).	
SOCIOECONOMIC			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Employment and Income Patterns	1	According to the Jurupa Valley 2021-2029 Housing Element, about 13.1% of residents are employed in construction; 11.3% are employed in manufacturing; 10.4% in professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services and 10.1% in transportation and warehousing, and utilities. About 32% of Jurupa Valley households are lower income. In 2019, about one-fifth (20%) of Jurupa Valley households earned less than $35,000 and only 24% earned more than $100,000. The Project would result in the creation of temporary construction jobs that would benefit local vendors, and labor workers including framers, plumbers, electricians, painters and various inspectors. The Project will also provide affordable housing opportunities for qualified, low-income applicants. In this way, the project would benefit the local employment and income patterns.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	The Project site is currently vacant, undeveloped and designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the 2017 Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 General Residential. The site is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the north, east and west, and commercial uses to the south. The current land use designation allows for a density of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). With th approved 80% density bonus of 39 units added to the base density of 48 units, the Project could have up to 87 units. The Project proposes 80 units, consistent with the site's allowable density with added density bonus. The Project will provide affordable housing opportunities for qualified, low-income applicants, which is a net positive impact as it provides affordable housing opportunities to individuals/families displaced by rising housing costs. Development of the project will adhere to the development standards in the Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoning code and will therefore not negatively impact the character of the surrounding area. The proposed residences would operate independently, and will not displace individuals, existing jobs, or community facilities.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Two school districts provide public educational services in Jurupa Valley, included the Jurupa Unified School District (JUSD) and the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD). The Project site is located within the JUSD. Specifically, the site is located within the service boundaries of Pacific Avenue Elementary School, Jurupa Middle School, and Patriot Highschool. The Project will be required to pay the City's development impact fees (DIF) prior to construction. Funds collected are used for construction and reconstruction of school facilities. The project will comply with districts development fees and less than significant impacts to local schools are expected.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The Project is located in an area with a mix of residential and commercial land uses. The Project is in an area designated for Medium High Density Residential. The nearest commercial/office use is the dentist office located immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site on the northeast corner of Limonite Avenue and Camino Real. The Project would operate separate and independently from the existing office use.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	The Project site and future residents will be served by various health care and social service resources available within the City and County of Riverside. Future residents will be served by the local sheriff, fire, and emergency medical services and are within reasonable proximity to the site (see public safety section), The Riverside Community Hospital is located 3.7 miles southeast of the Project site. The nearest social services center is the Riverside County Social Services Department, approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the site. Project implementation is not expected to result in a substantial increase in population, such that it would hinder the available local services or leave the future residents out of reach for such services.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility	2	The Project proposes 80 multi-family residences, thus the solid waste generated by the development will likely fall under normal waste categories including garbage, recycling, and yard waste. Residential solid waste and recycling collection is administered by the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
and Capacity)		City through a contractual agreement with Burrtec Waste. Trash from Jurupa Valley is transported to the Agua Mansa Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility at 1830 Agua Mansa Road. From there, recyclable materials are transferred to third-party providers, and waste materials are transported to various landfills in Riverside County. There are six landfills currently operating in Riverside County and their remaining capacities are: Badlands (7,800,000 CY), Blythe (3,271,203 CY), Desert Center (127,414 CY), Lamb Canyon (19,242,950 CY), Oasis (204,558 CY), and El Sobrante (143,977,170 CY). Using the average of CalRecycle's multi-family residential sector generation rate of 5.1 pounds of waste per unit per day, the Project's 80 units could potentially generate 408 pounds of waste, or 0.2 tons per day. Annually, the Project would potentially generate 148,920 pounds, or 74.5 tons. This represents 0.000852% of the remaining landfill capacity in the County. The waste generated from the site is not expected to exceed the capacity of the waste systems or landfills within the Burrtec Waste service area. Sources: CalRecycle Solid Waste Facilities, Sites, and Operations, accessed November 2024. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/; CalRecycle Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, accessed May 2026. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastecharacterization/general/rates	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD) provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley. The Project site is within the service boundaries of JCSD. The City of Riverside, the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority, and the Orange County Sanitation District are responsible for treatment of wastewater in the JCSD service area. Wastewater from the Project will be conveyed to the City of Riverside Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP), located in the City of Riverside at 5950 Acorn Street. Currently, the RWQCP treats 46 million gallons per day. The Project site is in a developed area with existing sewer mains located in adjacent roadways.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Project wastewater discharges will be typical of residential uses and will not exceed the City's wastewater treatment requirements or Regional Water Quality Control Board. Other than onsite extensions, no new sewer infrastructure will be required which could result in significant environmental effects. The sewer system has the capacity to adequately service the proposed residential development. The Project will not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The Project is located within the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD)service boundaries. JCSD provides potable water to its urban retail customers, non-potable irrigation water for selected parks and school fields, and potable water to neighboring agencies. According to the JCSD 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) (Albert A. Webb Associates, June 2021), JCSD's total potable and non-potable water demand in 2020 was 29,272 acre-feet (AF). The 2025 and 2045 water demands are projected to be 30,865 AF and 37,135 AF, respectively. The JCSD's 2020 UWMP demonstrates that the district has sufficient water supplies available to meet current and future water needs of the district. The UWMPs long-term planning and future water demand projections are based, in part, on land use plans within district boundaries. The Project is consistent the site's land use designation, therefore the UWMP future water demand projections included buildout of the site. To estimate the Project's annual water demand for indoor use, a calculation was made based on Jurupa Valley's average household size of 3.62 people per the California Department of Finance. Using the California standard for indoor residential water use of 47 gallons per capita daily (GPCD), the Project's 80 housing units would generate a population of 290 residents, who would consume approximately 4,974,950 gallons per year, or 15.28 acre-feet per year. This represents 0.05% and 0.04% of JCSD's projected 2025 and 2045 annual water demands, respectively.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Police The Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides police services in Jurupa Valley, including the Project site. The department includes ten stations, five correctional facilities and other facilities. The Jurupa Valley Sheriff's station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard, located 2 miles northeast of the Project site. Project development will increase calls and demand for police and emergency services. However, this demand is not expected to hinder the Department's ability to provide police services or create demands that would require the construction of a new police station. The project proponent will be subject to any applicable Development Impact Fees for the 80 dwelling units being constructed. Fire and Emergency Medical Service Fire and emergency medical services are provided to the city, including the Project site, by the Riverside County Fire Department, in cooperation with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). The Department operates 97 fire stations throughout the County of Riverside with four of those located in Jurupa Valley. The nearest fire stations are Station 16 and Station 18, located 2 miles north and west of the site, respectively. It is anticipated that the development of the Project would result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire services. Project development will not require the construction of a new fire station. The project proponent will be subject to any applicable Development Impact Fees for the 80 dwelling units being constructed. The Project is required to implement fire safety construction features and design standards in accordance with the Jurupa Valley General Plan.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District and Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space District provide a wide range of protected open spaces, parks and recreational areas to the residents of Jurupa Valley. There are nine parks located within 2 miles of the Project site. The nearest park is Clay Park located 0.5 miles southwest of the site. Because the Project is within range of multiple community parks, and proposes onsite recreational facilities, the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		increased use of the existing park facilities associated with the 80 new multi-family units would not be significant enough to result in accelerated physical deterioration. The Project proponent will be subject to any applicable Development Impact Fees prior to construction.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The Project will be accessed via two driveways onto Canyon Terrace Drive. The Project proposes internal drive aisles and open parking spaces. Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) provides transit service throughout the City. The nearest bus stop is 300 feet southwest of the site on Limonite Ave. The Project is required to make necessary sidewalk/gutter improvements per City standards along Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. The City Engineer will review Project plans prior to approval to ensure the driveways provided adequate lines of sight and that overall site design is to City standards and does not pose any hazards. Based on the Focused Traffic Analysis (Appendix I), the intersection of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) B during the AM and PM peak hours for Year 2030 plus Project traffic conditions. Furthermore, the sight lines at the two (2) Project driveways along Canyon Terrace Drive are generally adequate as long as the landscaping and/or hardscapes located within the limited use areas east and west of the Project driveways are designed such that they do not exceed 30-inches in height. Therefore, the proposed Project will not impact the surrounding transportation system and motorists entering and exiting the Project site from the proposed driveways will be able to do so comfortably, safely, and without undue congestion.	Traffic and circulation requirements will be addressed in the City's Conditions of approval and in Appendix I Traffic Analysis Report.
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The site is undeveloped and contains native vegetation including several trees, grasses and coastal sage scrub. The site is designated for Medium High Density Residential and does not contain unique or locally important natural features, including landmarks or sensitive watershed areas, thus mitigation is not necessary.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	3	The site is undeveloped and contains native vegetation including several trees, grasses and coastal sage scrub. The site is surrounded by urban development, including major roadways, commercial and residential uses. As shown in Appendix B, the Section 7 ESA Species List, there are no federally listed species or critical habitats located on the Project site. Therefore, the project would have no impact on federally listed species. Local Requirements (Not Section 7 ESA) The Project site is located in the Burrowing Owl Survey Area and Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA). Per the BRA (Appendix G), the Project site is located in an area where surveys are required for BUOW. The Project site was determined not to provide suitable habitat that would support BUOW. No BUOW or sign were detected during ?eld survey and BUOW are considered absent from the project site. Out of an abundance of caution and to ensure BUOW remain absent from the Project site, a BUOW pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted per the guidelines set forth in the MSHCP 30-days prior to ground disturbing activities Results of the BRA survey determined that no suitable habitat for Narrow Endemic Plant Species occurs onsite; these species are therefore presumed absent from the project site, and no additional surveys are required. (See the Endangered Species Worksheet and mitigation measures for list of local requirements)	This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. An official species list was procured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that fulfills section 7(c) requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The species list (Appendix B) identifies threatened,

