



City of
Jurupa Valley
California

Housing Element 2021-2029

Revised Final Draft

Approved by the
Jurupa Valley City Council
on December 2, 2021
(Resolution No. 2021-99)

General Plan



Contents

5 – Housing Element.....	5-1	E. Financial Resources for Housing	5-74
A. Introduction	5-1	SB 2/LEAP Grants	5-74
Primary Goals	5-2	Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program	5-75
State Housing Element Requirements.....	5-2	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	
Consistency with Other Elements of the General		Funds	5-76
Plan	5-3	Additional Resources	5-76
Public Participation	5-5	F. Opportunities for Energy Conservation	5-76
B. Community Profile	5-11	State Regulations	5-77
Data and Methodology.....	5-11	State and Federal Programs	5-77
Population Trends and Characteristics.....	5-13	Private Sector Programs	5-77
Special Needs Groups.....	5-20	G. Housing Constraints.....	5-78
Housing Growth	5-30	Governmental Constraints	5-78
Composition of Housing Stock	5-30	Environmental Constraints.....	5-90
Vacancy Rates	5-32	Infrastructure Constraints	5-92
Housing Conditions.....	5-32	Market Constraints	5-95
Neighborhood Improvements and Removal		Energy Conservation Constraints.....	5-98
of Blight	5-34	H. Housing Element Goals, and Policies	5-98
Code Enforcement Activities.....	5-35	Goals	5-99
Housing Costs and Affordability.....	5-35	Policies.....	5-99
C. Existing Housing Needs	5-37	I. Housing Action Plan	5-105
Housing Cost Burden	5-38	Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.....	5-114
Overcrowding.....	5-39	J. Quantified Objectives	5-120
Publicly Assisted Housing	5-40	Appendices.....	5-121
Units at Risk of Converting to Market-Rate		Appendix A – Specific Plan Capacity and Vacant	
Housing.....	5-41	Sites Inventory.....	5-123
Fair Housing in Jurupa Valley	5-44	Appendix B – Proposed Redesignation/Rezone	
Resources for Special Needs Groups	5-45	Sites.....	5-159
Families	5-50	Appendix C – Public Participation	5-169
Housing Resources	5-51	Appendix D – Evaluation of Previous Housing	
D. Housing Opportunities and Resources.....	5-63	Element/Past Accomplishments.....	5-207
Credits toward RHNA.....	5-64	Appendix E – Fair Housing Assessment	5-215
Progress in Meeting Housing Needs.....	5-73		
Additional Sites Needed to Meet RHNA.....	5-74		

Tables

Table 5.1 : Regional Population Trends, 2000-2019.....	5-13	Table 5.32 : Inland Empire Affordable Housing Project Examples.....	5-52
Table 5.2 : Age Distribution – Percent of Total Population, 2010-2019.....	5-14	Table 5.33 : Jurupa Valley Permitted Uses by Zone	5-54
Table 5.3 : Racial and Ethnic Composition, 2010-2019...	5-14	Table 5.34 : City of Jurupa Valley 6 th Cycle RHNA Allocation.....	5-64
Table 5.4 : Employment by Industry, 2019	5-15	Table 5.35 : Approved Units Built/Entitled June 30- September 30, 2021	5-65
Table 5.5 : Total Households and Household Growth, 2010-2019.....	5-16	Table 5.36 : Pipeline Projects (Units Pending Approval) as of September 30, 2021	5-66
Table 5.6 : Household Characteristics, Percent of Total.....	5-16	Table 5.37 : ADU Affordability Assumptions, 2021-2029	5-67
Table 5.7 : Occupied Units by Tenure, 2019	5-17	Table 5.38 : Approved I-15 Corridor Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	5-69
Table 5.8 : Household Size Distribution, 2019	5-17	Table 5.39 : Approved Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021- 2029	5-69
Table 5.9 : Household Income by Tenure, 2019.....	5-18	Table 5.40 : Proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan Amendment (2021) Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	5-70
Table 5.10 : Distribution by Income Group, Percent of Total Households	5-19	Table 5.41 : Approved Paradise Knolls Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2019	5-71
Table 5.11 : Elderly with Disabilities Limiting Independent Living in Jurupa Valley, 2009-2013 and 2019	5-21	Table 5.42 : 2021-2029 Projected Specific Plan Development.....	5-71
Table 5.12 : Householders by Tenure and Age	5-22	Table 5.43 : General Plan Affordability Level Assumptions	5-71
Table 5.13 : Disability Characteristics, Percent of Total Population, 2019	5-23	Table 5.44 : City Council and Planning Commission Approved Projects by Density and Affordability, January 1, 2019- October 15, 2021	5-72
Table 5.14 : Large Households (5 persons or more) by Tenure, 2019.....	5-26	Table 5.45 : Sites Inventory	5-73
Table 5.15 : Extremely Low Income (ELI) Households.....	5-26	Table 5.46 : Progress in Meeting 6 th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation	5-73
Table 5.16 : Homeless Population in Jurupa Valley and Riverside County, 2017-2020	5-28	Table 5.47 : RHNA Summary With Redesignation Sites...	5-74
Table 5.17 : Farm Worker Employment Profile, Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area	5-28	Table 5.48 : Jurupa Valley General Plan Residential Land Use Designations, 2017	5-80
Table 5.18 : Housing Unit Growth Jurupa Valley and Nearby Jurisdictions	5-30	Table 5.49 : Summary of Residential Zoning Districts Development Standards	5-81
Table 5.19 : Unit Type by Tenure, 2019	5-31	Table 5.50 : Residential Parking Requirements.....	5-82
Table 5.20 : Unit Size by Tenure, 2019.....	5-31	Table 5.51 : Planning Fees.....	5-83
Table 5.21 : Household Occupancy Status, 2010-2019...	5-32	Table 5.52 : Residential Development Impact Fees (Per Unit)	5-84
Table 5.22 : Tenure by Age of Housing Stock (Occupied Units)	5-33	Table 5.53 : Street Design Standards.....	5-93
Table 5.23 : Number of Dwellings Lacking Plumbing or Complete Kitchen Facilities, 2019	5-34	Table 5.54 : Disposition of Home Loans, 2019	5-97
Table 5.24 : Average Rent by Unit Size.....	5-36	Table 5.55 : Housing Action Plan Summary, 2021- 2029	5-106
Table 5.25 : Housing Affordability Matrix, Riverside County, 2020.....	5-37	Table 5.56 – Fair Housing Program Action Items	5-115
Table 5.26 : Income Limits	5-38	Table 5.57 : Quantified Objectives.....	5-120
Table 5.27 : Overcrowding by Tenure, Percent of Total Households	5-40		
Table 5.28 : Non-Public Housing Affordable Units in Jurupa Valley.....	5-41		
Table 5.29 : Rental Subsidies Required – Mission Villas, 2019	5-43		
Table 5.30 : Senior Housing Development.....	5-47		
Table 5.31 : Homeless and Special Needs Housing Resources.....	5-49		

5 – HOUSING ELEMENT



Figure 5-1: Housing Diversity in Jurupa Valley

A. INTRODUCTION

This Housing Element identifies the housing needs and goals, policies, and programs for Jurupa Valley for 2021 through 2029, and promotes expanded housing opportunities, community safety, prosperity, and quality of life for all, consistent with Jurupa Valley’s adopted Community Values Statement, included in *Appendix 8.0 to the 2017 General Plan*.

This Housing Element was prepared to establish a strategy to meet this young City’s housing needs for all income levels, including affordable and market-rate housing. This Housing Element was prepared to meet the State of California’s 6th Cycle Housing Element Update Planning Period from October 15, 2021 to October 15, 2029. The primary issues addressed include:

1. The provision of decent housing in a healthy environment for all income levels;
2. Affordable housing for special needs populations;

3. Implementation of housing programs;
4. Rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable housing; and
5. Removal of blight.

Housing is a key part of the City's overall economic development efforts to improve and expand its housing stock, improve property values, diversify the employment base, and improve the quality of life for all residents.

This element contains a reflection of the local issues and state law requirements for the State of California and also demonstrates a determination to meet the minimum requirements under the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) determined by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The following list provides the Primary goals that continue to influence the City's objectives, policies, and programs:

Primary Goals

- HE 1: Encourage and, where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.
- HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special needs households.
- HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.
- HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.
- HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.

HE 6: Affirmatively further fair housing.

The Housing Element of the General Plan is only one facet of a City's planning program. The *California Government Code* requires that General Plans contain an integrated, consistent set of goals and policies. This Housing Element helps shape and is influenced by policies contained in the other nine Elements of this General Plan; particularly by the Land Use Element, which establishes the location, type, intensity, and distribution of land uses throughout the City, and by the Mobility Element, which establishes policies for the movement of people, goods, and services throughout the City.

State Housing Element Requirements

State law requires the preparation of a Housing Element as part of a jurisdiction's General Plan (*California Government Code* §65302(c)). It is the primary planning guide for local jurisdictions to identify and

prioritize housing needs and to determine ways to meet these needs best while balancing community objectives and resources.

Appendix A in this Housing Element contains background details regarding the City’s inventory of sites for housing development, and Appendix B contains a summary of proposed sites for redesignation/rezone.

Consistency with Other Elements of the General Plan

This Housing Element builds upon the other General Plan elements and is consistent with the policies and proposals set forth in them. By law, General Plans must be internally consistent. Therefore, proposed amendments to any element must be evaluated against the other General Plan elements to ensure that no conflicts occur.

When the City of Jurupa Valley incorporated in 2011, the new City adopted the County’s General Plan, including the Housing Element. The 2017 Housing Element was the City’s first locally prepared housing element and was developed as part of its new 2017 General Plan. The 2021-2029 Housing Element is the second Housing Element for the City of Jurupa Valley as required by the timeline set by HCD. As part of the development of this Housing Element Update, the City ensured consistency with the Safety and Environmental Justice elements as required by state law, as well as all other elements of the General Plan.

Housing must be viewed in a context that includes more than the availability of adequate shelter. External factors affecting the adequacy of housing include the quality of public services, aesthetics and visual characteristics, and proximity to related land uses. For example, the location of housing often determines the extent of school, park, library, police, fire, and other services associated with housing.

Housing is a unique element in that the plans for housing can significantly change the plans and development of the other elements. The following explains how the elements are related.

- **Air Quality:** In terms of housing, air quality can dictate the types and concentration of housing development due to the kinds of emissions that can result from human activities that produce air-polluting greenhouse gases. Air Quality Goal #6 works to deal with the expected issues surrounding Jobs and Housing.
- **Community Safety, Services and Facilities:** This combined element covers facilities and safety that can affect the physical development and quality of life in Jurupa Valley. Community Safety, Service and Facilities Goal #1 and

Goal #2 integrate the efforts to provide protection and services to the new housing development in the City.

- **Economic Sustainability:** Build and maintain a thriving local economy to expand employment and business opportunities, provide needed products and services, increase median income and property values, and help preserve and enhance Jurupa Valley's quality of life. In this context, housing can change the speed of growth of the economic base of the community and seek a housing and jobs balance within the City.
- **Environmental Justice:** The goal of the Environmental Justice Element is to ensure environmental equity for all persons, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, and establish and maintain an open and inclusionary public decision-making process. While all of the goals in the Environmental Justice Element impact the development of the Housing Element, Environmental Justice Goal #4 specifically reviews Healthy and Affordable Housing.
- **Healthy Communities:** The Healthy Communities Element establishes goals and policies to help improve quality of life and foster healthy behavior and lifestyles, translating the General Plan vision for a robust Jurupa Valley into reality. Housing in this context is viewed as physical, social, and cultural factors of health and well-being of the community of Jurupa Valley.
- **Land Use:** The goal of the Land Use Element is to use land to maintain and enhance Jurupa Valley's unique, small-town character and equestrian-friendly neighborhoods while promoting economic opportunities and prosperity for all. This element works with housing to maintain population growth and development trends, and balance the types and density of housing in the City.
- **Mobility:** The Mobility Element works to create a multi-modal mobility network that protects Jurupa Valley's semi-rural character and lifestyle, is attractive, and provides all users with safe connections to homes, jobs, schools, commercial areas, public facilities, and recreation areas, and that reduces dependence on the use of single-occupant automobiles.
- **Noise:** In the Noise Element, the City describes how it intends to prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure on its residents, employees, visitors, and other persons. In the case of housing, the Noise Element will consider land use compatibility to noise generators like commercial and industrial development to housing.

- **Conservation and Open Space:** The Conservation and Open Space Element promotes public health and safety by redirecting development away from areas subject to geologic hazards, flooding, and fires. The goals of the Conservation and Open Space Element are integrated into housing through access to open spaces from housing and the hope to preserve the resources for the future generation of Jurupa valley residents.

Public Participation

In preparing the 6th Cycle Housing Element, involvement with community members was prioritized to fully understand their values and ideas for the future. There were several opportunities for community members and housing interest groups to express their input and weigh in on housing issues. Although in-person outreach was limited due to COVID-19 constraints, the community adapted and found meaningful ways to get involved in the Housing Element update process through digital engagement platforms and virtual meetings. A summary of outreach activities conducted during the planning effort is provided below. Appendix C contains community engagement materials used to inform and solicit input from the public during the process, including public notices, the Community Housing Survey, and community workshops.

Website and Community Housing Survey

In winter 2020-21, the City launched the Housing Element Update webpage and online Community Housing Survey (in English and Spanish). The website contained educational information about the purpose and process for the Housing Element, project updates, and notices of upcoming opportunities to participate. This included the opportunity to sign up for an email list for future updates for the public study sessions and workshops that were planned for community participation.

To date, the Community Housing Survey has resulted in 231 responses. To connect with as many residents of Jurupa Valley as possible, the survey was promoted through the City's Planning Commission and City Council meetings, the City's email list, the City's Facebook page, and the City's website. The survey was open to the public through the Housing Element development process, and the responses demonstrated that the community's interests and concerns reflected those found in the data and demographics. The responses from a majority of the survey takers show that those with the greatest need for housing in Jurupa Valley are seniors, large families, young adults, and homeless persons. The responses also reveal that the community does not see any difficulty in finding housing but does see the need for affordable housing and would like

to see more diversity in affordable housing. Through the survey, the City also received a wide variety of comments on housing that are available in full in Appendix C.

A summary of the survey responses identified the following housing concerns and desires for the City.

- Desire to increase the variety of housing types and affordability
- Desire to see government assistance for the maintenance of existing homes
- Desire to see housing developed near access to community and commercial amenities
- Desire to provide housing to those who are in the special need categories (i.e., those who are homeless, single parent household, seniors or living with disabilities)

The survey was provided in English and Spanish. To reach growing population of Spanish speakers living in the community, the outreach notices were also provided in Spanish and English. In addition to the normal methods of distribution and legal noticing; the many utility companies, public agencies and nonprofits organizations that operate in the City were able to provide their customers access to the information available through their websites and utility bills. These surveys results captured the community's sentiments towards the current housing issues present in Jurupa Valley.

The City incorporated the data into the overall analysis of the Element and the main concerns of the community were reviewed and addressed in the Housing Opportunities and Resources Section of this Housing Element. The responses received from the community resulted in specific emphasis on affordable housing and diversity of in future housing types.

Planning Commission and City Council Study Sessions: Housing Element Overview, Sites Inventory and New Housing Laws

Public input was facilitated by means of separate Study Sessions conducted with the Planning Commission and the City Council on March 10, 2021 and April 15, 2021, respectively, that provided an overview of Housing Element requirements and housing law and a discussion of the City's RHNA and potential housing sites to meet the RHNA. The Planning Commission and City Council were generally supportive of the need for additional housing sites in the City and indicated areas of the City where additional housing and density would be most feasible, including within the Specific Plan areas and along the City's major transportation corridors. The meetings were noticed as follows and open for public participation and comment.

- Notices were mailed to interested persons and public agencies.
- Notices were posted at City Hall.
- Notices were posted on the City’s website.
- Notices were placed in the Press Enterprise Newspaper (print and digital).

Community Workshops

On April 5 and 6, 2021 public workshops were conducted on the Housing Element, one in English and one in Spanish. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the workshops were conducted via teleconference with computer stations available at City Hall for participants without computer access. The workshops were advertised on the City’s website, community websites, and through social media. During the workshops, City staff provided an overview of Housing Element requirements and housing law and a discussion of the City’s RHNA and potential housing sites to meet the RHNA. Participants were then encouraged to provide their input on housing issues and needs in Jurupa Valley. Overall, participants agreed that lack of affordable housing is the biggest housing issue in Jurupa Valley.

During these workshops the participants also emphasized the following concerns and desires for the City to address:

- Desire to increase the variety of housing types and affordability,
- Desire to locate higher density housing near transportation corridors,
- Desire to see more multi-family dwelling development and small lot or condo developments to increase the income variety of the community,
- Desire to see more shared open spaces in the community and developments with less traditional lawns.

These comments have been incorporated into the development of the Housing Opportunities and Resources Section of this Housing Element.

Public Review Draft Housing Element

The Draft Housing Element was made available for public review at City Hall and on the City’s website beginning on May 20, 2021. Notices to inform the public and stakeholders about the availability of the Draft Housing Element were mailed and emailed to housing interest groups, including all homeowner’s associations in the City, and announcements of the Draft Housing Element were sent to subscribers of the City’s email service, community agencies, and

Facebook, and were made at Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

Planning Commission and City Council Joint Study Session: Final Sites Inventory and Draft Housing Element

On May 20, 2021, a joint study session was conducted with the Planning Commission and the City Council on the Final Sites Inventory (Appendix A), Proposed Redesignation/Rezone Sites (Appendix B), and the Draft Housing Element. This study session provided an overview of the Draft Housing Element and a detailed overview of the sites inventory. The meeting was noticed and open for public participation and comment. In addition, the City directly invited housing interest groups, including affordable housing developers and nonprofits, senior care providers, property management companies, and the Chamber of Commerce. A notice was also mailed to representatives of all homeowner's associations in the City.

This study session was attended by Planning Commissioners, City Council members, community members, and community interest group representatives. The study session was livestreamed through the City website, and community members were provided the opportunity to send in written comments ahead of the session on May 20, 2021. The study session began with an overview of the Draft Housing Element and the timeline of the development and community involvement with this document. The presentation also included a review of the Sites Inventory and ability of the City to meet its RHNA allocation based on existing and proposed land use designations and known development projects. The presentation was then followed by a discussion about proposed sites for redesignation/rezone to the City's highest density residential designation (HHDR) and R-3 zone and the criteria used to select sites. Sites were chosen to best encapsulate the City's RHNA as set by the HCD. The discussion centered on vacant sites available in the City of Jurupa Valley.

The City Council had the following comments, and based on individual study sessions, the draft document and the list of sites provided, they voiced their desires to see the following:

- Desire to see highest density housing around commercial development
- Desire to see fewer industrial uses around housing
- Desire to see that no more housing get built directly in areas that are currently impacted by traffic issues
- Desire to see quality housing through designs and buffering to reduce the effects of pollutants to housing sites

All of the comments provided by City Council members were included and responded to through the programs in this document. For example, the housing sites proposed for redesignation and rezoning have been located near existing and planned commercial developments and future commercial development so that the community will have access to amenities.

Planning Commissioners provided comments on the sites and the following desires:

- Desire to house as many people as possible in the community as part of a balancing act with jobs
- Desire to see that the development for highest density housing infill and transit corridors spread the density throughout the city
- Desire for inclusionary and mixed income developments for residents to encourage healthy communities

These comments were taken into account when writing this document and were used to modify the overall Sites Inventory and proposed redesignation/rezone sites. The current housing policies in this document also include programs to address the diversity of housing for different incomes, the concentration and location of highest density housing, as well as environmental justice needs for housing development.

This meeting was attended by the public and watched through the livestream available on the City website. This meeting was recorded and kept for future record. Representatives from the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) and Inland Equity, two local environmental justice groups, attended the meetings and spoke of their comments on the Draft Housing Element and also wrote into the City concerning potential additional programs to further the development of affordable for all.

The nonprofits discussed the following desires for inclusion in the City's Housing programs:

- Desire for rent control in Jurupa Valley
- Desire to raise fines through code enforcement for substandard housing in both rental and ownership
- Desire for elimination of the lowest density residential zoning
- Desire for programs to assist with housing ownership rather than renting
- Desire to relocate the potential housing sites farther away from transportation corridors
- Desire to see inclusionary and mixed housing

The comments received by the City at this study session from these two nonprofit groups have been addressed by the programs of this

Housing Element, including a study for an inclusionary housing ordinance, the special criteria of potential housing site inventory selection, and the continued work by the code enforcement team to deal with substandard housing. As the City continues to grow and attempts to accommodate the development of the community, it makes all efforts to provide better housing for all income levels through the proposed programs.

Public Review of Draft Housing Element

On May 27, 2021, the Draft Housing Element was updated with the comments received from the City Council and Planning Commission Joint session and then reposted on the City website for public review of the 6th cycle. The announcement for this draft availability was also posted on the City's website and social media platforms and was sent to all community parties. The update draft was also sent to HCD for the first review. The typical Housing Element review period is 60 days, and on July 23, 2021 the City met with the staff from the HCD to review the State's preliminary comments, which were formally provided to the City in writing on July 26, 2021. The City has incorporated changes requested by the State in a revised Draft Housing Element Update.

On October 5, 2021, the City made the revised Draft Housing Element with HCD-requested updates available on the City's website with an invitation for comments. This document was posted on social media, sent to local agencies, and emailed to commissioners, council members, community groups, and others requesting notification. As of October 15, 2021, the City did not receive any comments from the public on the revised Draft Housing Element; however, the document remained available for public review and comment through February 7, 2022. The intention was to keep all community members informed of any changes and updates to the Housing Element and obtain as many comments as possible to best create a document that suits the needs of the people of Jurupa Valley.

On November 10, 2021, the Planning Commission considered the Housing Element Update at a duly noticed public hearing. The Planning Commission received a detailed overview of the Housing Element Update and invited members of the public to address the Commission. However, no members of the public asked to be heard. The Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the Housing Element Update to the City Council.

On December 2, 2021, the City Council considered the Housing Element Update at a duly noticed public hearing. The Mayor invited members of the public to address the Council on the Housing Element Update. However, no members of the public asked to be

heard. Following discussion of the project, the Council made minor modifications to the sites inventory and unanimously approved the Housing Element Update. In addition, the Council authorized the Community Development Director to make any non-substantive, technical modifications to the document based on further comments from HCD without the need for re-approval by the City Council.

On December 13, 2021, the City received the second comment letter from HCD on the Housing Element. The letter acknowledged that the City had responded to many of HCD's previous comments and requested additional information and clarification on the AFFH and other topics.

On February 7, 2022, the City made the second revision of the Housing Element available on the City's website with an invitation for comments. This document was posted on social media, sent to local agencies, and emailed to commissioners, council members, community groups, and others requesting notification. The revision reflected changes made to the element in response to HCD's letter of December 13, 2021. As of February 21, 2022, the City received one comment on the revised Housing Element Update related to whether the revised proposal for the Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan was included in the document. As stated in Section D, the revised proposal was not included as it is early in the process and has not been reviewed or approved by the City. The revised draft Housing Element Update was submitted to HCD on February 22, 2022 for review and certification.

B. COMMUNITY PROFILE

This section analyzes demographic and housing characteristics that influence the demand for and availability of housing in the City of Jurupa Valley. This analysis forms the foundation for community-based housing programs that can most feasibly meet the needs of the residents of the City of Jurupa Valley. This also looks at the growth of the community and uses that data to plan for housing needs within the community of Jurupa Valley.

Data and Methodology

Work on this 2021-2029 Housing Element began in 2020 prior to completion and publication of 2020 census information. In addition, the City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated on July 1, 2011, after the 2010 Census had been conducted. As such, the City of Jurupa Valley was not identified as a city in the decennial census. Nonetheless, preparation of this Housing Element involved the assemblage and presentation of relevant demographic and housing data for Jurupa

Valley as an individual jurisdiction. Jurupa Valley was added to the demographic data available starting in 2013 as its own city.

The following key data sources were used to complete this Housing Element. Sources of specific information are identified in the text, tables, and figures.

- Census data (2010) and American Community Surveys (2019 and 2017)
- California Department of Finance (2013)
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2013-2017

While the City was not recognized as an incorporated city in the decennial census, demographic and housing data for Jurupa Valley is extracted from the decennial censuses (2010 U.S. Census) by retrieving the data for the block groups and census tracts that generally describe the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. The 2021-2029 Housing Element was prepared in 2020-2021 and was part of the 2020 Census data collection as a Place; however, because the certified Census data has not been released to the public for use, this Housing Element utilizes the American Community Survey (ACS) for 2019. While most of the data is available for the ACS for 2019, not all data is complete and so the data for the 2017 ACS is used in the analysis.

Another method of compiling decennial census data for the City of Jurupa Valley is using data for the Census Designated Places (CDPs) that comprise the City of Jurupa Valley. Six CDPs generally form the boundaries of Jurupa Valley: Crestmore Heights, Glen Avon, Mira Loma, Pedley, Rubidoux, and Sunnyslope.

Since the 2010 Census, the Bureau of Census has been conducting sample surveys, known as the American Community Surveys (ACS), on specific demographic and housing variables. ACSs are conducted every 1, 3, or 5 years, depending on the specific variables in question and the population size of the community. Some ACSs do contain data for the City of Jurupa Valley as an incorporated city. Therefore, by necessity, this report draws from multiple ACS data sets that depend upon the availability of data for the City. The ACS data gives us an opportunity to analyze demographic and housing data in the City as recent as 2019. When data is not available at the city-level, this report applies the same method used above for retrieving data from the decennial censuses, and extracts data at the block-group or tract-level.

Population Trends and Characteristics

Housing needs are influenced by population and employment trends. This section provides a summary of the changes to the population size, age, and racial/ethnic composition of the City of Jurupa Valley since 2000.

Historical, Existing, and Forecast Growth

The City of Jurupa Valley was incorporated from within Riverside County in 2011 and covers a 45-square-mile area. The City encompasses the neighborhoods of Jurupa Hills, Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Pedley, Indian Hills, Belltown, Sunnyslope, Crestmore Heights, and Rubidoux, thus known as “A Community of Communities.”

Jurupa Valley is located in a region that, since 2000, has experienced robust population growth. According to the U.S. Census, Riverside County had a population of just over 2,470,546 persons in 2019. Overall, the County has experienced steady population growth over the last two decades, with the total number of residents increasing by 59.86% since 2000. *Table 5.1* compares the population of Riverside County with neighboring counties.

Table 5.1: Regional Population Trends, 2000-2019

	2000	2010	2019	Percent Change 2000-2010	Percent Change 2010-2019
Riverside County	1,545,387	2,189,641	2,470,546	41.7%	12.8%
San Bernardino County	1,709,434	2,035,210	2,180,085	19.1%	7.1%
Imperial County	142,361	174,528	181,215	22.6%	3.8%
Jurupa Valley*	80,596	93,817	109,525	16.4%	16.7%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2000-2010 and ACS 2019

*Jurupa Valley Data for 2000-2010 aggregated from county data by tract level

According to the U.S. Census, Jurupa Valley experienced a 16% population increase between 2000 and 2010. Followed by a 17% population increase between 2010-2019 indicating a steady growth of population in comparison to the growth seen at the County of Riverside. This indicates that while the growth of the population of the County has slowed in the last 10 years, the growth of Jurupa has not slowed and is still contributing to the overall growth of the county.

Age Composition

To estimate the age profile of Jurupa Valley residents, census tract level data from the 2010 Census and 2019 ACS data was used. Between 2010 and 2019, the Jurupa Valley population experienced growth in all age groups, but overall, the City’s population is getting older. The “prime working” population, residents between the ages of 25 and 54 years, remains the largest age group in the City. The “school age” population, those between the ages of 5 and 17 years, makes up the next largest segment of the City’s residents. The

percentage of residents of all age categories stayed within a few percent of what it was the previous decade.

Table 5.2: Age Distribution – Percent of Total Population, 2010-2019

Age Group	2010		2019	
	City of Jurupa Valley ¹	Riverside County ²	City of Jurupa Valley	Riverside County
0 - 4 years	8.0%	7.4%	7.0%	6.3%
5 - 17 years	26.2%	24.3%	25.1%	18.5%
18 - 24 years	8.0%	7.1%	8.7%	9.5%
25 - 44 years	26.5%	26.3%	28.4%	27.0%
45 - 54 years	13.4%	13.4%	10.6%	12.3%
55 - 64 years	9.6%	9.8%	9.0%	11.6%
65+	8.3%	11.8%	11.2%	14.8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 (DP1).and ACS 2019

1 Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level

2 Riverside County: 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level

Ethnicity/Cultural Identity

In terms of ethnicity and cultural identity, most Jurupa Valley residents are Hispanic. As of 2010, 67% of Jurupa Valley residents were of Hispanic origin (*Table 5.3*), and during the next decade, the Hispanic/Latino community rapidly grew to become almost 74% of the City’s population. Between 2010 and 2019, the largest change in population was Asian/Pacific Island in Jurupa Valley where the population doubled in size, replacing the Black/African American population as the third largest ethnic group in the City. The percentage of total Black/African Americans decreased by half since 2010 in the City, shifting to the fourth largest population group in Jurupa. In comparison to the County ethnic demographics, the City saw change while the County remained basically the same with about a 5% drop in the Non-Hispanic White category and about a 5% increase to the Hispanic and Latino category.