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			endangered, proposed and candidate species and critical habitat that may occur within the Project boundaries and/or may be affected by the proposed Project. A total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species were listed as having the potential to occur on the Project site.' 1. Burrowing Owl Surveys To mitigate potential impacts to burrowing owl, two pre-construction surveys shall be conducted in accordance

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			with CDFW protocol. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to ground disturbance, and the second shall occur within 24 hours of the initiation of ground disturbance activities for any phase of development on the Project site. * If no owls are detected during those surveys, ground disturbance may proceed without further consideration of this species, assuming there is no lapse between the surveys and construction

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			, because the protocol states ''time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance. '' * If burrowing owls are detected during the surveys, avoidance and minimization measures shall be required. Avoidance and minimization measures may include establishing a buffer zone, installing a

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			visual barrier, implementing burrow exclusion and/or closure techniques, in conformance with CDFW protocol. 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season (early February through August), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted within thirty (30) days of the start of any

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey should document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities should stay outside of a 300-foot

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer is expanded to 500 feet. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			construction activities can occur. Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to destroy any bird's nest or any bird's eggs that are protected under the MBTA. Further, any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (Birds of Prey, such as hawks and owls) are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 which makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			their nest or eggs. Consultation with CDFW might be required prior to the removal of any raptor nest on the project site, if found.
Other Factors 1	3	The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertently during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed	The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertentl

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional responsibilities for the undertaking.	y during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional responsibilities for the undertaking.
Other Factors 2	2	A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations.	A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris,

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations.
ENERGY			
Energy Efficiency	2	The Project will result in 80 multi-family residences that would consume electricity and natural gas for daily operations, including heating, cooling, ventilation, cooking, and lighting. The Project would also result in the consumption of transportation fuels by vehicles and equipment during construction and	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		vehicles accessing the site over the long-term. The Project contractor will be required to comply with SCAQMD rules including specific standards that limit equipment idling times. The Project's 80 homes would be constructed in compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards which include mandatory guidelines per the State's Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6, and per the California Green Building Code, Title 24, Part 11. These requirements include the installation of rooftop solar. The energy impacts from this Project are expected to be less than significant.	

Supporting documentation

Camino Terrace FHSZ Mapping 8_6_26.pdf
Appendix I Camino Terrace Traffic Analysis Letter Report 6_2026.pdf
Appendix H Camino Terrace Geotechnical Investigation 6_2021.pdf
Appendix G Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis.pdf
Appendix E Camino Terrace Phase I ESA(3).pdf
Project Information Worksheet-Partner Worksheet 8_6_26.pdf
Environmental Assessment Worksheet-Partner Worksheet 8_6_26.pdf
Appendix D Camino Terrace Section 106 Consultation-7_31_26(1).pdf
Appendix F FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report 1_21_25(2).pdf
Appendix C Camino Terrace Cultural Report 8_24(2).pdf
Appendix B Camino Terrace IPaC Species List 5_28_26(1).pdf
Appendix A Camino Terrace Detailed Report 5_28_26(1).pdf

Additional Studies Performed:

Appendix A: CalEEMod Detailed Report, CalEEMod Version 2022.1, prepared by Terra Nova Planning and Research, Inc. May 28, 2026. Appendix B: Section 7 Endangered Species List, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, letter generated May 28, 2026. Appendix C: Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by Duke CRM, August 2024. Appendix D: Section 106 Consultation (to date), materials provided by the County of Riverside, Department of Housing and Workforce Solutions, December 12,2024 Appendix E: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Verdantas, Inc. June 30, 2026. Appendix F: FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report, generated January 21, 2025. Appendix G: Biological Assessment Letter Report, prepared by BLUE Consulting Group. May 30, 2024. Appendix H: Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Leighton and Associates, Inc. June 10, 2021. Appendix I:

Focused Traffic Analysis, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG). June 11, 2026.