Table 5.3: Racial and Ethnic Composition, 2010-2019

Ethnic Group	2010				2019			
	City of Jurupa Valley ¹		Riverside County ²		City of Jurupa Valley		Riverside County	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Non-Hispanic White	24,488	26.1%	869,068	39.7%	21,051	19.2%	836,932	33.9%
Black/African American	3,079	3.3%	130,823	6.0%	2,014	1.8%	151,215	6.1%
Hispanic or Latino	62,376	66.5%	995,257	45.4%	80,687	73.7%	1,236,032	50.0%
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	311	0.3%	10,931	0.5%	328	0.3%	10,320	0.4%
Asian/Pacific Island	2,286	2.4%	131,770	6.0%	4,619	4.2%	173,027	7.0%
Other	136	0.2%	3,682	0.2%	331	0.3%	6,562	0.3%
Two or more races	1,141	1.2%	48,110	2.2%	495	0.5%	56,458	2.3%
Total population	93,817	100%	2,189,641	100%	109,525	100%	2,470,546	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 and 2020 (DP05) ACS 2019

1 Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level

2 Riverside County: 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level

Employment Trends

Housing needs are influenced by employment trends. Significant employment opportunities within the City can lead to growth in demand for housing in proximity to jobs. The quality (including job security, and stability) and/or pay of available employment can determine the need for various housing types and prices.

Table 5.4: Employment by Industry, 2019

Industry	Jurupa Valley*		Riverside County	
	Employees	%	Employees	%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting, and Mining	299	0.6%	11,155	1.0%
Construction	6,047	13.1%	104,266	9.7%
Manufacturing	5,204	11.3%	96,142	8.9%
Wholesale Trade	2,356	5.1%	28,943	2.7%
Retail Trade	4,310	9.3%	129,331	12.0%
Transportation and Warehousing, and Utilities	4,648	10.1%	72,544	6.7%
Information	295	0.6%	13,500	1.3%
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental & Leasing	2,751	6.0%	53,776	5.0%
Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative, and Waste Management Svcs	4,817	10.4%	106,748	9.9%
Educational, Health and Social Services	8,482	18.4%	231,824	21.6%
Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Services	4,013	8.7%	112,373	10.5%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	1,827	4.0%	57,484	5.3%
Public Administration	1,136	2.5%	56,808	5.3%
Total	46,185	100%	1,074,894	100%

Data indicates the occupations held by Jurupa Valley/Riverside County residents; the location of the related workplace is not indicated by this data.

*Source: American Community Survey, 2019 (DP03)

As shown in *Table 5.4*, over 18.4% of Jurupa Valley’s residents are employed in educational, health, and social services industries.

About 13.1% 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. This data represents the jobs the American Community Survey Estimates that there are held by the residents of Jurupa Valley but there is no data to show that these percentages are reflective of the industries operating within the City of Jurupa Valley.

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), the unemployment rate in Jurupa Valley has steadily declined since 2010. In 2019, the City’s unemployment rate was recorded at 8.5% which decreased from the 10.5% in 2010. Despite the decreasing trend, this unemployment rate is still higher than the County’s unemployment rate of 5.8%.

Household Characteristics

This section describes Jurupa Valley’s household characteristics. The Census Bureau defines a household as all persons living in a single housing unit, whether or not they are related. One person living alone is considered a household, as is a group of unrelated people living in a single housing unit.

Household Growth

In 2015-2019, the American Community Survey reported 24,907 households in Jurupa Valley, an increase of less than 1% from 2010, as shown in *Table 5.5*. According to the Census, the number of households in Jurupa Valley is growing at a slower pace than both Riverside County and the State of California overall.

Table 5.5: Total Households and Household Growth, 2010-2019

Area	2010	2019	Percent Increase 2010-2019
Jurupa Valley ¹	24,787	24,907	0.48%
Riverside County ²	686,260	724,893	5.62%
California	12,577,498	13,157,873	4.61%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2010 (H16) and ACS 2015-2019 5 Year (DP02)

1 Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the block group level

2 Riverside County: 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level

Household Characteristics and Size

As shown in *Table 5.6*, the majority of households in Jurupa Valley in 2010 were family households (83%), at a higher proportion than the County as a whole (74%). About 44% of all households in the City were families with children and more than 32% of households had at least one elderly member (65+ years). About 7% of all households were made up of an elderly person living alone. In comparison to the state and the county, Jurupa Valley has a much higher number of large households (5+ persons per household) and it is reflected in the main needs of the community.

Table 5.6: Household Characteristics, Percent of Total

	City of Jurupa Valley	Riverside County	California
Household Type			
Families	82.8%	73.8%	68.2%
Families with Children	43.4%	31.7%	28.9%
Married Families with Children	31.1%	22.4%	20.6%
Male Headed Families with Children	3.4%	2.5%	2.4%
Female Headed Families with Children	8.9%	6.8%	5.9%
Non-Family Households	17.2%	26.2%	31.8%
Senior Living Alone	7.1%	10.5%	10.0%
Households with Elderly (65+ years)	31.9%	33.8%	30.8%
Household Size			
Large Households (5+)	48.7%	33.4%	28.7%
Large Households - Owners	31.8%	22.9%	16.2%
Large Households - Renters	16.9%	10.5%	12.4%

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2019 (DP02, S1101, S2501)

Tenure

Tenure refers to whether housing is rented or owned. Housing tenure is, in turn related to household income, composition (household size and relationships), and age of the householder. Communities need to have an adequate supply of units available both for rent and for sale to accommodate a range of households with varying incomes, family sizes, composition (individuals living together and their relationships to one another), and lifestyles. Approximately 62% of Jurupa Valley households owned their homes, and 38% of households rented their homes in 2019. As shown in *Table 5.7*, the homeownership rate in Jurupa Valley was only slightly lower than in Riverside County but noticeably higher than in the State of California as a whole.

Table 5.7: Occupied Units by Tenure, 2019

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Jurupa Valley	15,293	62.3%	9,254	37.7%	24,548	100%
Riverside County	493,150	67.1%	241,797	32.9%	734,948	100%
California	7,223,672	54.9%	5,934,200	45.1%	13,157,873	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census 2010 (H16 -SF1) ACS 2019

As shown in *Table 5.8* households of five or more persons made up the majority of households in 2019 with 49%, while the comparable figure for the County was only 33%. Larger renter-households (with five or more persons) had the greatest relative increase, while owner-occupied households with three to four persons had the greatest decrease. This trend may reflect that housing ownership has become increasingly unaffordable to larger households or that some people are rejoining families because of housing costs, thereby resulting in overcrowding.

Table 5.8: Household Size Distribution, 2019

Household Size	Total Households	% of Total Households	Renter-Households	% of Total Households	Owner-Households	% of Total Households
Jurupa Valley*						
1 Person	3,179	13.0%	1,453	5.9%	1,726	7.0%
2 Persons	4,510	18.4%	1,513	6.2%	2,997	12.2%
3-4 Persons	4,907	20.0%	2,154	8.8%	2,753	11.2%
5+ Persons	11,952	48.7%	4,143	16.9%	7,809	31.8%
Total	24,548	100%	9,263	37.7%	15,285	62.3%
Riverside County						
1 Person	150,187	20.4%	61,142	8.3%	89,045	12.1%
2 Persons	223,412	30.4%	59,036	8.0%	164,376	22.4%
3-4 Persons	116,160	15.8%	44,496	6.1%	71,664	9.8%
5+ Persons	245,189	33.4%	77,041	10.5%	168,148	22.9%
Total	734,948	100%	241,715	32.9%	493,233	67.1%
California						
1 Person	3,169,002	24.1%	1,743,267	13.2%	1,425,735	10.8%
2 Persons	4,036,952	30.7%	1,598,340	12.1%	2,438,612	18.5%
3-4 Persons	2,180,067	16.6%	963,641	7.3%	1,216,426	9.2%
5+ Persons	3,771,852	28.7%	1,633,883	12.4%	2,137,969	16.2%
Total	13,157,873	100%	5,939,131	45.1%	7,218,742	54.9%

Source: ACS 2019 (S2501)

*Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level

Household Income


Median incomes in Jurupa Valley varied considerably by tenure. During this time, the median incomes for owner-occupied households in the Jurupa Valley were consistently nearly double those of renter-occupied households. 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.

Table 5.9: Household Income by Tenure, 2019

	Owner-Households		Renter-Households		Total Households	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than \$5,000	182	1.2%	0	0.0%	182	0.7%
\$5,000 to \$9,999	84	0.5%	155	1.7%	239	1.0%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	368	2.4%	480	5.2%	848	3.5%
\$15,000 to \$19,999	126	0.8%	508	5.5%	634	2.6%
\$20,000 to \$24,999	312	2.0%	1,443	15.6%	1,755	7.1%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	534	3.5%	648	7.0%	1,182	4.8%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	1,542	10.1%	1,541	16.6%	3,083	12.6%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	2,580	16.9%	1,655	17.9%	4,235	17.3%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	2,333	15.3%	1,717	18.5%	4,050	16.5%
\$100,000 to \$149,000	3,664	24.0%	888	9.6%	4,552	18.5%
\$150,000 or more	3,560	23.3%	228	2.5%	3,788	15.4%
Total	15,285	100%	9,263	100%	24,548	100%

Source: American Community Survey, 2019 (S2503)

Percent of Total Households within Each Income Level, 2015 and 2019



Source: American Community Survey 2015 and 2019 (S2503)

The relatively high percentage of lower income persons residing in Jurupa Valley is one of several indicators showing a concentration of low-cost rental or sale housing in the City, particularly in several older neighborhoods in Mira Loma, Sunnyslope, Belltown, Glen Avon, and Rubidoux.

For purposes of the Housing Element, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has established five income groups based on Area Median Income (AMI):

- Extremely Low Income: up to 30% of AMI
- Very Low Income: 31% to 50% of AMI
- Low Income: 51% to 80% of AMI
- Moderate Income: 81% to 120% AMI
- Above Moderate Income: >120% AMI

County Median Income as published by HCD must be used to establish income groups for the purpose of the Housing Element.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) periodically receives “custom tabulations” of Census data from the Census Bureau that are largely not available through standard Census products. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2013-2017 ACS. This dataset, known as the “CHAS” data (Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy), provides insight on the extent of housing problems experienced by lower-income households.

According to the CHAS data presented in *Table 5.10*, approximately 17% of Jurupa Valley households can be considered extremely low or very low income (50% or less of the AMI) and an additional 14% can be classified as low income (51% to 80% AMI). The majority of the City’s households (69%), however, were within the moderate and above moderate-income category (greater than 100% AMI). By comparison, about 61% of Riverside County households were moderate or above moderate-income households, which is slightly lower than that of Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.10: Distribution by Income Group, Percent of Total Households

Jurisdiction	Total Households	Extremely Low Income (0-30% of AMI)	Very Low Income (31-50% of AMI)	Low Income (51-80% of AMI)	Moderate Income (80% - 100% of AMI)	Above Moderate Income (100%+ of AMI)
Jurupa Valley*	39,850	8.4%	8.8%	14.3%	9.0%	59.6%
Riverside County	711,725	11.3%	11.1%	16.4%	9.8%	51.4%
State of California	12,888,130	15.2%	12.5%	16.2%	9.6%	46.5%

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) Data, 2013-2017

*Jurupa Valley: 2013- 2017 CHAS data

Notes:

1 AMI = Area Median Income

2 Data presented in this table is based on special tabulations from sample Census data. The number of households in each category usually deviates from the 100% count due to the need to extrapolate sample data out to total households. Interpretations of this data should focus on the proportion of households rather than on precise numbers. Furthermore, because HUD programs do not cover households with incomes above 80% of the County AMI, CHAS data does not provide any breakdown of income groups above 80% AMI.

According to ACS data used for the HCD Data Viewer, the city is dominated in almost all tracts by Hispanic populations by less than a 10 percent gap to the next largest ethnic group and about 50 percent of the tracts by a predominate gap, concentrated in the northeast side of the City adjacent to Riverside. This area of the City largely consists of older homes located in closer proximity to industrial development. The ACS data also shows that there is one tract in Jurupa Valley that is white majority as the predominate population by less than a 10 percent cap. This tract also happens to be one of the few tracts that have a higher income than the surrounding tracts in comparison. This is important when looking at the Site Inventory because the ethnic majority can provide insight into the type of cultural habits and cohabitation habits seen through the City and can also provide insight into locations throughout the City that require a higher density of housing.

HUD categorizes any tract and block group with more than 51 percent of the population as Low Moderate Income to have a concentration of need. So while the breakdown of income for Jurupa Valley shows that about 60% of the total population is above moderate income, the ACS data by tract shows that majority of the City's tracts are populated with households that are Low Moderate Income. The concentration varies of LMI varies with 50% of the tracts in Jurupa Valley showing data of a population of 25%-50% of total population living in the Low Moderate Income categories. And another 25% of tracts showing that 50% to 75% of the population in those tracts living in the Low Moderate Income categories. The City also has two tracts that fall into the categories of having a Low Moderate Income concentrated population of 75% to 100% which are located adjacent to the Flabob Airport and the Mira Loma Industrial Overlay. These two areas are also considered disadvantaged communities per the City's Environmental Justice Element due to the proximity to industrial uses and the concentration of low-income residents. As part of the Site Inventory Analysis these tracts were reviewed for the viability for the addition of affordable housing and a few sites located in these two tracts were included as potential sites for development. The City recognizes that the majority of the potential sites are located outside of these tracts and dispersed evenly through the community to prevent any segregation of income from happen.

Special Needs Groups

Certain households, because of their special characteristics and needs, may require special accommodations and may have difficulty finding housing due to special needs. Special needs groups include seniors, persons with disabilities, families with children, single-parent households, large households, homeless persons and

persons at-risk of homelessness, farm workers, and persons with HIV/AIDS.

These special needs groups are all addressed as part of the Housing Element programs to provide the needed additional attention for housing needs as specified by State Law. The City continues to evaluate the programs for providing access to housing for all of its current and future residents.

Seniors

Seniors (persons aged 65 and above) are gradually becoming a more substantial segment of the City’s population in Jurupa Valley, with an increase of 3% increase since 2010 from 8.3% of the overall population to 11.2%. Elderly persons are vulnerable to housing problems due to limited income, prevalence of physical or mental disabilities, limited mobility, and high health care costs. The elderly, particularly those with disabilities, may face increased difficulty in finding housing accommodations. A senior on a fixed income can face great difficulty finding safe and affordable housing. Subsidized housing and federal housing assistance programs are increasingly challenging to secure and often involve long waiting lists.



Figure 5-2: Senior housing, Country Village Apartments, Jurupa Valley

According to the 2019 ACS 1 Year Estimates, about 11% of all residents in Jurupa Valley were aged 65 or older, 31% of the City’s households included at least one elderly member and 18% of households were headed by a senior resident. Between 2009 and 2013, a little over 16% of all seniors in Jurupa Valley were living in poverty. The 2009-2013 ACS also estimated that about 16% of Jurupa Valley’s elderly population had at least one disability and 25% had two or more disabilities, as shown in *Table 5.11*. This is comparable to the elderly population in the county (16%) and the state (15%) with one disability; and similar to the elderly population in the county (20%) and the state (22%) that report two or more disabilities. By the 2019 the population of elderly persons decreased in comparison to the entire population of the City of Jurupa Valley, but the total number of elderly persons and those who had disabilities increased by about 1,000 persons.

Table 5.11: Elderly with Disabilities Limiting Independent Living in Jurupa Valley, 2009-2013 and 2019

Disability Status	2009-2013 ^{1,2}		2019	
	Total ³	% of People 65+	Total ⁴	% of People 65+
With one type of disability	1,218	16.0%	1,467	12.5%
With two or more types of disability	1,894	24.9%	2,802	23.8%
Total with a disability	3,112	40.9%	4,269	36.3%

Source: ACS 2009-2013 and ACS 2019 (C18108)

- 1 Jurupa Valley: 2009-2013 ACS data aggregated at the census tract level
- 2 Estimated data from 2009-2013 ACS for illustrative purposes only
- 3 ACS 2009-2013, 65+ year olds: 7,593
- 4 ACS 2019: 65+ year olds: 11,774

Generally, the median income for a senior household was about one-third of that for an average household. Data from the County’s 2013-2017 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) supports the information presented below. According to CHAS, in Jurupa Valley, 69% of elderly renter-occupied households and 31% of elderly owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden (i.e., total housing costs exceeded 30% of total income). Similarly, in the County, 65% of elderly-renter-occupied households and 35% of elderly-owner-occupied households suffered from housing cost burden. Furthermore, the majority of elderly-headed households in both Jurupa Valley and Riverside County were homeowners. Many may need financial assistance in making necessary repairs or accessibility improvements.

Table 5.12: Householders by Tenure and Age

Householder Age	2010*				2019			
	Owner-Occupied	%	Renter-Occupied	%	Owner-Occupied	%	Renter-Occupied	%
15-24 years	189	1.2%	462	5.6%	23	0.2%	354	3.8%
25-34 years	1,489	9.1%	1,835	22.3%	1,390	9.1%	1,947	21.0%
35-64 years	11,743	72.1%	4,498	54.6%	10,411	68.1%	5,430	58.6%
65-74 years	1,757	10.8%	799	9.7%	2,358	15.4%	833	9.0%
75 plus years	1,115	6.8%	639	7.8%	1,102	7.2%	699	7.5%
Total	16,293	100%	8,233	100%	15,285	100%	9,263	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census 2010 (QT-H2) and ACS 2019 (B25007)

*Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

Persons with Disabilities

Federal laws define a person with a disability as “any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities; has a record of such impairment; or is regarded as having such impairment.” In general, a physical or mental impairment includes hearing, mobility and visual impairments, chronic alcoholism, chronic mental illness, AIDS, AIDS Related Complex, and mental retardation that substantially limit one or more major life activities. Major life activities include walking, talking, hearing, seeing, breathing, learning, performing manual tasks, and caring for oneself.

The U.S. Census Bureau classifies disabilities into the following categories:

- **Hearing difficulty:** Deaf or having serious difficulty hearing
- **Vision difficulty:** Blind or having serious difficulty seeing, even when wearing glasses
- **Cognitive difficulty:** Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty remembering, concentrating, or making decisions



Figure 5-3: Dwelling with universal access design

- **Ambulatory difficulty:** Having serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs
- **Self-care difficulty:** Having difficulty bathing or dressing
- **Independent living difficulty:** Because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem, having difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor’s office or shopping

According to the 2019 ACS, approximately 10% of the Jurupa Valley population had one or more disabilities. Of the disabilities tallied during that time, as shown in *Table 5.13*, ambulatory and cognitive disabilities were the most prevalent. The City’s elderly population, in particular, seemed to be the most affected by disabilities, with about 41% of Jurupa Valley seniors affected by at least one disability.

Table 5.13: Disability Characteristics, Percent of Total Population, 2019

Disability by Age and Type	5 to 17 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over	Total
Total Persons with a Disability	4.6%	9.9%	41.0%	10.1%
Disability Type				
Hearing Difficulty	1.1%	1.5%	19.8%	3.3%
Vision Difficulty	1.2%	2.4%	7.9%	2.6%
Cognitive Difficulty	4.8%	2.6%	9.1%	4.0%
Ambulatory Difficulty	0.0%	3.9%	26.9%	5.5%
Self-Care Difficulty	2.1%	1.5%	6.4%	2.35
Independent Living Difficulty*	--	3.5%	20.8%	6.25

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2019 (S1810)

*Tallied only for persons 18 years and over and percent represents all disabilities tallied, not percent of all disabled persons. A person can have multiple disabilities.

The City’s homeless population also appeared to be disproportionately affected by disabilities and health issues. The County of Riverside’s 2020 Point-In-Time Homeless Report found that 25% of Jurupa Valley’s homeless population had a physical disability, 14% reported a mental illness, 30% had a substance abuse disorder, and 20% reported a chronic health condition. Among those persons who are experiencing homelessness, dual diagnoses have been noted as a problem, i.e., cognitive difficulty connected to chemical dependency/addiction.

In 2019, the American Community Survey estimates 41% of all persons aged 65 and over have a disability. Over the last two decades there has been a steady increase of those aging into the 65 years and older demographic. Because seniors have a much higher probability of being disabled, the housing and service needs for persons with disabilities should grow considerably, commensurate with senior population growth. Special housing needs for persons with disabilities fall into two general categories: physical design to address mobility impairments; and in-home social, educational, and medical support to address developmental and mental impairments.

Persons with Developmental Disabilities

As defined by state law, “developmental disability” means a severe, chronic disability of an individual who:

- Is attributable to a mental or physical impairment or combination of mental and physical impairments;
- Is manifested before the individual attains age 18;
- Is likely to continue indefinitely;
- Results in substantial functional limitations in three or more of the following areas of major life activity: a) self-care; b) receptive and expressive language; c) learning; d) mobility; e) self-direction; f) capacity for independent living; or g) economic self-sufficiency; and
- Reflects the individual’s need for a combination and sequence of special, interdisciplinary, or generic services, individualized supports, or other forms of assistance that are of lifelong or extended duration and are individually planned and coordinated.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the U.S. Administration on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.5%. This equates to approximately 1,643 persons in the City of Jurupa Valley, based on the 2019 ACS population Estimate of 109,525.

The Inland Regional Center is a community-based, private nonprofit corporation funded by the State of California to serve people with developmental disabilities, as required by the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (aka Lanterman Act). The Lanterman Act is part of California law that sets out the rights and responsibilities of persons with developmental disabilities. The Inland Regional Center is one of 21 regional centers throughout California and serves individuals and their families who reside within Riverside County. The Regional Center provides diagnoses and assessments of eligibility, and helps plan, access, coordinate, and monitor the services and supports that are needed because of a developmental disability. As of April 2021, the Regional Center had over 39,800 clients living Inland Empire living in a variety of different assisted situations, at home, in care facilities and living independently with the help of the service provided.

Families with Children and Single-Parent Households

According to the 2019 American Community Survey Estimates, approximately 43.4% of all households in Jurupa Valley have children under the age of 18, as shown in *Table 5.6* (page [5-16](#)). Single-parent households often require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing, as

well as accessible daycare, health care, and other supportive services. Due to their generally lower income and higher living expenses such as daycare, single-parent households have limited opportunities for finding affordable, decent, and safe housing.

In 2019, approximately 2,327 single-parent households resided within Jurupa Valley, representing 11% of the City's households. An estimated 2,067 households of the 2,327 single-parent households with children under age 18 are headed by females. Of particular concern are single-parent households with lower incomes.

Housing element law requires analysis of specialized housing needs, including female-headed households, to ensure adequate childcare or job training services. In Jurupa Valley, 14.6 % are female headed (compared to 14.3% in the SCAG region), 6.1% are female headed with children (compared to 6.6 % in the SCAG region), and 0.8% are female headed with children under 6 (compared to 1.0 % in the SCAG region).

Female-headed households with limited incomes have trouble finding adequate, affordable housing. It is estimated that 895 female-headed households in the City have incomes below the federally recognized poverty level. Of the 895 female-headed households in poverty, 647 are estimated to have children at home.

Large Households

Large households are defined as those with five or more members. These households are usually families with two or more children or families with extended family members such as in-laws or grandparents. It can also include multiple families living in one housing unit to save on housing costs. Large households are a special needs group because the availability of adequately sized, affordable housing units is often limited. To save for necessities such as food, clothing, and medical care, lower- and moderate-income large households may reside in smaller units, resulting in overcrowding. With the recent COVID-19 pandemic, these households are likely working with even smaller budgets when caring for their families.

As indicated in *Table 5.6* (page 5-16), in 2019, 48.7% of all households in Jurupa Valley had five or more members, which is high in comparison to the 33.4% of the County. Generally, areas with higher proportions of large households also tend to have a high proportion of intergenerational families, non-White populations, and have higher rates of overcrowding and higher cost burden. Cultural differences can also contribute to overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger households or more open attitudes about intergenerational living, shared costs, and living arrangements, even in small housing units. In addition, recently



Figure 5-4: Large families and multi-generational households

arrived immigrants may stay with relatives on a temporary basis until they are established.

Table 5.14: Large Households (5 persons or more) by Tenure, 2019

Number of Persons in Unit	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Total
Total large households	5,362	2,706	11,952
Total households	16,293	8,233	24,548
Percent of total households	32.9%	32.9%	48.7%

Source: ACS 2019

Extremely Low-Income Households

As previously identified, extremely low-income (ELI) households are those making 30% (or less) of the AMI. In 2019, approximately 2,062 extremely low-income (ELI) households resided in the City, representing 8.4% of the total households and compared with 11.3% for the County of Riverside. Most extremely low-income households are renters and experience a high incidence of housing problems, such as overpayment (defined as cost burden greater than 30% of income), overcrowding and substandard housing.

As shown in Table 5.15 below, HUD CHAS data, based on the 2014-2018 ACS, estimates there are 2,250 ELI households in Jurupa Valley. ELI households are more likely to experience housing problems such as overcrowding and cost burden. Over 90% of ELI renters and 77% of ELI owners experience one or more housing problems. Lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities is not as common among ELI households compared to overcrowding or cost burden. ELI owner-occupied households are cost burdened at a higher rate (65.6%) than ELI renter-occupied households (62.1%). However, there is a higher rate of incomplete facilities and overcrowding among ELI renters compared to owners.

Table 5.15: Extremely Low Income (ELI) Households

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
With one or more housing problem*	615	76.9%	1,310	90.3%	1,925	85.6%
Lacking complete plumbing/kitchen facilities	4	0.5%	50	3.4%	54	2.4%
Overcrowded (>1 person per room)	85	10.6%	360	24.8%	445	19.8%
Severely overcrowded (>1.5 persons per room)	30	3.8%	145	10.0%	175	7.8%
Cost burdened (>30%)	525	65.6%	900	62.1%	1,425	63.3%
Severely cost burdened (>50%)	495	61.9%	805	55.5%	1,300	57.8%
Total Households	800	100.0%	1,450	100.0%	2,250	100.0%

*Totals are not mutually exclusive as housing can have multiple problems
Source: HUD CHAS Data (based on 2014-2018 ACS), 2021.

The concentration of those living under the poverty line in Jurupa Valley is concentrated in 5 tracts. Of these tracts, one of them has a concentration of 30% to 40% of the total population in that tract living under the poverty line. This tract is located near the Flabob Airport and is one of the older neighborhoods in the City. This area and the neighboring tracts are considered as an area with a need of

additional housing and was analyzed in the Site Inventory with the other guidelines like access to amenities, transportation, and other criterion. The City also continues to work with the local housing authority and the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County (FHCRC) to assist those who need the resources and access to housing assistance.

Homeless Persons

On January 4, 2012, final regulations went into effect to implement changes to the HUD definition of homelessness contained in the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act. The definition affects who is eligible for various HUD-funded homeless assistance programs. The new definition includes four broad categories of homelessness:

- People who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, in emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or who are exiting an institution where they temporarily resided.
- People who are losing their primary nighttime residence, which may include a motel or hotel or a doubled-up situation, within 14 days and lack resources or support networks to remain in housing.
- Families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and likely to continue in that state.
- People who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, have no other residence, and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.

This definition demonstrates the diversity of people experiencing homelessness. The numerous locations in which people experiencing homelessness can be found complicate efforts to accurately estimate their total population. For example, an individual living with friends on a temporary basis could be experiencing homelessness but would be unlikely to be identified in a homeless count.

The most recent point-in-time count conducted in 2020 identified 103 unsheltered homeless individuals in the City of Jurupa Valley. This figure has fluctuated in the past 4 years and the number of sheltered persons to unsheltered persons has minimal data. The 2020 homeless population in Jurupa Valley made up about 4.8% of the total unsheltered homeless population for Riverside County, as shown in *Table 5.16*. The point-in-time count is a snapshot of how many homeless people are on streets and in emergency and transitional shelters on any given day in Riverside County and Jurupa Valley, although numbers can vary significantly by season.