Appendix I Camino Terrace Traffic Analysis Letter Report 6_2026(1).pdf
Appendix H Camino Terrace Geotechnical Investigation 6_2021(1).pdf
Appendix G Biological Resources Assessment and MSHCP Consistency Analysis(1).pdf
Appendix E Camino Terrace Phase I ESA(3).pdf
Appendix D Camino Terrace Section 106 Consultation-7_31_26(2).pdf
Appendix C Camino Terrace Cultural Report 8_24(2).pdf
Appendix F FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report 1_21_25(2).pdf
Appendix A Camino Terrace Detailed Report 5_28_26(2).pdf
Appendix B Camino Terrace IPaC Species List 5_28_26(2).pdf

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:
Annjanette Aguilar 2/20/2025 12:00:00 AM

2b Site Visit Feb 20 2025.docx
1_Wakeland Camino Terrace NEPA_Regional Location Map 5_29_26.pdf
2_Wakeland Camino Terrace Vicinity Map 5_29_26.pdf
3_Wakeland Camino Terrace Site Aerial 5_29_26.pdf
4_Wakeland Camino Terrace Site Plan 5_29_26.pdf

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

Persons/Agencies Consulted Annjanette Aguilar Barreras, Development Specialist II, County of Riverside, Department of Housing and Workforce Solutions. Email correspondence December 11, 2024. Sources California Coastal Commission, Coastal Zone Boundary, web page accessed May 2026: https://www.coastal.ca.gov/maps/czb/. California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder, accessed May 2026: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/ California Earth Hazards Zone Application, CA Department of Conservation. Accessed May 2026. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp CalRecycle Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, accessed May 2026. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastecharacterization/general/rates CalRecycle Solid Waste Facilities, Sites, and Operations, accessed May 2026. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/; ''Camino Terrace Detailed Report'' CalEEMod Version 2022.1. prepared May 28, 2026. Cultural Resources Assessment, Camino Terrace, prepared by Duke Cultural Resources Management, LLC. August 2024. EPA De Minimis Threshold Source. Website accessed May 2026. https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables. EPA Green Book. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.epa.gov/green-book; EPA Map of Sole Source Aquifer Locations. https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ad

a1877155fe31356b. Accessed May 2026. Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan. Jurupa Valley Municipal Code National Flood Insurance Program Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 06025C0702H. National Register Database and Research, National Park Service. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm Nationwide Rivers Inventory, accessed May 2026: https://www.nps.gov/subjects/rivers/nationwide-rivers-inventory.htm National Transportation Noise Map, accessed May 2026. https://maps.dot.gov/BTS/NationalTransportationNoiseMap/ National Wild and Scenic River System, accessed May 2026: https://www.rivers.gov/rivers/apps/; https://www.rivers.gov/study-rivers ''Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 15.5 Acres located East of Camino Real and North and South of Canyon terrace APNs 185-460-001; 185-470-001; 185-470-002 Jurupa Valley, California 92509,'' prepared by Leighton and Associates, Inc. July 7, 2022. Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document, Adopted March 2005. https://rcaluc.org/sites/g/files/aldnop421/files/migrated/Portals-13-PDFGeneral-plan-newplan-20--20Vol.-201-20Riverside-20Municipal.pdf USDA Web Soil Survey, web mapper, accessed May 2026. https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx U.S. Fish and Wildlife, National Wetland Inventory, Webmapper. Accessed May 2026. https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation website, accessed May 28, 2026. https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/ Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority Interactive RCA/MSHCP Map, accessed May 28, 2026. https://www.wrc-rca.org/rcamaps/

List of Permits Obtained:

Building Permit Mechanical Permit Electrical Permit Plumbing Permit Letter of Determination

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were published on August 9, 2026, and made available on the County's website for public review and comment. Subsequently, the County received a public comment letter dated September 11, 2026, from Dr. Kanya Godde Chrisco, Ph.D., RPA, which is included as Appendix A to the formal Response to Comments. To allow the County sufficient time to review the comments and prepare the formal Response to Comments, the item presenting the EA and FONSI was postponed from the Board of Supervisors' agenda. The EA and FONSI will be republished at a later date, following

completion of the County's review and response process, to provide an opportunity for public review and comment.

Wakeland Camino Terrace RTC_FINAL_v3.pdf

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The Project is consistent with the underlying land use (Medium High Density Residential) (with affordable housing density bonus) and in an urbanized area with constructed roads, utility services. The Project would not exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the local air district (SCAQMD) and would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in any pollutant of concern. The Project is required to perform a burrowing owl preconstruction survey and a narrow endemic plant survey in accordance with City requirements and the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRC MSHCP). The Project shall also conduct a nesting bird survey in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in the event construction begins between February 1st and August 31st of the calendar year. The Project is required to pay various permit and development impact fees to local agencies further mitigating impacts to local services. In addition, impacts associated with any land disturbance impact, such as biological resources, geology or hydrology, would be equivalent to those of any other development, and will be constructed upon regardless of the land use or development proposed. The overall impact of the proposed Project will not cumulatively impact the environment.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]

The site is designated Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) with an allowable density range of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre (not including density bonus). The site's steep terrain poses unique engineering and financial challenges, thus constraining development of the site. The Project proposes 80 affordable multi-family residential units. Alternatives to the proposed plan include, but are not limited to: * Increase the number of residential buildings. While this would increase the number of housing units, it would also put more strain on the City's community services and would increase criteria pollutant emissions, noise levels, traffic, energy demand, water demand, and waste/wastewater generation. * Develop a market price project as opposed to an affordable housing project. While it would generate more revenue for the developer and increase the City's housing stock, this alternative would not address the affordable housing needs of the City, and of the State. Furthermore, a market price project in the MHDR/R3 zone would be limited to a maximum of 48 residential units (max 8 DU/AC). The proposed Project both increases the City's housing stock and provides affordable housing opportunities. Therefore, the Project is the superior development option. Both alternative discussed above would have similar impacts and require the same development mitigation as the proposed Project. The same impact fees, development standards, and pre-construction site

surveys would be required. However, for reasons described above, the proposed Project is the superior development option.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