Figure 5-5: Jurupa Valley homeless camp

Table 5.16: Homeless Population in Jurupa Valley and Riverside County, 2017-2020

	Unsheltered	Sheltered	Total Homeless Population
Jurupa Valley			
2017	129	n/a	129
2018	148	46	194
2019	139	n/a	139
2020	103	n/a	103
Riverside County			
2017	1,638	768	2,406
2018	1,685	631	2,316
2019	2,045	766	2,811
2020	2,155	729	2,884

Source: 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 Riverside County Homeless Point-In-Time Count Report.

Farm Workers

As traditionally defined, farm workers are persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Permanent farm workers tend to work in fields or processing plants. During harvest periods when workloads increase, the need to supplement the permanent labor force is satisfied with seasonal workers. Often these seasonal workers are migrant workers, defined by the inability to return to their primary residence at the end of the workday. The agricultural workforce in Riverside County does many jobs, including weeding, thinning, planting, pruning, irrigation, tractor work, pesticide applications, harvesting, transportation to the cold storage or market, and a variety of jobs at packing and processing facilities, as described in *Table 5.17*.

Table 5.17: Farm Worker Employment Profile, Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area

Occupation Title	Employment	Location Quotient*	Mean Hourly Wage	Annual Mean Wage
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations	7,610	1.48	\$15.14	\$31,480
First-Line Supervisors of Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Workers	220	0.92	\$25.82	\$53,710
Agricultural Inspectors	250	1.73	\$19.37	\$40,290
Graders and Sorters, Agricultural Products	70	0.23	\$14.69	\$30,550
Farmworkers and Laborers, Crop, Nursery, and Greenhouse	6,370	2.02	\$14.43	\$30,020
Farmworkers, Farm, Ranch and Aquacultural Animals	140	0.35	\$18.94	\$39,400

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. May 2020 Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Area Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates

**"Location Quotient" is the ratio of the area concentration of occupational employment to the national average concentration

Jurupa Valley was once primarily a farming area, with dairies, orchards, row crops, and small farms. With urbanization, most agricultural uses have moved out of the City and therefore, agricultural employment within the City of Jurupa Valley is declining. According to SCAG data, only about one-tenth of 1% of the City's civilian workforce (or 743 persons) works in agriculture and related occupations. It follows that few farm workers live and work in the City. While only small, isolated pockets of commercial agricultural remain in the City, cities must also consider housing needs for farmworkers employed in outlying County areas. In Riverside

County, there are a few farm worker housing developments that currently operate at capacity during harvest seasons.

Farm worker households tend to have high rates of poverty, live disproportionately in housing that is in the poorest condition, have very high rates of overcrowding, have low homeownership rates, and are predominantly members of minority groups. Some immigrant farm workers may have an inherent fear and mistrust of law enforcement and other government authorities based on their experience or perception of the government in their country of origin or on the rumors and experiences of other farm workers. These farm workers may be reluctant to report fair housing issues or violations or contact any government official for assistance. Furthermore, most federally funded housing programs, including the Housing Choice Voucher program and other subsidy programs, exclude persons who are undocumented. This means that people who are sometimes most in need are unable to obtain housing assistance, and others are unable to find any housing and instead must resort to homeless shelters, to sleeping in their vehicles, or to homeless encampments.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the average annual full-time wage for farm workers and laborers in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA in May 2020 was \$31,480. Within farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, first-line supervisors and agricultural inspectors earned the highest wages. *Table 5.17* above presents the location quotient for farming, fishing, and forestry occupations. The location quotient is the ratio of the area concentration of occupational employment to the national average concentration. A location quotient greater than one indicates the occupation has a higher share of employment than average, and a location quotient less than one indicates the occupation is less prevalent in the area than average. The location quotient for agricultural employment in Jurupa Valley shows there is a moderate to high concentration of all types of agricultural occupation in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario MSA.

According to SCAG Pre-Certified Local Housing Data, 743 persons living in Jurupa Valley worked in Farming with 486 of them having full-time jobs in this industry compared to the total farm workers in the SCAG region. That is less than 1% of the total full-time workers living in the City. The data shows that the agricultural industry is slowing in Jurupa Valley as less land is farmed. Similarly, only 801 persons are employed in the farming industry by businesses located within Jurupa Valley; 577 of which are full-time year-round jobs. While the City is not a center for regional farming, agriculture is essential to the regional economy and food supply within distribution.

The different special needs groups are identified again with the associated aids and programs within the City of Jurupa in the following resource section.

Housing Growth

Historically, housing growth in Jurupa Valley lagged behind the County and other neighboring jurisdictions, but experienced growth similar to the state as a whole. Between 2000 and 2010, Jurupa Valley’s housing stock increased at a significantly slower rate than the County’s and other nearby cities. However, housing growth in the region was severely impacted by the recent recession and, since 2010, the City’s housing stock has grown at rates lower rate than the County and the state average.

Table 5.18: Housing Unit Growth Jurupa Valley and Nearby Jurisdictions

City/County ^{1,2}	Number of Units 2000	Number of Units 2010	Number Units 2019	Percent Change 2000-2010	Percent Change 2010-2019
Jurupa Valley	23,429	26,176	26,680	12.5%	1.9%
Moreno Valley	41,431	55,559	55,784	34.1%	0.4%
Perris	10,553	17,906	18,906	69.7%	5.5%
Hemet	29,401	35,305	35,522	20.1%	0.6%
Riverside County	584,674	800,707	857,222	36.9%	7.1%
California	12,214,549	13,680,081	14,367,012	12.0%	5.0%

Sources: Bureau of the Census 2000 (H001) and 2010 (QT-H1), ACS 2015-2019 5 Year Estimates (DP04).

1 Jurupa Valley: 2000 Census data aggregated at the block group level and 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract level.

2 Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet and Riverside County, State of California: 2000 and 2010 Census data aggregated at the city, county or state

Composition of Housing Stock

The composition of the City’s housing stock, specifically regarding its available housing inventory by unit type, has remained fairly stable since 2000, which is to be expected given the City’s limited housing growth during this time. The California Department of Finance, which records building permit data submitted by local jurisdictions, estimates that single-family detached and attached units comprise the majority of the City’s housing stock (81%), while multi-family units make up about 13% of the housing stock and about 6% in mobile homes (*Table 5.19*). Countywide, in 2019, 69% of housing units were single-family detached units compared to 57% in the state. In Riverside County, multi-family units represented about 17% of the housing stock in 2019; compared to 31% in the state. Dwelling unit size and type significantly affect housing cost, density, and character. In general, smaller, single-family housing and multi-family housing allow more cost-efficient construction and tend to be more affordable for lower income households. The current data presented shows that the number of affordable units based on size is inadequate at both the City and County levels.

As shown in *Table 5.19*, owner-occupied housing units were predominantly single-family detached, comprising 90% of all owner-occupied units. The majority of renter-occupied units were also single-family detached housing units (55%).

Table 5.19: Unit Type by Tenure, 2019

	Owner-Occupied		Renter- Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	% of Total Owner-Occupied	Units	% of Total Renter-Occupied	Units	% of Total Occupied Units
Single-family, detached	13,801	90.3%	5,101	55.1%	19,927	77.5%
Single-family, attached	368	2.4%	401	4.3%	769	3.0%
Multi-family (2-4 units)	22	0.1%	595	6.4%	617	2.4%
Multi-family (5+ units)	0	0.0%	3,138	33.9%	2,722	10.6%
Mobile homes	1,067	7.0%	444	4.8%	1,643	6.4%
Other (boats, RV)	27	0.2%	0	0.0%	27	0.1%
Total	15,285	100%	9,263	100%	25,705	100%

Source: American Community Survey 2019, (DP04)

As previously identified and shown in *Table 5.14* (page 5-26), Jurupa Valley has a significant number of large households (i.e., households with five or more persons). According to the ACS 2019, approximately 49% (*Table 5.14*) of all Jurupa Valley households are classified as large households, compared with about 33% in the County and 29% in the state. In 2019, about 35% of renter-occupied units were two-bedroom units, and about 32% were three-bedroom units, as shown in *Table 5.20*. Over 36% of owner-occupied units had three bedrooms and 40% had four bedrooms. Generally, housing units with three or more bedrooms are the most suited for large households, indicating that adequately sized rental units may be in limited supply in Jurupa Valley.

Table 5.20: Unit Size by Tenure, 2019

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	%* of Total Owner-Occupied	Units	%* of Total Renter-Occupied	Units	%* of Total Occupied Units
Studio/1 bedroom	230	1.5%	1,479	16.0%	1,709	7.0%
2 bedrooms	1,861	12.2%	3,266	35.3%	5,127	20.9%
3 bedrooms	5,609	36.7%	2,955	31.9%	8,564	34.9%
4 bedrooms	6,055	39.6%	1,287	13.9%	7,342	29.9%
5 or more bedrooms	1,530	10.0%	276	3.0%	1,806	7.4%
Total	15,285	100%	9,263	100%	24,548	100%

Source: American Community Survey, 2019 (DP04)

*Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding

Vacancy Rates

A certain number of vacant units are needed in the housing market to moderate the cost of housing and allow sufficient housing choice. Vacancy rates are generally higher among rental properties, as rental units have greater attrition than owner-occupied units do. A healthy vacancy rate (one that permits sufficient choice and mobility among a variety of housing units) is considered to be 2% to 3% for ownership units and 5% to 6% for rental units. In 2010, the vacancy rate in Jurupa Valley was 6.3%, as shown in *Table 5.21*. By 2019, the overall vacancy rate for the City was determined to be 4.3%. This overall rate, however, includes housing units that were vacant due to foreclosures, seasonal occupancy, or other reasons. The actual vacancy rate (actual number of unoccupied dwelling units at any given time) for the City is likely to be higher than the listed rate, because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the loss of housing due to the associated effects of the economic crash during 2020. According to the 2019 ACS, only about 21% of the City’s 1,114 vacant units were actually available for rent or sale, which reflects a relatively high number of seasonably occupied and possibly abandoned units.

Table 5.21: Household Occupancy Status, 2010-2019

Occupancy Status	2010	Percent of Total Housing Units	2019	Percent of Total Housing Units
Occupied Housing Units	24,526	93.7%	24,907	95.7%
Vacant Housing Units	1,650	6.3%	1,114	4.3%
For Sale	561	2.3%	165	0.6%
For Rent	409	1.6%	66	0.3%
Total Housing Units	26,176	100%	26,021	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census 2010, (QT-H1); ACS 2019 5-Year Estimates (DP04)

Jurupa Valley: 2010 Census data aggregated at the census tract.

Riverside County: 2010 Census data aggregated at the County level.

Housing Conditions

Age of Housing Stock

The age of a housing unit is often an indicator of housing conditions. In general, housing that is 30 years or older may exhibit a need for repairs based on the useful life of materials. Housing more than 50 years old is considered aged and is more likely to exhibit a need for major repairs.

Jurupa Valley’s housing stock is older. Approximately 42% of the owner-occupied units in the City were built before 1980, and 18% were built before 1960. Of the City’s renter-occupied units, 47% were built before 1980, and 21% were built before 1960. *Table 5.22* summarizes the age of the City’s housing stock by tenure. Based on housing age alone, a significant portion of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock could require rehabilitation in the upcoming decade.

Table 5.22: Tenure by Age of Housing Stock (Occupied Units)

Year Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter- Occupied		Total Occupied Housing Units	
	Units	%* of Total Owner-Occupied	Units	%* of Total Renter-Occupied	Units	%* of Total Occupied Units
2010 or later	2,292	15.0%	768	8.8%	3060	12.8%
2000 - 2009	1,425	9.3%	2,216	25.5%	3641	15.2%
1990 - 1999	1,798	11.8%	932	10.7%	2730	11.4%
1980 - 1989	3,273	21.4%	1,295	14.9%	4,568	19.0%
1970 - 1979	2,493	16.3%	1,050	12.1%	3,543	14.8%
1960 - 1969	1,255	8.2%	1,168	13.4%	2,423	10.1%
1950 - 1959	1,804	11.8%	712	8.2%	2,516	10.5%
1940 - 1949	659	4.3%	911	10.5%	1,570	6.5%
1939 or earlier	286	1.9%	211	2.4%	497	2.1%
Total	15,285	100	8,696	100%	23,981	100%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2019 (B25036)

*Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding

The data are from the American Community Survey and therefore, is based on a sample of units and extrapolated to represent the entire housing stock. This table is intended only to provide a general picture of age and tenure of the housing stock.

The City of Jurupa Valley does not maintain a list of housing in need of repair or replacement. However, Planning and Code Enforcement staff estimate that approximately 10% of all the housing built prior to 1980 will need some level of rehabilitation during the 2021-2029 planning period, and 1% will need replacement. For owner-occupied housing, this equates to 650 potential homes in need of rehabilitation and 65 homes in need of replacement. For renter-occupied housing, the numbers are 405 potential homes in need of rehabilitation and 41 homes in need of replacement.

Housing Conditions

Housing condition refers to the ability of various systems in a house to meet adopted building codes for health and safety, including plumbing, heating, electrical, and structural systems. Housing conditions are considered substandard when one or more systems are found to be below the minimum standards required by Section 1001 of the Uniform Housing Code. Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents' health and safety that substandard housing poses.

In addition to structural deficiencies and standards, the lack of infrastructure and utilities often serves as an indicator for substandard conditions. According to the 2019 ACS, 82 occupied units in Jurupa Valley (0.3% of all units) lacked complete plumbing facilities and 234 units lacked complete kitchen facilities (0.9% of all units), as shown in *Table 5.23*. This may be due to the fact that in Jurupa Valley, "substandard" dwellings such as tack rooms, storage or other outbuildings are often used illegally as guest quarters or as separate dwelling units. Under the City's Zoning Code, guest

quarters are not permitted to have kitchens. However, with the adoption of the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance (ADU), the City is seeing more permit applications for the legalization of these substandard dwelling units that are often cited by Code Enforcement. Currently, Code Enforcement is dealing with 387 permits that involve substandard dwellings.

One possible reason for the common use of substandard dwellings in the City is the relatively high number of lower income/large households and overcrowding in some residential areas. It should be noted that there might be some overlap in the number of substandard housing units, as some units may lack both complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. Similar to the county and the state, housing units lacking appropriate infrastructure and utilities comprise a very small proportion of the City’s housing stock.