Absent the proposed Project the site would remain undeveloped until future development projects are proposed for the site. The No Action alternative may prevent federal funding, but future homes would likely be constructed by an alternative builder from alternative sources of funding.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The Project is consistent with the underlying land use (Medium High Density Residential) and in an urbanized area with constructed roads, utility services. The Project would not exceed criteria pollutant thresholds established by the local air district (SCAQMD) and would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in any pollutant of concern. The Project is required to perform a burrowing owl preconstruction survey in accordance with City requirements and the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRC MSHCP). The Project shall also conduct a nesting bird survey in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in the event construction begins during the nesting season. The Project is required to pay various permit and development impact fees to local agencies further mitigating impacts to local services. Project shall adhere to all Condition of Approval provided by the City. Impacts associated with any land disturbance impact, such as biological resources, geology or hydrology, would be equivalent to those of any other development, and will be constructed upon regardless of the land use or development proposed. The Project proposes the construction of 80 affordable single-family housing units and is therefore a net benefit to lower income/minority communities by providing more affordable housing opportunities. Construction of the project will not place future residents in an area with known human health, environmental, economic, or social effects in comparison to the surrounding homes or residential land use designations within the City of Jurupa Valley.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	Traffic and circulation requirements will be addressed in the City's Conditions of approval and in Appendix I Traffic Analysis Report.	N/A		
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. An official species list was procured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that fulfills section 7(c) requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The species list (Appendix B) identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species and critical habitat that may occur within the Project boundaries and/or may be affected by the proposed Project. A total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species were listed as having the potential to occur on the Project site.' 1. Burrowing Owl Surveys To mitigate potential impacts to burrowing owl, two pre-construction surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFW protocol. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to ground disturbance, and the second shall occur within 24 hours of the initiation of ground disturbance activities for any phase of development on the Project site. * If no owls are	N/A	Mitigation Measures include Mitigation Plan text.	

	detected during those surveys, ground disturbance may proceed without further consideration of this species, assuming there is no lapse between the surveys and construction, because the protocol states ''time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance.'' * If burrowing owls are detected during the surveys, avoidance and minimization measures shall be required. Avoidance and minimization measures may include establishing a buffer zone, installing a visual barrier, implementing burrow exclusion and/or closure techniques, in conformance with CDFW protocol. 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season (early February through August), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted within thirty (30) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey should document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities should stay outside of a 300-foot			

	buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer is expanded to 500 feet. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities can occur. Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to destroy any bird's nest or any bird's eggs that are protected under the MBTA. Further, any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (Birds of Prey, such as hawks and owls) are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 which makes it unlawful to take, possess, or destroy their nest or eggs. Consultation with CDFW might be required prior to the removal of any raptor nest on the project site, if found.			
Other Factors 1	The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertently during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic	N/A	Mitigation Measures include Mitigation Plan text.	

	Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional			

	responsibilities for the undertaking.			
Other Factors 2	A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations.	N/A	Mitigation Measures include Mitigation Plan text.	

Project Mitigation Plan

Mitigation Measures include Mitigation Plan and monitoring text.

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD's policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site's proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?

✓ **No**

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

From the Project site, the nearest civilian airports are the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport, located 9,500 feet south and 10,500 feet east, respectively. There are no military airports in the Project vicinity. The image (Airport Radius Map) attached depicts the location of the two airports in relation to the Project site (Camino Terrace), with a 2,500-foot project radius. The Project site is located within Zone E and immediately south (40 feet) of the Height Review Overlay Zone (HROZ) of the Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Map. The Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Plan Policy document does not provide land use restrictions or environs specific to Zone E. The HROZ is defined as areas of land in the vicinity of an airport where the ground lies above a Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 (FAR 77) surface (navigable airspace) or less than 35 feet beneath such surface. Within the HROZ, an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review is required for any proposed object taller than 35 feet above the ground. The Project is not within the HROZ and proposes building heights up to 35 feet, not to exceed 35 feet, and would therefore not be considered a potential airport hazard. Project development shall conform to the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan of Riverside County, and the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan.

Supporting documentation

Airport Runway Clear Zones-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf
Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibility Map.png
Airport Radius Map.png
Airport Hazards-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Barrier Resources

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.	Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)	

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRA units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Compliance Determination

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Supporting documentation

Coastal Barrier Resources Act-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Flood Insurance

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained.	Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128)	24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b).

1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?

No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

✓ Yes

2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:

FEMA National Flood Ins Rate Map.png

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The FEMA Map Service Center provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

4. While flood insurance is not mandatory for this project, HUD strongly recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Will flood insurance be required as a mitigation measure or condition?

Yes

✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C0702H, the Project site is not located within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project site and surrounding area is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (unshaded Zone X).

Supporting documentation

Flood Insurance-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Air Quality

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.	Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d))	40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93

1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?

✓ Yes

No

Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?

No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

✓ Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

- ✓ Ozone
- ✓ Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns
- ✓ Particulate Matter, <10 microns

3. What are the *de minimis* emissions levels (40 CFR 93.153) or screening levels for the non-attainment or maintenance level pollutants indicated above

Ozone	10.00	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns	70.00	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	70.00	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

Provide your source used to determine levels here:
Units are in tons per year, per EPA De Minis Thresholds https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables

4. **Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the de minimis or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?**

- ✓ No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.

Enter the estimate emission levels:

Ozone	1.34	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns	0.16	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	0.51	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels.

Screen Summary
Compliance Determination

The Project is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) within the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) jurisdictional boundaries. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified six air pollutants as being of concern both on a nationwide and statewide level: ozone (O3); carbon monoxide (CO); nitrogen dioxide (NO2); sulfur dioxide (SO2); lead (Pb); and particulate matter (PM), which is subdivide into two classes based on particulate size: PM equal to or less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10) and PM equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5). With the exceptions of ozone, PM10 and PM2.5, the SCAB, including the Project location, is in attainment for all federal air pollutant standards Regional Federal Attainment Status - Project Location within the SCAB Criteria Pollutant Attainment Status Ozone (O3) Nonattainment -Extreme Carbon Monoxide (CO) Attainment Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) Nonattainment - Serious Particulate Matter (PM10) Maintenance - Serious Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) Attainment Lead (Pb) Attainment Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Attainment Source: EPA Green Book. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.epa.gov/green-book Buildout of the Project will result in air quality impacts during construction and operation. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2022.1 was used to project air quality emissions that will be generated by the Project (Appendix A). As shown below, project emissions will not exceed the Federal de minimis thresholds for O3 (NOx or ROG), PM10, PM2.5 or the SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants. Federal De Minimis Thresholds (tons per year) O3 Extreme Nonattainment PM10 Serious Maintenance PM2.5 Serious Nonattainment Annual Maximum Emissions NOx ROG Construction 1.34 0.40 0.31 0.16 Operation 0.28 0.62 0.51 0.13 De Minimis Thresholds 10 70 70 Exceeds? No No No Emission Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1. (Appendix A) De Minimis Threshold Source: EPA website accessed May 2026. https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables SCAQMD Criteria Pollutant Emission Thresholds (pounds per day) Daily Maximum Emissions CO NOx ROG SO2 PM10 PM2.5 Construction 30.06 29.23 6.71 0.04 9.13 5.13 SCAQMD Thresholds 550 100 75 150 150 55 Exceeds? No No No No No No Operation 16.54 1.57 3.70 0.03 2.95 0.78 SCAQMD Thresholds 550 55 55 150 150 55 Exceeds? No No No No No No Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1 (output tables provided in Appendix A). Attached: Appendix A ''Camino Terrace Detailed Report'' CalEEMod Version 2022.1. prepared May 28, 2026. Sources: ''Camino Terrace Detailed Report'' CalEEMod Version 2022.1. prepared May 28, 2026. ; EPA Green Book. Website accessed May 2026: https://www.epa.gov/green-book; De Minimis Threshold Source: EPA website accessed May 2026. https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables.

Supporting documentation

Appendix A Camino Terrace Detailed Report 5_28_26.pdf
Air Quality-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.	Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d))	15 CFR Part 930

1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?

Yes

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The Project site is located in the City of Jurupa Valley, Riverside County, California. As shown in the Coastal Zone Boundary Maps by the California Coastal Commission, below, the Project site is located 30+/- miles northeast from the nearest Coastal Zone.

Supporting documentation

Coastal Zone Boundary.png
Coastal Zone Management Act-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulations
It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.		24 CFR 58.5(i)(2) 24 CFR 50.3(i)
Reference		
https://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/site-contamination		

1. How was site contamination evaluated?* Select all that apply.

✓ ASTM Phase I ESA

ASTM Phase II ESA

Remediation or clean-up plan

ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.

None of the above

* HUD regulations at 24 CFR § 58.5(i)(2)(ii) require that the environmental review for multifamily housing with five or more dwelling units or non-residential property include the evaluation of previous uses of the site or other evidence of contamination on or near the site.
For acquisition and new construction of multifamily and nonresidential properties HUD strongly advises the review include an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to meet real estate transaction standards of due diligence and to help ensure compliance with HUD's toxic policy at 24 CFR §58.5(i) and 24 CFR §50.3(i). Also note that some HUD programs require an ASTM Phase I ESA.

2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances* (excluding radon) found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)

Provide a map or other documentation of absence or presence of contamination** and explain evaluation of site contamination in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

✓ No

Explain:

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Project by Verdantas, Inc (June 30, 2026) pursuant to the processes prescribed in ASTM International (ASTM) Standards E1527-21, recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical RECs (HRECs), or controlled RECs (CRECs) in connection with the site. The Phase I ESA produced the following findings: * No REC, HREC, or CRECs were found on-site * The site is not listed on local or regional environmental regulatory agency records, including DTSC Envirostor, CalGEM Well Finder, SCAQMD FINDS, NPMS, and SWRCB GeoTracker databases. * The environmental database search indicated no adjoining or nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. A review of the DTSC Envirostor, SWRCB GeoTracker, SCAQMD FINDS, CalGEM Well Finder and NPMS (pipelines) databases revealed no nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. The reconnaissance of adjoining properties revealed no evidence indicating they have likely created a REC on the Site. * A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the site in a prior Phase 1 ESA near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations. No further environmental investigations were recommended. Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Verdantas, Inc. June 30, 2026 (Appendix E)

Yes

* This question covers the presence of radioactive substances excluding radon. Radon is addressed in the Radon Exempt Question.
** Utilize EPA's Enviromapper, NEPAssist, or state/tribal databases to identify nearby dumps, junk yards, landfills, hazardous waste sites, and industrial sites, including EPA National Priorities List Sites (Superfund sites), CERCLA or state-equivalent sites, RCRA Corrective Action sites with release(s) or suspected release(s) requiring clean-up action and/or further investigation. Additional supporting documentation may include other inspections and reports.

3. Evaluate the building(s) for radon. Do all buildings meet any of the exemptions* from having to consider radon in the contamination analysis listed in CPD Notice CPD-23-103?

✓ Yes

Explain:

The site is vacant. There are no buildings present on site.

No

* Notes:
- Buildings with no enclosed areas having ground contact.
- Buildings containing crawlspaces, utility tunnels, or parking garages would not be exempt, however buildings built on piers would be exempt, provided that there is open air between the lowest floor of the building and the ground.
- Buildings that are not residential and will not be occupied for more than 4 hours per day.
- Buildings with existing radon mitigation systems - document radon levels are below 4 pCi/L with test results dated within two years of submitting the application for HUD assistance and document the system includes an ongoing maintenance plan that includes periodic testing to ensure the system continues to meet the current EPA recommended levels. If the project does not require an application, document test results dated within two years of the date the environmental review is certified. Refer to program office guidance to ensure compliance with program requirements.
- Buildings tested within five years of the submission of application for HUD assistance: test results document indoor radon levels are below current the EPA's recommended action levels of 4.0 pCi/L. For buildings with test data older than five years, any new environmental review must include a consideration of radon using one of the methods in Section A below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Project by Verdantas, Inc (June 30, 2026) pursuant to the processes prescribed in ASTM International (ASTM) Standards E1527-21, recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical RECs (HRECs), or controlled RECs (CRECs) in connection with the site. The Phase I ESA produced the following findings: * No REC, HREC, or CRECs were found on-site * The site is not listed on local or regional environmental regulatory agency records, including DTSC Envirostor, CalGEM Well Finder, SCAQMD FINDS, NPMS, and SWRCB GeoTracker databases. * The environmental database search indicated no adjoining or nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. A review of the DTSC Envirostor, SWRCB GeoTracker, SCAQMD FINDS, CalGEM Well Finder and NPMS (pipelines) databases revealed no nearby facilities likely to have created a REC on the Site. The reconnaissance of adjoining properties revealed no evidence indicating they have likely created a REC on the Site. * A Transite(R) asbestos-containing cement pipe was observed on the Site near the southeast corner of Camino Real and Canyon Terrace Drive. While not a REC, the inert construction debris, concrete debris, and asbestos containing Transite(R) pipe should be removed and property disposed prior to Site development. The construction debris and concrete debris may be disposed of as inert construction waste. The Transite(R) pipe