Table 5.23: Number of Dwellings Lacking Plumbing or Complete Kitchen Facilities, 2019

Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	Total	% of Total Housing Units
Jurupa Valley¹				
Lacking plumbing facilities	32	36	82	0.3%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	42	179	234	0.9%
Riverside County²				
Lacking plumbing facilities	1,621	1,341	2,347	0.4%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	1,883	4,390	5,435	0.9%
California³				
Lacking plumbing facilities	20,916	43,006	56,547	0.5%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	26,676	124,714	149,260	1.2%

Source: American Community Survey, 2019 5 Year Estimates (B25049, DP04).

1 Jurupa Valley: Housing Units: 24,907

2 Riverside County Housing Units: 724,893

3 California Housing Units: 13,044,266

Neighborhood Improvements and Removal of Blight

Jurupa Valley includes nine distinct communities with varied settings, housing types, and housing needs. Some neighborhoods in the older communities of Rubidoux, Mira Loma, Belltown, and Glen Avon consist mostly of pre-1980s houses, many with deferred maintenance and code compliance issues; a lack of storm water drainage and other public improvements; and localized blighted areas caused by accumulated trash, illegal dumping, and graffiti. These conditions can discourage reinvestment in these areas, lower property values, and detract from neighborhoods’ safety and appearance. It is a primary goal of this young city to reverse urban blight and improve residential neighborhood quality and pride through code enforcement, public and private capital investment, and heightened awareness and attention to community needs. The City has worked since the last housing element to provide grants to aid homeowners with neighborhood and housing improvements. These grants were obtained through the LEAP grants from HCD and

offered to the community in two waves of grants. These grants will be part of the 2021-2029 Housing Element's effort to continue neighborhood improvements.

The City has tracked these grants and advertised them on the City website, City Hall bulletins and on social media. However, grants are limited and with the new housing element the City expects to continue to offer these grants to qualifying properties. These grants are meant for rehabilitation and updates as required as needed. These grants however do not cover the neighborhood infrastructure improvements and the City has a program to prioritize the lacking infrastructure in neighborhoods that need it the most to minimize blight and allow for both neighborhood pride and better connectivity/accessibility throughout the community.

Code Enforcement Activities

The City of Jurupa Valley has established a Code Enforcement program to ensure a high quality of life throughout the communities and maintain property values. Code compliance in the City is a responsive program under which property inspections are done only when inspection requests and complaints are received. Such a system may result in under-reporting of code compliance issues, particularly regarding the rental housing stock. Often, tenants fear retaliation from the landlords and are therefore less willing to report an issue. Legal residency issues or language barriers may be another obstacle for reporting code compliance issues. According to the Code Enforcement staff, in January 2021 Jurupa Valley had 387 active code enforcement cases dealing with housing conditions and/or safety issues, and the City has closed 4,346 such cases since the 2017 Housing Element. The City has some cases that have been open since 2012 and still being worked on, provided that in the past 4 years the City has made significant improvements and growth since incorporation. An estimated 234 parcels are currently considered substandard which makes up less than 0.1% of the City. These properties have been recorded as needing code compliance according to ACS data from 2019. And while this number is smaller than that recorded by Code Enforcement it is likely that the City has more substandard homes than recorded since the only cases that are documented are the ones filed through a complaint or through self-report. The City will continue to try and address the needs of community through the program for the rehabilitation programs.

Housing Costs and Affordability

Home Prices and Rents

Realtor.com® was used to provide housing market data for Jurupa Valley. This information is sourced daily from listings and property data on the realtor.com website, which includes an up-to-date and

accurate aggregation of real estate listings from approximately 800 regional listings from Multiple Listing Service (MLS). According to realtor.com, in March 2021, the average home listing price in Jurupa Valley was \$499,078. The average selling price for homes in the City was slightly lower than that. This amounts to about \$360 per square foot on average and, according to ACS 2019, there are only 165 homes on the market available for purchase currently.

Information on current rental rates in the City was obtained through a review of advertisements on Craigslist during January 2021. Available rental housing ranged from single-room studios to multi-bedroom single family units. Most of the available units in the City were two-bedroom, and three-bedroom units, based on listings advertised. *Table 5.24* summarizes average rents by unit size. Overall, the units of varying sizes were listed as available for rent in January 2021 with an average rent of \$1,902.

Table 5.24: Average Rent by Unit Size

Studio	1-Bedroom	2-Bedroom	3-Bedroom	4+ Bedroom
\$1,145	\$1,216	\$1,649	\$2,500	\$3,000

Source: www.craigslist.org, accessed January 20, 2021

Affordability Gap Analysis

To determine overall housing affordability, the costs of homeownership and renting are compared to a household's ability to pay these costs. Housing affordability is defined as spending no more than 30% to 35% of gross household income (depending on tenure and income level) on housing expenses. *Table 5.25* summarizes affordable rents and purchase prices by income category based on the 2020 HCD median income of \$75,300 for Riverside County. General cost assumptions for utilities, taxes, and property insurance are shown. Affordable purchase price assumes a 4% interest rate with a 30-year fixed rate mortgage loan and a 10% down payment.

Given the need for a down payment and the high costs of homeownership, lower income households lacking sufficient savings or transferable equity must usually occupy rental housing. The affordability problem also persists in the rental market. The situation is exacerbated for large households and seniors with lower and moderate incomes given the limited supply of large units. The cost burden for these groups is increased with the COVID-19 pandemic, and from the community survey, these special needs groups are also the ones that the community believes need the most help in finding affordable and available housing.

Table 5.25: Housing Affordability Matrix, Riverside County, 2020

Income	Annual Income	Affordable Monthly Housing Costs	Utilities (per month)	Taxes and Insurance (per month)	Maximum Affordable Price	
					per month	per year
Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)						
1-Person	\$15,850	\$396	\$205	\$139	\$191	\$13,823
2-Person	\$18,100	\$453	\$218	\$158	\$235	\$20,092
3-Person	\$21,720	\$543	\$246	\$190	\$297	\$28,186
4 Person	\$26,200	\$655	\$274	\$229	\$381	\$39,993
5 Person	\$30,680	\$767	\$305	\$268	\$462	\$50,980
Very Low Income (30-50% AMI)						
1-Person	\$26,400	\$660	\$205	\$231	\$455	\$59,005
2-Person	\$30,150	\$754	\$218	\$264	\$536	\$71,697
3-Person	\$33,900	\$848	\$246	\$297	\$602	\$80,348
4 Person	\$37,650	\$941	\$274	\$329	\$667	\$89,028
5 Person	\$40,700	\$1,018	\$305	\$356	\$712	\$93,891
Low Income (50-80% AMI)						
1-Person	\$42,200	\$1,055	\$205	\$369	\$850	\$126,669
2-Person	\$48,200	\$1,205	\$218	\$422	\$987	\$148,997
3-Person	\$54,250	\$1,356	\$246	\$475	\$1,110	\$167,499
4 Person	\$60,250	\$1,506	\$274	\$527	\$1,232	\$185,815
5 Person	\$65,100	\$1,628	\$305	\$570	\$1,322	\$198,386
Median Income (80-100% AMI)						
1-Person	\$52,700	\$1,318	\$205	\$461	\$1,112	\$171,637
2-Person	\$60,250	\$1,506	\$218	\$527	\$1,288	\$200,603
3-Person	\$67,750	\$1,694	\$246	\$593	\$1,448	\$225,313
4 Person	\$75,300	\$1,883	\$274	\$659	\$1,609	\$250,268
5 Person	\$81,300	\$2,033	\$305	\$711	\$1,727	\$267,764
Moderate Income (100-120% AMI)						
1-Person	\$63,250	\$1,581	\$205	\$553	\$1,376	\$216,818
2-Person	\$72,300	\$1,808	\$218	\$633	\$1,590	\$252,208
3-Person	\$81,300	\$2,033	\$246	\$711	\$1,787	\$283,342
4 Person	\$90,350	\$2,259	\$274	\$791	\$1,985	\$314,721
5 Person	\$97,600	\$2,440	\$305	\$854	\$2,135	\$337,570

Sources: 2020 HCD Income Limits - Riverside County; Riverside Housing Authority Utility Allowance Schedule, 2020; Veronica Tam and Assoc., 2021
 AMI=Area Median Income

Assumptions:

1. Affordable housing cost = 30% household income
2. Taxes, insurance, HOA = 35% monthly affordable cost (owner costs only)
3. 10% down payment
4. 3% interest rate

C. EXISTING HOUSING NEEDS

This section provides an overview of existing housing needs in Jurupa Valley. It focuses on four types of housing need in the community:

1. Housing need resulting from housing cost burden;
2. Housing need resulting from overcrowding;
3. Housing need resulting from population growth; and
4. Housing needs of special needs groups such as elderly persons, large households, persons with disabilities, female-headed households, homeless persons, and farm workers.

Housing Cost Burden

As previously identified, housing cost burden is generally defined as households paying more than 30% of their gross income on housing-related expenses, including rent or mortgage payments and utilities. High housing costs can cause households to spend a disproportionate percentage of their income on housing. This may result in payment problems, deferred maintenance, or overcrowding. Housing Cost Burden adversely affects the low income, very low income and extremely low-income residents the most and with the 2020-2021 COVID-19 pandemic, these income groups have been hit even harder with cost burdens. To track information related to cost burdens and issues surrounding fair housing, the City of Jurupa Valley is contracted with the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County. The agency helps track housing trends that can be considered an impediment to accessing housing. According to the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County 2019-2020 Fiscal Year Report, most landlord/tenant complaints (23.45%) were related to housing lease/rental terms, followed closely (22.61%) by complaints related to Notices (e.g., eviction notices, late rent notices, and other notices from landlords), and then by complaints related to speed and lack of repair to rental facilities. According to the Fair Housing Council, recent increases in complaints related to these categories are likely linked to the loss of work due to the pandemic closures and safety regulations implemented by the State of California for a staggered reopening of businesses. The increasing cost burdens and global pandemic have exacerbated the issue and resulted in the associated issues such as overcrowding and the need to assist those in the special needs groups identified in the Community Profile.

This section uses data from the CHAS provided by HUD. The CHAS provides information related to households with housing problems, including cost burden, overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen facilities and plumbing systems. The most recent estimates are derived from the 2013-2017 ACS and released by the HUD April 13, 2021. The data includes a variety of housing need variables, further broken down by HUD-defined income limits and HUD-specified housing types. It should be noted that HUD-defined income limits differ slightly from the income limits established by the state, as shown in *Table 5.26*.

Table 5.26: Income Limits

HUD Income Limits	State HCD Income Limits
Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)	Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)
Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)	Very Low (31-50% AMI)
Low Income (51-80% AMI)	Low Income (51-80% AMI)
Moderate/Above Moderate Income (81%+ AMI)	Moderate Income (81-120% AMI)
	Above Moderate Income (>120% AMI)

AMI=Area Median Income

According to HCD's Data viewer 20% to 40% percent of Owner Occupied Households have monthly costs that are 30.0 percent or more of Household using recent (2015-2019) ACS data. In the same data time period, renters are more cost burdened with data showing 40% to 60% percent of renter households have monthly costs that are 30% or more of household income. However, overpayment by owners and renters went down since 2014, as the proportion of residents in higher income groups has increased. The rising housing cost is ever increasing and ultimately leads to other related housing issues like overcrowding and lack of availability of affordable homes for special needs groups.

Overcrowding

By definition, dwelling units with more than one person per room are considered overcrowded and units with more than 1.5 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded. Overcrowding increases health and safety concerns and stresses the condition of the housing stock and infrastructure. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households and the availability of suitably sized housing. Overcrowding impacts owners and renters; however, renters are generally more significantly impacted. Some households may not be financially able to purchase adequately sized housing and may instead accept smaller housing or reside with other individuals or families in the same home to lower costs. With the current 2020-2021 COVID-19 pandemic, the stress on housing availability and affordability is even higher, causing additional overcrowding.

Household overcrowding reflects various living situations: 1) a family lives in a home that is too small; 2) a family chooses to house extended family members; or 3) unrelated individuals or families are "doubling up" to afford housing. However, cultural differences also contribute to the overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger household sizes than others due to the preference of sharing living quarters with extended family members and as a way of sharing living costs among family members. Overcrowding can strain physical facilities and the delivery of public services, reduce the quality of the physical environment, contribute to a shortage of parking, and accelerate the deterioration of homes and neighborhoods.

Approximately 18% of all households in Jurupa Valley were overcrowded, and 4% were severely overcrowded, according to the 2019 ACS. As shown in *Table 5.27*, overcrowding is significantly more common among the City's renter-households than owner-households. By comparison, the incidence of overcrowding in Riverside County is much lower at almost half as many households dealing with this issue.

Table 5.27: Overcrowding by Tenure, Percent of Total Households

	Overcrowded (1+ occupants per room)			Severely Overcrowded (1.5+ occupants per room)		
	Renter	Owner	Total	Renter	Owner	Total
Jurupa Valley	30.0%	10.2%	17.5%	6.2%	3.0%	4.2%
Riverside County	11.9%	4.6%	7.0%	2.7%	1.3%	1.7%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 2019 (B25014).

Publicly Assisted Housing

The availability and location of publicly assisted housing may be a fair housing concern. If such housing is concentrated in one area of a community or of a region, a household seeking affordable housing is limited to choices within the area. In addition, public/assisted housing and Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) assistance should be accessible to qualified households regardless of race/ethnicity, disability, or other protected class status.

Public Housing

The City of Jurupa Valley does not have its own housing authority and so collaborates with the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) when providing public housing. Eligible residents must be seniors or disabled, or have an annual gross income at or below 80% of the AMI. The City indicated in its Fair Housing Assessment (Appendix E) that 456 households live in public housing in Jurupa Valley. In addition to these households being served, more than double that number are on the waitlist.

Housing Choice Vouchers Program

HACR administers the federally funded Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) for Jurupa Valley residents. This housing voucher program (also known as Section 8 housing) provides rental subsidies to low-income families that spend more than 30% of their gross income on housing cost and currently 344 Jurupa Valley households are receiving Housing Choice Vouchers. For the distribution of Voucher assistance within the City, HACR has established local preferences such as families who have lost HCVs due to funding cuts, working families, elderly or disabled, and veterans. As of February 2018, 1,742 households were on the waiting list for the HCV program. Of these households, 292 are seniors, 409 are disabled and 282 are self-identified as homeless without permanent housing.

As an extension of the HCV program, HACR assists eligible families who purchase a home by applying their existing HCV towards a monthly mortgage payment. Eligible families may qualify for a maximum period of 10 or 15 years (depending on the mortgage terms).