should be removed and disposed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with applicable regulations. No further environmental investigations were recommended. In general, observations should be made during future Site development for areas of possible contamination such as, but not limited to, the presence of underground facilities, railroads, buried debris, waste drums, and tanks, stained soil or odorous soils. Should such materials be encountered, further investigation and analysis may be necessary at that time. Source: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Verdantas, Inc. June 30, 2026 (Appendix E)

Supporting documentation

Contamination Toxic Substances Multifamily-Partner Worksheet 8_5_26.pdf
Housing Specific Environmental Requirements-Partner Worksheet 8_6_26.pdf
Appendix E Camino Terrace Phase I ESA(4).pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Endangered Species

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service ("FWS" and "NMFS" or "the Services").	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq*.); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect specifies or habitats?

No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

✓ Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?

✓ No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below. Documentation may include letters from the Services, species lists from the Services' websites, surveys or other documents and analysis showing that there are no species in the action area.

Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. An official species list was procured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that fulfills section 7(c) requirements of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The species list (Appendix B) identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species and critical habitat that may occur within the Project boundaries and/or may be affected by the proposed Project. A total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species were listed as having the potential to occur on the Project site.' 1. Burrowing Owl Surveys To mitigate potential impacts to burrowing owl, two pre-construction surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFW protocol. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to ground disturbance, and the second shall occur within 24 hours of the initiation of ground disturbance activities for any phase of development on the Project site. * If no owls are detected during those surveys, ground disturbance may proceed without further consideration of this species, assuming there is no lapse between the surveys and construction, because the protocol states ''time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance.'' * If burrowing owls are detected during the surveys, avoidance and minimization measures shall be required. Avoidance and minimization measures may include establishing a buffer zone, installing a visual barrier, implementing burrow exclusion and/or closure techniques, in conformance with CDFW protocol. 2. Migratory Bird Treaty Act If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season (early February through August), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted within thirty (30) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey should document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities should stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer is expanded to 500 feet. It is recommended that a biological monitor be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities can occur. Pursuant to California Fish and Game Code Section 3503, it is unlawful to destroy any bird's nest or any bird's eggs that are protected under the MBTA. Further, any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (Birds of Prey, such as hawks and owls) are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5 which makes it unlawful to take, possess, or

destroy their nest or eggs. Consultation with CDFW might be required prior to the removal of any raptor nest on the project site, if found.

Supporting documentation

Endangered Species Act-Partner Worksheet 8_5_26.pdf
Burrowing Owl Survey Area.png
Appendix B Camino Terrace IPaC Species List 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

- ✓ Yes
- No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards.	N/A	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C

1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?

✓ No

Yes

2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?

No

✓ Yes

3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:

- **Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR**
- **Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.**

If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. A Phase 1 ESA was prepared for the Project site (Appendix E) that searched the underground storage tank (UST) database for registered USTs in the Project area. The data was sourced from the State Water Resources Control Board?s Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database. A review of the EDR radius map report (Appendix D of the Phase I ESA) revealed there are 5 listed sites within 0.4 miles of the project site, including 2 USTs within approximately 175 feet of the site associated with a nearby 7-Eleven. No evidence of current or former aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) or USTs containing hazardous substances or petroleum products was observed on the Site.

Supporting documentation

Appendix E Camino Terrace Phase I ESA(3).pdf
Explosives-Partner Worksheet 8_5_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	7 CFR Part 658

1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?

Yes

✓ No

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The site is currently vacant and not being used or designated for agricultural uses. According to the California Important Farmlands mapping, the Project site is designated as ''Other Land.'' The Project site is designated for Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) in the Jurupa Valley General Plan and zoned R-3 (General Residential). No impacts to farmland would occur.

Supporting documentation

Important Farmland Map.png
Farmlands-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Floodplain Management

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires Federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable.	Executive Order 11988 * Executive Order 13690 * 42 USC 4001-4128 * 42 USC 5154a * only applies to screen 2047 and not 2046	24 CFR 55

1. Does this project meet an exemption at 24 CFR 55.12 from compliance with HUD's floodplain management regulations in Part 55?

Yes

(a) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 58.34 and 58.35(b).

(b) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 50.19, except as otherwise indicated in § 50.19.

(c) The approval of financial assistance for restoring and preserving the natural and beneficial functions and values of floodplains and wetlands, including through acquisition of such floodplain and wetland property, where a permanent covenant or comparable restriction is place on the property's continued use for flood control, wetland projection, open space, or park land, but only if:
(1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and
(2) The property is cleared of related improvements except those which:
(i) Are directly related to flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land (including playgrounds and recreation areas);
(ii) Do not modify existing wetland areas or involve fill, paving, or other ground disturbance beyond minimal trails or paths; and
(iii) Are designed to be compatible with the beneficial floodplain or wetland function of the property.

(d) An action involving a repossession, receivership, foreclosure, or similar acquisition of property to protect or enforce HUD's financial interests under previously approved loans, grants, mortgage insurance,

or other HUD assistance.

(e) Policy-level actions described at 24 CFR 50.16 that do not involve site-based decisions.

(f) A minor amendment to a previously approved action with no additional adverse impact on or from a floodplain or wetland.

(g) HUD's or the responsible entity's approval of a project site, an incidental portion of which is situated in the FFRMS floodplain (not including the floodway, LiMWA, or coastal high hazard area) but only if: (1) The proposed project site does not include any existing or proposed buildings or improvements that modify or occupy the FFRMS floodplain except de minimis improvements such as recreation areas and trails; and (2) the proposed project will not result in any new construction in or modifications of a wetland .

(h) Issuance or use of Housing Vouchers, or other forms of rental subsidy where HUD, the awarding community, or the public housing agency that administers the contract awards rental subsidies that are not project-based (i.e., do not involve site-specific subsidies).

(i) Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Describe:

✓ No

2. Does the project include a Critical Action? Examples of Critical Actions include projects involving hospitals, fire and police stations, nursing homes, hazardous chemical storage, storage of valuable records, and utility plants.

Yes

Describe:

✓ No

3. Determine the extent of the FFRMS floodplain and provide mapping documentation in support of that determination

The extent of the FFRMS floodplain can be determined using a Climate Informed Science Approach (CISA), 0.2 percent flood approach (0.2 PFA), or freeboard value approach (FVA). For projects in areas without available CISA data or without FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Studies (FISs) or Advisory Base Flood Elevations (ABFEs), use the best available information[1] to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information[2] for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved[3] structures must be elevated to the FFRMS floodplain regardless of the approach chosen to determine the floodplain.

Select one of the following three options:

CISA for non-critical actions. If using a local tool , data, or resources, ensure that the FFRMS elevation is higher than would have been determined using the 0.2 PFA or the FVA.

0.2-PFA. Where FEMA has defined the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that FEMA has designated as within the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain.

✓ FVA. If neither CISA nor 0.2-PFA is available, for non-critical actions, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that results from adding two feet to the base flood elevation as established by the effective FIRM or FIS or — if available — a FEMA-provided preliminary or pending FIRM or FIS or advisory base flood elevations, whether regulatory or informational in nature. However, an interim or preliminary FEMA map cannot be used if it is lower than the current FIRM or FIS.

[1] Sources which merit investigation include the files and studies of other federal agencies, such as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Soil Conservation Service and the U. S. Geological Survey. These agencies have prepared flood hazard studies for several thousand localities and, through their technical assistance programs, hydrologic studies, soil surveys, and other investigations have collected or developed other floodplain information for numerous sites and areas. States and communities are also sources of information on past flood 'experiences within their boundaries and are particularly knowledgeable about areas subject to high-risk flood hazards such as alluvial fans, high velocity flows, mudflows and mudslides, ice jams, subsidence and liquefaction.

[2] If you are using best available information, select the FVA option below and provide supporting documentation in the screen summary. Contact your local environmental officer with additional compliance questions.

[3] Substantial improvement means any repair or improvement of a structure which costs at least 50 percent of the market value of the structure before repair or improvement or results in an increase of more than 20 percent of the number of dwelling units. The full definition can be found at 24 CFR 55.2(b)(12).

5. Does your project occur in the FFRMS floodplain?

Yes

✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06065C0702H, the Project site is not located within a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. The Project site and surrounding area is located in an Area of Minimal Flood Hazard (unshaded Zone X). According to the FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report (Appendix F), the Project site is not located within a FFRMS floodplain.

Supporting documentation

FEEMA National Flood Insurance Map.png
FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report Project Location.png
Floodplain Management-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf
Appendix F FFRMS Freeboard Value Approach Report 1_21_25.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 "Protection of Historic Properties" https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

	No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)
	No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
	No, because the project consists solely of activities covered by the ACHP's PROGRAM COMMENT ON CERTAIN HOUSING, BUILDING AND TRANSPORTATION UNDERTAKINGS, as demonstrated in the ACHP PC Checklist.
✓	Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):

✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Response Period Elapsed

✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Not Required

✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)

✓ Cahuilla Band of Indians Completed
✓ Morongo Band of Mission Indians Completed
✓ Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Completed

Other Consulting Parties

Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:

Section 106 Consultation The County conducted Section 106 consultation pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800. The 15 tribes within the County of Riverside listed in the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT), as well as Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, were contacted via Certified Mail on 6/11/2024 and 7/3/2024, respectively. The 30-day period ended: 7/11/2024, 8/2/2024, and 8/8/2024. According to the County of Riverside, only Cahuilla, Morongo, and Soboba requested consultation/monitoring. The County has forwarded the information to the Project manager and advised them to contact the tribes to discuss monitoring. Any requests and input from consultation with the Project team will be considered for inclusion in conditions of approval. See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. There will be no impact to historic properties.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?

Yes
No

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

1. **Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:**
   See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet and Appendix C

   In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.

   Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information

   Additional Notes:

2. **Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?**

   ✓ Yes

   Document and upload surveys and report(s) below.
   For Archeological surveys, refer to HP Fact Sheet #6, Guidance on Archeological Investigations in HUD Projects.

   Additional Notes:

   Cultural Resources Assessment A Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared for the Project by Duke Cultural Resources Management, LLC (Duke CRM) in August 2024 (Appendix C). The Project site is vacant. The assessment was conducted in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Action (NHPA/Section 106), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cultural resources assessment included a records search for cultural resources at the Eastern Information Center (EIC), a search of the Sacred Land Files at the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and a field survey conducted on September 30, 2022, by Duke CRM staff and a tribal archaeologist for the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians. The site is currently undeveloped with thick vegetative coverage including shrubs and several scattered trees. There are no built structures on site. The Project is located along the periphery of the traditional territory of four Native American groups, the Gabrieleno,

the Luiseno, the Cahuilla, and the Serrano. Duke CRM confirmed that the site had remained vacant, with the first residential homes constructed to the southeast of the Project in the 1950s, and the residential homes to the north were constructed in the 1960s. No historic built environment resources were identified, and no cultural resources were found during the site field survey. Duke CRM concluded that the lack of cultural resources within the Project area indicated a low sensitivity for prehistoric cultural resources and a low sensitivity for historic cultural resources. Please see worksheet for additional information.

No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.

✓ No Historic Properties Affected

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload concurrence(s) or objection(s) below.

Document reason for finding:

✓ No historic properties present.

Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Section 106 Consultation The County conducted Section 106 consultation pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800. The 15 tribes within the County of Riverside listed in the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT), as well as Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, were contacted via Certified Mail on 6/11/2024 and 7/3/2024, respectively. The 30-day period ended: 7/11/2024, 8/2/2024, and 8/8/2024. According to the County of Riverside, only Cahuilla, Morongo, and Soboba requested consultation and recommended that a Soboba tribal monitor be present during ground disturbing activities, and the Cahuilla and Morongo tribes requested monitoring. The County forwarded the information to the Project manager who has since contacted the tribes to discuss monitoring. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the Cahuilla Band of Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians have requested that tribal monitors be present for all ground disturbing activities, as well as specific measures to mitigate and resolve any adverse effects to historic properties discovered inadvertently during the course of project related ground disturbing activity. CR-1: Native American Monitoring Agreements (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-2: Retention of Archaeologist (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-3: Cultural Resource Management Plan (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-4: Pre-Grade Meeting (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-5: On-site Monitoring (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-6: Inadvertent Discovery of Cultural Resources (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-7: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) CR-8: FINAL REPORT: (See Historic Preservation Partner Worksheet for complete text) See Appendix D for relevant materials and email correspondence between the County of Riverside, the Project manager, and tribes. National Register of Historic Places According to the National Register of Historic Places and Natural Historic Landmark Records database, there are no historic structures or listed Historic Places located on-site, or in the City of Jurupa Valley. Although there no foreseeable impacts to historic properties at this time, under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discoveries, the Riverside County Department of HWS may have additional responsibilities for the undertaking.