Other Affordable Housing Developments

Housing developments utilizing federal, state, and/or local programs, including state and local bond programs, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), density bonus, or direct assistance programs, are often restricted for use as low-income housing and provide another source of affordable housing for a jurisdiction. Table 5.28 summarizes housing developments in Jurupa Valley in which some or all of the units are designated as affordable for low to moderate-income households. While additional affordable units have been approved for entitlement since the last Housing Element Update, none have been built and ready for occupation.

Table 5.28: Non-Public Housing Affordable Units in Jurupa Valley

Property Name	Property Address	Funding Source	Unit Size	Total Affordable Units	Total Project Units	Expiration of Affordability
Mission Villas	5870 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509	LIHTC, §202/811	53 – 1 BR 1 – 2 BR	54	54	2038
Mission Palms	5875 Mission Blvd. Rubidoux, CA 92509	RDA, LIHTC, HOME	88 – 1 BR 20 – 2 BR 1 – 3 BR	109	109	2059
Mission Palms II	3702 La Rue St. Riverside, CA 92509	RDA	73 – 1 BR 18 – 2 BR	91	91	2062
Mission Village Senior Apartments	8989 Mission Blvd. Riverside, CA 92509	RDA, LIHTC,	90 – 1 BR 12 – 2 BR	102	102	2066
Habitat for Humanity-CalVet Jurupa Valley Veterans Housing	At the end of Amarillo Street in Glen Avon area	CalVet Habitat, HACR	18 – 3 BR 8 – 4 BR	26	26	2061
Total				382	382	

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 2021

Notes: These properties were developed prior to the incorporation of Jurupa Valley. Therefore, records on these properties do not use Jurupa Valley as the location but these properties are located in Jurupa Valley.

Abbreviations: HOME: HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HUD); CDBG: Planning Block Grant (HUD); RDA: City Redevelopment Agency; LIHTC: Low Income Housing Tax Credit; HTF: Housing Trust Fund; MHSA: Mental Health Services Act

Units at Risk of Converting to Market-Rate Housing

Projects at Risk

State law requires that the City identify, analyze, and propose programs to preserve existing multi-family rental units that are eligible to convert to non-low-income housing uses due to termination of subsidy contract, mortgage prepayment, or expiring use restrictions during the next 10 years. Thus, this at-risk housing analysis covers a 10-year period from October 15, 2021 to October 15, 2031 (10 years from the statutory deadline of the Housing Element). Consistent with state law, this section identifies publicly assisted housing units in Jurupa Valley, analyzes their potential to convert to market rate housing uses, and analyzes the cost to preserve or replace those units.

Within the at-risk analysis period, only one project is considered to be at-risk of converting to market-rate housing—54-unit Mission Villas senior housing, funded with Section 202 financing and Section 8 project-based rent subsidies. The project was placed in service in 1998 and Section 202 carries a 40-year low-income use restriction. The Section 8 contract for Mission Villas was last renewed in February 2020. However, HUD has prioritized funding for Section 8 renewals for senior housing projects (Section 202), and therefore, this project is at low risk of converting to market-rate housing. There are several public agencies and private nonprofits in the West Riverside County area with the capacity to acquire and manage at-risk units or develop new affordable units. In 2020, these include:

- 1. Housing Authority of the County of Riverside**
5555 Arlington Avenue, Riverside, CA 92504
(951) 351-0700
- 2. Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc.**
4164 Brockton Avenue, Riverside, CA 92501
Phone: (951) 682-6581
- 3. Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing**
340 E. 2nd Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 480-1249
- 4. National Community Renaissance**
9421 Haven Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
Phone: (909) 483-2444
- 5. Habitat for Humanity Riverside**
2180 Iowa Avenue, Riverside, CA 92507
Phone: (951) 787-6754
- 6. Path of Life Ministries**
1240 Palmyrita Avenue, Suite A, Riverside, CA 92507
Mail: PO Box 1445, Riverside CA
Phone: (951) 786-9048

Preservation and Replacement Options

To preserve the existing affordable housing stock, the City must either preserve the existing assisted units or facilitate the development of new units. Depending on the circumstances of the at-risk projects, different options may be used to preserve or replace the units. Preservation options typically include: 1) transfer of project to nonprofit ownership; 2) provision of rental assistance to tenants; and 3) purchase of affordability covenants. For example, CDBG and HOME funds may be used to acquire and rehabilitate the affordable units in exchange for an extended affordability covenant on the assisted units. In terms of replacement, the most direct option is the development of new assisted multi-family housing units. These options are described below. Due to the City's significant financial constraints, all options would require a

collaborative effort between the City and the Riverside County Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agency to pursue.

1. Transfer of Ownership

Transferring ownership of an at-risk project to a nonprofit housing provider is generally one of the least costly ways to ensure that the at-risk units remain affordable for the long term. Transferring property ownership to a nonprofit organization would secure low-income restrictions, and the project would become potentially eligible for a greater range of governmental assistance. Mission Villas is a Section 202 senior housing project, which is nonprofit-owned. Therefore, transferring ownership to another nonprofit is not a necessary preservation option.

2. Rental Assistance

Table 5.29 shows rental subsidies required for a typical 54-unit below-market apartment project in Jurupa Valley in 2019. According to HUD records, the units at Mission Villas are renting at \$676 monthly, significantly below Fair Market Rents for comparable units. If these units convert to market rate, the tenants should expect to pay at least \$986 per month, resulting in an affordability gap of \$310. As indicated in Table 5.29, the total cost of subsidizing the rents of all 54 at-risk units is estimated at \$16,740 per month or \$200,880 annually. Providing this level of subsidies for at least 55 years would require over \$20 million, assuming an annual inflation rate of 2.5% over 55 years. The feasibility of this alternative is highly dependent upon the availability of reliable funding sources necessary to make rent subsidies and the willingness of property owners to participate in the program.

Table 5.29: Rental Subsidies Required – Mission Villas, 2019

Unit Size	Total Units	Fair Market Rent ¹	Household Size	Contract Rent ²	Monthly Subsidy per Unit	Total Monthly Subsidy
1-bedroom	54	\$986	1 person	\$676 per month	\$310	\$16,740

1 Fair Market Rent (FMR) is determined by HUD, 2019.
 2 2015 contract rent for unit at Mission Villas per HUD records.

3. Purchase of Affordability Covenants

Another option to preserve the affordability of the at-risk project is to work with Riverside County’s Housing Authority or nonprofit housing agencies and developers to provide incentives to the property owner to maintain the project as affordable housing. Incentives could include writing down the interest rate on the remaining loan balance, providing a lump-sum payment, and/or supplementing the rents to market levels. The feasibility of this option depends on whether the complex has a high level of debt-to-equity ratio. By providing lump sum financial incentives or ongoing

subsidies in rents or reduced mortgage interest rates to the owner, the City can ensure that some or all of the units remain affordable. Funding available for purchase of affordability covenants is also limited. Typically, HUD funds cannot be used for this purpose.

4. Construction of Replacement Units

The construction of new low-income housing units is a means of replacing the at-risk units if they are converted to market-rate units and are eligible for HUD funds. The cost of developing housing depends upon a variety of factors, including density, size of the units (i.e., square footage and number of bedrooms), location, land costs, and type of construction. Assuming an average construction cost of approximately \$150,000 per unit, it would cost over \$8.1 million (excluding land costs) to construct 54 new assisted units. Including land costs, the total cost to develop replacement units would be higher.

5. Cost Comparisons

The above analysis attempts to estimate the cost of preserving the at-risk units under various options. These cost estimates are general estimates and are intended to demonstrate only the relative magnitude of funding required. Actual costs of preservation would depend on the individual circumstances of the at-risk property and market conditions at the time.

New construction of 54 replacement units has the highest upfront costs (\$8.1 million, excluding land costs) but the new units would typically be subject to long-term affordability restrictions and high housing quality standards. In evaluating the various options, the City or the responsible housing agency must consider the available funding sources and the willingness of property owners to participate in preservation, among other factors. With the dissolution of redevelopment in California and as a “young” city, Jurupa Valley has virtually no financial capacity to support affordable housing development.

The majority of funding for housing related projects stem from state grants and aid money. This is not a sustainable way to develop and as the above analysis has indicated, the City currently has very limited resources for such prospects.

Fair Housing in Jurupa Valley

Housing is a crucial part of our community, because as it affects everyone at a fundamental level and equal access is necessary to meet the essential needs of each person. In recognizing equal housing access as a fundamental right, the federal government and the State of California have both established fair housing choice as a

right protected by law. To comply with state law, the City of Jurupa Valley continues to participate in an effort to assess impediments to fair housing of the community through an “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Study”. The most recent analysis was completed in 2019 and defines “affirmatively further fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes.

State law added a requirement for an assessment of fair housing to be included in the housing element, which includes the following components: a summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the City’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity; analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities, an assessment of contributing factors, and an identification of fair housing goals and actions. The City of Jurupa Valley’s Fair Housing Assessment is included in Appendix E.

Key issues identified from as impediments to fair housing in the City of Jurupa Valley includes impediments stemming from the lack of education and awareness on housing resources; lack of fair housing enforcement activity; discriminatory lending, renting and real estate practices in the City; and restrictive land use policies. These impediments are be tracked and investigated by the City with the assistance of the Hair Housing Council of Riverside County, while continuing to develop policy and best practices to better achieve fair housing for Jurupa Valley.

Resources for Special Needs Groups

Special needs groups make up a large portion of the population in the City of Jurupa Valley and the main groups that need the most assistance in the City with such a steady population growth is elderly persons, large households, persons with disabilities, female-headed households, homeless persons, and farm workers. This section reviews the same special needs groups presented in the Community Profile with the resources that are currently available to the residents of Jurupa Valley.

Seniors

The Riverside County Office on Aging is a planning and advocacy entity that serves as the official Area Agency on Aging (AAA) throughout Riverside County. It is charged to provide leadership in developing a system of care services for older persons and adults with disabilities in the County. Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) are local aging programs that provide information and services on a

range of assistance for older adults and those who care for them. Some of the programs and services provided by AAA include:

- Aging and Disability Resource Connection Program
- Care Coordination
- Caregiving
- Care Transitions Intervention (CTI)
- Community Outreach and Education
- Legal Assistance
- Transportation

Some senior programs in the City of Jurupa Valley have been offered in partnership with Jurupa Valley Adopt a Family program, a community-based 501(c)(3) organization, and Healthy Jurupa Valley. Services and programs provided include assistance to senior households during the holiday seasons, and workshops catering to senior residents; recent workshop topics include returning to work after retirement. Through Healthy Jurupa Valley, seniors are also invited to attend senior health fairs. Additionally, the Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District provides a Senior Mentoring Program that focuses on providing enrichment and/or general assistance to senior citizens, including assistance with everyday tasks and exposing seniors to new activities.

Seniors in Jurupa Valley may also benefit from programs offered through the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency (EDA). Through the Senior Home Repair Grant (SHRG) Program, EDA may be able to cover up to \$6,000 of cost of repairs with no loan or payback requirement.

In terms of affordable housing resources, there are 357 affordable rental units in 4 rental properties throughout Jurupa Valley that are restricted for seniors, with renter qualifications not to exceed anywhere from 50% to 80% of median income. In addition to the senior housing developments listed in *Table 5.30*, seniors in the City are served by 11 state-licensed residential care facilities for the elderly and 15 adult residential facilities with a combined capacity to serve 379 persons. In addition, Country Village Apartments provides 1,238 senior apartments, with rents affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

Table 5.30: Senior Housing Development

Name	Address	Units
Mission Village Senior Apartments	8989 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509	102
Country Village Apartments	10250 Country Club Drive Jurupa Valley, CA 91752	1,238
Mission Villas	5870 Mission Boulevard Riverside, CA 92509	54
Mission Palms	5875 Mission Boulevard Rubidoux, CA 92509	109
Mission Palms II	3702 La Rue Street Riverside, CA 92509	92
Total		1,595

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2020

Persons with Disabilities

A number of nonprofit agencies provide supportive services to persons with disabilities living in Jurupa Valley. ARC of Riverside County is a private, nonprofit corporation serving adults with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. ARC operates six facilities in Western Riverside County providing services for those in need of full-time programming to ensure the development and maintenance of functional skills required for self-advocacy, community integration, and self-care. In addition, the Community Access Center (CAC), an independent living center located in the City of Riverside, has been providing services to people with disabilities in the County since 1995. CAC provides information, supportive services, and independent living skills training. The City is also amending the current zoning code to include the necessary provisions to meet the Lanterman Act and will include and allow for group homes, boarding homes for person with disabilities.

Single Parent Households

Limited household income constrains the ability of single-parent households to afford adequate housing, childcare, health care, and other necessities. Of the single-parent households, 33.4% are male headed and 66.6% are female headed, leading to even greater constraints with American Community Survey for 2017 showing over 25% of those female-headed households are living under poverty level.

Several agencies that serve Jurupa Valley residents offer various programs for families with children. The Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District offers programs and recreational classes for the City's youth, including health fairs, youth sports, special events, help with homework, and volunteer programs. Additional community and family resources are available through Healthy Jurupa Valley, as part of a national Healthy Cities movement to improve the health and quality of life for City residents. Healthy Jurupa Valley efforts are

carried out through Action Teams, including the Jurupa Valley Family Resource Network, and include the organization of special community events such as the Healthy Jurupa Valley Extravaganza Health Fair that provides access to community services and children activities.

Single-parent households in Jurupa Valley can also benefit from general programs and services for lower-and moderate-income persons, including the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency's (EDA) First Time Homebuyer and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by nonprofit organizations in the region such as the Food Bank.

Large Families

The average household size in Jurupa Valley is 4.21 persons compared to 3.3 persons in Riverside County, and these larger households make up about 30% of all households in the City. The large family households exist typically to both reduce the overall burden of housing costs and the cost of other necessities such as food, clothing, medical care, and other essentials. Large households in Jurupa Valley can benefit from general programs and services for lower-and moderate-income persons, including The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside Housing Choice Voucher and Public Housing programs, the County of Riverside Economic Development Agency's (EDA) First Time Home Buyer (FTHB) and Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) Programs, and various community and social services provided by nonprofit organizations in the region.