Supporting documentation

Historic Preservation-Partner Worksheet 8_5_26.pdf
Appendix D Camino Terrace Section 106 Consultation-7_31_26.pdf
Appendix C Camino Terrace Cultural Report 8_24.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

✓ Yes

No

Noise Abatement and Control

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD's noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate.	Noise Control Act of 1972 General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: "Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields"	Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B

1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:

✓ New construction for residential use

NOTE: HUD assistance to new construction projects is generally prohibited if they are located in an Unacceptable zone, and HUD discourages assistance for new construction projects in Normally Unacceptable zones. See 24 CFR 51.101(a)(3) for further details.

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster
None of the above

4**. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the vicinity (1000' from a major road, 3000' from a railroad, or 15 miles from an airport).**

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

There are no noise generators found within the threshold distances above.

✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

5. **Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the**

✓ Acceptable: (65 decibels or less; the ceiling may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Indicate noise level here: 60

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Normally Unacceptable: (Above 65 decibels but not exceeding 75 decibels; the floor may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

HUD strongly encourages conversion of noise-exposed sites to land uses compatible with high noise levels.

Check here to affirm that you have considered converting this property to a non-residential use compatible with high noise levels.

Indicate noise level here: 60

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

National Transportation Noise Impacts A review of the National Transportation Noise Map by the U.S. Department of Transportation indicates that the Project site is located outside of the mapped noise contours associated with road and airport travel. Local Noise Impacts The Project site is located immediately west of Camino Real and north of Limonite Avenue, both of which are classified as major arterial roadways and primary sources of traffic noise. According to the City of Jurupa Valley 2017 General Plan, Figure 7-6 Noise Contour Map (Future 2035 conditions), the 70 CNEL noise

contour encroaches only slightly into the western and southern portions of the site immediately adjacent to the roadways. The Project incorporates building setbacks that further reduce noise exposure, including a minimum 25-foot setback from Camino Real and more than a 300-foot setback from Limonite Avenue. As a result, the majority of the site falls within the 60-65 CNEL range, and no portions of the site are exposed to exterior noise levels exceeding 70 CNEL. HUD considers exterior noise levels of 65 dB DNL (or equivalent CNEL) or less as Acceptable. Levels above 65 dB but not exceeding 75 dB are Normally Unacceptable and require appropriate mitigation. For this Project, the effective exterior exposure across the developable portions of the site remains at or below the upper end of the Acceptable range (or low end of Normally Unacceptable at the immediate roadway edges), and well below the Unacceptable threshold of 75 dB. The Jurupa Valley City Council approved the Project on March 19, 2026. The approving resolution explicitly requires that the Project conform to all requirements of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, applicable State laws, and City ordinances, pursuant to Section 9.240.330(3) of the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code. This includes full compliance with the California Building Code (Title 24), which mandates that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable. Standard construction practices for residential development, combined with the provided setbacks, are expected to achieve the required noise level reduction. Where needed, enhanced measures such as upgraded glazing, sealed construction, or mechanical ventilation (allowing windows-closed conditions) will be implemented to ensure interior levels remain at or below 45 dB. Adherence to these mandatory, code-enforced requirements will effectively mitigate potential noise impacts to acceptable levels. No additional project-specific noise abatement beyond standard compliance is required. Airport Noise Compatibility The Project site is located outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport 55-65 CNEL noise contours. The Project would not experience significant levels of airport-related noise. Sources: Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document, Adopted March 2005. https://rcaluc.org/sites/g/files/aldnop421/files/migrated/Portals-13-PDFGeneral-plan-newplan-20--20Vol.-201-20Riverside-20Municipal.pdf; National Transportation Noise Map, accessed May 2026.

Supporting documentation

Riverside Municipal Airport Compatibiity Map.png
National Transportation Noise Map.png
Noise EA-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

- ✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.	Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)	40 CFR Part 149

1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

Yes

✓ No

2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Supporting documentation

Sole Source Aquifers(1).png
Sole Source Aquifers-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 requires avoiding to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands, and avoiding actions that directly or indirectly support new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory must be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not delineated on NWI maps must also be evaluated.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in 24 CFR 55.10 and referenced in Executive Order 11990? The term "new construction" shall include grading, clearing, draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities for any structure or facilities, including the siting of new manufactured housing units.

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction activities directly impact an onsite wetland?

The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds. This definition includes those wetland areas separated from their natural supply of water as a result of activities such as the construction of structural flood protection methods or solid fill roadbeds and activities such as mineral extraction and navigation improvements. This definition includes both wetlands subject to and those not subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as well as constructed wetlands.

✓ No, an onsite wetland will not be directly impacted by new construction activities, as defined in 24 CFR 55.10.

Yes, there is an onsite wetland that will be directly impacted by new construction activities, as defined 24 CFR 55.10.

3. Will the proposed project indirectly affect wetlands by modifying the flow of stormwater, releasing pollutants, or otherwise changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability?

Yes, wetlands may be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

✓ No, wetlands will not be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

4. Will the proposed project indirectly affect off-site wetlands?

Yes, off-site wetlands may be indirectly affected.

✓ No, off-site wetlands will not be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) indicate the project site does not contain any streams, riparian habitat, marshes, protected wetlands, vernal pools, or sensitive natural communities protected by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No impact would occur.

Supporting documentation

National Wetland Inventory Map.png
Wetlands-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c))	36 CFR Part 297

1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?

✓ No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.
Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no rivers located on the Project site. The nearest ''Wild and Scenic River'' is Deep Creek located approximately 26 miles northeast of the Project site. The nearest ''Nationwide River'' is Little Creek, South Fork located approximately 17.5 miles north of the Project site. There are no ''Study Rivers'' in the Project vicinity according to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System database. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Supporting documentation

Nationwide Rivers Inventory and Wild and Scenic River System.png
Wild Scenic Rivers-Partner Worksheet 5_28_26.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No