Farm Workers

In Jurupa Valley, there are few farm worker resources due a number of service providers in Riverside County. While farm workers have access to many of the other resources that the other special needs groups have as well, they have more limited assistance and services to farmworkers. The Family Resource Center Program at Mecca Family and Farm Workers Service Center (91-275 66th Avenue, Suite 100, Mecca, CA 92254) provides seven core service types: parenting skills, self-sufficiency, community action, child abuse prevention services, information and referral services, education and literacy, and life skills. There are also two farm worker housing projects located in Riverside County: Chapultepec Apartments (62-600 Lincoln Street, Mecca, CA 92254; 31 units) and Las Mañanitas (91-200 Avenue 63 Mecca, CA 92254; 128 beds).

The space at these housing projects is limited and serve the county as a whole, and with the added pressure of the COVID-19 pandemic, the State has implemented a program called “Housing for the Harvest” to assist these essential workers in the effort to keep California fed and safe. Riverside County partnered with the TODEC Legal Center to distribute financial and housing aid to farm workers who suffered loss of wages due to the COVID-19 pandemic and to provide housing alternatives those exposed and require quarantining for 14 days.

While these programs are in place to help this special need group, more can be done for more permanent solutions to the need for farm worker housing in Jurupa Valley. This Housing Element update includes a program that addresses the need for farmworker housing in the City by amending the Zoning Code to address the requirements of the Employee Housing Act.

Homeless Persons

The 2020 Point-in-Time homeless count, which occurred in January 2020, identified 103 unsheltered homeless individuals in comparison to the 139 unsheltered homeless individuals counted during the same survey in 2019 in the City of Jurupa Valley. While the numbers have declined from the previous year, this number does not include possible increases due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The resources and services described in *Table 5.31* serve low income and special needs populations in Jurupa Valley—not just the homeless. While some of the programs and services identified below are not located within the City’s boundaries, the services they provide are available to persons residing in Jurupa Valley. At the same time, the City also uses federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) money to fund housing for up to three homeless persons each night by subsidizing room rentals at program-approved transient housing in the area.

Table 5.31: Homeless and Special Needs Housing Resources

Agency/Program	Description	Location
Emergency Shelter		
Path of Life Ministries - Community Shelter Program	An emergency homeless shelter that serves adults by providing temporary housing along with assistance in obtaining important documents, job readiness, computer workshops, counseling, meals, hygiene supplies and various other forms of support. This program provides beds for up to 64 qualified single men and women.	2840 Hulen Place Riverside, CA 92507
Path of Life Ministries - Family Shelter Program	This program is offered to single parents with children, couples with children and single women. Support services focus on rapid re-housing, employment and increased income. It is a dormitory setting with 50 beds.	2530 Third Street Riverside, CA 92507
Path of Life Ministries - Emergency Cold Weather Shelter	The Path of Life Community Emergency Shelter provides an additional 72 beds from December to mid-April. These beds are provided on a night-by-night basis under the federal cold weather shelter initiative in cooperation with the County of Riverside.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506

Agency/Program	Description	Location
Community Kitchens		
Calvary Chapel	Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.	5383 Martin Street Jurupa Valley, CA 95168-11092
Eagle Food Ministries	Provides food boxes for individuals and families on Thursdays.	5410 Beach Street Riverside, CA 92509
Manna Ministries	Food assistance is provided on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of every month.	4318 Pyrite Street Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Rubidoux Missionary Baptist Church	Groceries are provided to families and individuals on the 2nd and 4th Saturday of each month.	2890 Rubidoux Boulevard Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Rubidoux Family Resource Center	Provides groceries and food, and also provides referrals to resources such as thrift stores and clothing	5473 Mission Boulevard Rubidoux, CA
Transitional Housing		
The Place	Jefferson Transitional Programs (JTP) is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) offering vocational, supported living, and educational programs for individuals with chronic mental illness and/or addictions.	3839 Brockton Avenue Riverside, CA 92501
Safe House Transitional Living	A 15-bed apartment complex in downtown Riverside. Services are available to older homeless youth ages 18-22 for up to 18 months. Five apartments are set aside for Permanent Supportive Housing for youth ages 18-24.	9685 Hayes Street Riverside, CA 92503
Permanent Supportive Housing		
Path of Life Ministries	Provides immediate housing to chronically homeless individuals and some families, in scattered privately owned homes and apartments throughout Riverside County.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506
Rental and Support Services		
Path of Life Ministries	<u>Rapid-Rehousing Program</u> : provides assistance for the most immediate housing possible for homeless families with children and provides temporary rental subsidies. <u>Rental Assistance Program</u> : when available, provides one-time rental assistance (up to \$1,000) to those exiting from homelessness or at risk of becoming homeless.	6216 Brockton Avenue, #211 Riverside, CA 92506
Foothill AIDS Project	Provides housing assistance, including help in locating and paying for emergency, transitional, or permanent housing, funds for paying rent, mortgage, and utility assistance. Referrals are available to other government and private subsidized housing programs and the state's homeless prevention program.	3576 Arlington Avenue, #206 Riverside, CA, 92506
Inland Empire Veterans Stand Down	Reunites homeless veterans with their families and communities through restorative resources and services. Some services provided include VA Claim assistance, legal clinics/seminars, transportation, food, blankets/sleeping bags, and care counseling.	6185 Magnolia Avenue, #338 Riverside, CA 92506
Disabled American Veterans Charity	Provides free, professional assistance to veterans and their families in obtaining benefits and services.	4351 University Avenue Riverside, CA 92501
Lutheran Social Services	Some emergency services provided include food pantry, grocery packs, clothes, lunches, motel vouchers, eviction prevention, and rental assistance.	3772 Taft Street Riverside, CA 92503

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2015

Families

As part of the previous housing element, the City removed the definition of “family” as it was too constraining to the diverse household types in the Jurupa Valley. The City instead used a housing element program to allow for a more open ended interpretation of what a family is under the housing element and City code. There is no current plan to create a new definition for family in the City of Jurupa Valley due to the possibility of creating unnecessary restrictions to options for housing in the City.

Housing Resources

A jurisdiction's housing resources include the existing housing stock as well as vacant and underutilized land that can support additional housing. The paragraphs below outline the City of Jurupa Valley's housing resources and demonstrate how the City can provide its share of the region's future housing need. In addition, financial and administrative resources available to support housing activities and facilitate implementation of housing policies and programs are addressed, as well as opportunities for energy conservation.

Residential Density and Affordable Housing

State housing law requires jurisdictions to provide an analysis showing that land use designations or zones identified for the development of housing for lower income households are sufficient to encourage such development. The law provides two options for preparing the analysis: 1) describe market demand and trends, financial feasibility, and recent development experience; or 2) utilize default density standards deemed adequate to meet the lower income housing need. According to state law, the default density standard for the City of Jurupa Valley is 30 dwelling units per acre.

Based on an analysis of affordable housing development in the Western Riverside County region and on discussions with local affordable housing developers, as outlined in the following section, the City has determined that a base density of 25 du/a (allowed maximum density, not including any applicable density bonus) is appropriate to accommodate the City's lower-income housing need. Not only does 25 du/a accommodate the lower income need, it also minimizes the impact of the density amongst the currently available housing stock. The density of these new residential developments is important in so far as they match the character of the community, which primarily consists of larger lot, ranch style single family homes.

Program HE 1.1.1 commits the City to amending the Land Use Map of the General Plan to add 69.2 acres of HHDR-designated land with appropriate zoning to allow multi-family ownership and rental housing. The HHDR land use designation allows a density of 21-25 dwelling units per acre, with additional density possible through state-mandated density bonuses. As outlined in Section D, Housing Opportunities and Resources, the additional acreage will enable the City of Jurupa Valley to meet and exceed its 2021-2029 RHNA while also protecting the rural, country aesthetics of the City.

Land costs in Jurupa Valley continue to be significantly lower than those of Orange and Los Angeles Counties; hence, the number of units per acre necessary to allow an affordable housing development project to achieve economies of scale is smaller than that of many other Southern California cities. A survey of vacant properties

for sale in Jurupa Valley on LandSearch.com showed seven properties available and suitable for residential development. Properties ranged in size from 1 to 17 acres and had an average land cost of \$160,000 per acre. By comparison, vacant properties in inland Orange County on mostly smaller, infill sites range from \$1 million to well over \$1.5 million per acre.

The City contacted three affordable housing developers within the Riverside/Jurupa Valley area: National Community Renaissance, Jamboree Housing Corporation, and Bridge Housing Corporation. Based on those conversations, it was determined that densities of 25 dwelling units per acre are sufficient to accommodate affordable housing development within the City of Jurupa Valley. According to these developers, the primary determinant of affordability is land cost, followed by the type and cost of construction. They noted that there was a “pivot point” density at or near 25 dwelling units per acre. As density increased beyond this point, podium type development was typically required, significantly increasing the cost of construction. For this reason, these developers believed densities of 25 dwellings per acre or less were more feasible than higher densities in the Riverside/San Bernardino market. They also stressed the importance of project compatibility with surrounding uses in setting project density because this related directly to the time and cost of development. Consequently, these nonprofit developers indicated that sites designated at 25 dwelling units per acre would be suitable to develop affordable housing. The examples in *Table 5.32* show that, while the densities vary within the Inland Empire, the average density is about 24.14 units per acre. These developments are in diverse locations including some of the highest densities found on infill projects in the middle of the jurisdiction’s downtown area.

Table 5.32: Inland Empire Affordable Housing Project Examples

Jurisdiction	Development Name	Address	Acreage	Dwelling Units	Dwelling Units/Acre
Jurupa Valley	Northtown Housing	Mission and Crestmore	26	68	13.23
Ontario	Palm Terrace 2 Apartments	1449 East D Street	2.08	48	24
Riverside	Cedar Glen Apartments	9830 County Farm Road	7.41	100	13.5
Riverside	Mission Heritage Project	3933 Mission Inn Avenue	1.72	71	41.28
Rancho Cucamonga	Villa Pacifica II	7418 Archibald Avenue	2.27	60	26.43
Rancho Cucamonga	Day Creek Villas	12250 Firehouse Court	4.04	140	34.65
Fontana	Sierra Ave Apartments	16839 Ramona Avenue	4.31	60	13.92
Moreno Valley	Courtyards at Cottonwood	Cottonwood and Indian	6.78	80	11.80

Currently, state law requires that cities provide additional aid to housing developers to streamline the process for the development of affordable housing, specifically for the low income, and the very low-income housing categories. To comply with state law, in 2021, the City is in the process of developing a “by right” process for projects in the HHDR General Plan designation with a minimum of

10% of units affordable to affordable to lower income households during the 2021-2029 planning period to be processed without the need for discretionary review. This law intends to incentivize the development of affordable housing and minimize government constraints on developing affordable housing units in California.

Variety of Housing Opportunity

The Zoning Code provides for a range of housing types, including single-family, multi-family, accessory dwelling units, manufactured homes, mobile home parks, licensed community care facilities, employee housing for seasonal or migrant workers as necessary, assisted living facilities, emergency shelters, supportive housing, transitional housing, and single room occupancy (SRO) units. *Table 5.33* summarizes the types of housing allowed by Jurupa Valley's Zoning Code to ensure a variety of housing opportunities continue to be available and the City continues to update the permitted uses of each zone as required by state law.

Single- and Multi-Family Uses

One-family dwellings are permitted uses in most residential zones. Multi-family dwellings are permitted in the R-4 zone, as well as the R-2, R-3, and R-6 zones with the approval of a Site Development Permit (SDP). As outlined in Section G, Housing Constraints, the Site Development Permit (SDP) process is a typically discretionary review process that is strictly concerned with addressing design and potential impacts. Additionally, the Community Development Director acts on SDPs unless the Community Development Director has determined that there is a significant impact on the community. In that case, SDPs are referred to the Planning Commission for consideration.

SDPs for residential projects are typically approved by the Community Development Director and generally do not require Planning Commission approval, except when the project is processed concurrently with a General Plan Amendment, a Specific Plan, a Tentative Tract Map, or other entitlements that require Planning Commission or City Council action.

Table 5.33: Jurupa Valley Permitted Uses by Zone

Zoning District	One- Family Dwelling	Multiple Family Dwelling	Accessory Dwelling Unit	Congregate Care Facilities	Emergency Shelter	Transitional and Supportive Housing ¹	Farm Worker Housing ²	Employee Housing	SRO	Manufactured Housing/ Mobile Home	Mobile-Home Park	Planned Residential Development
R-R/R-R-O	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-1/R-1A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-2	P	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-2A	P	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-3	P*	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-3A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
R-T	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-T-R	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	-	P#
R-4	P*	P*	P	P*	NP	P	NP	P*	P*	P	CUP	P#
R-6	P	P	P	NP	NP	P	NP	P	P	P	CUP	P#
PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	NP	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	P#
I-P	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	P*	NP	P*	NP	NP
A-1	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	P*	NP	NP	P*	CUP	P#
A-2	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	P*	NP	NP	P*	CUP	P#
W-2	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P#
R-D	P	P*	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P	CUP	P#
N-A	P	NP	P	NP	NP	P	NP	NP	NP	P*	NP	P#

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Zoning Code, 2021

P = Permitted by Right; CUP = Conditional Use Permit Required; "NP" = Not Permitted; P* = Requires Site Development Permit; P# = Requires PC/CC review; PUD = Allowed with PUD; rezoning required.

Notes: 1 Transitional and Supportive housing subject to same requirements that apply to standard residential uses.

2 Employee housing for six or fewer persons is treated as a single-family structure and residential use.

Accessory Dwelling Units

ADUs are attached or detached dwelling units that provide complete independent living facilities for one or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, cooking, and sanitation. ADUs may be an alternative source of affordable housing for lower income households and seniors. These units typically rent for less than apartments of comparable size.

California law requires local jurisdictions to adopt ordinances that establish the conditions under which ADUs are permitted through a ministerial process (*California Government Code*, §65852.2). To meet the requirements of state law, the City amended the ADU code in 2018 and 2020 to minimize requirements and to stay consistent with current code and to keep the process ministerial. A ministerial process is intended to reduce permit processing periods and development costs, because proposed ADU that comply with local zoning regulations and standards can be approved without a public hearing.

Jurupa Valley permits ADU on parcels that have a legal, single-family dwelling existing on the site, subject to additional development standards and the approval of an ADU Permit. ADU Permits are reviewed by the Community Development Director and do not require discretionary review or a hearing. Current code also allows for Junior ADU within existing single-family homes in addition to an ADU, effectively allowing up to three units on a single parcel. The code also allows up to two ADUs to be added to multi-family dwellings, subject to additional development standards and the approval by the Community Development Director.

Mobile Housing

State law requires local governments to permit mobile homes meeting federal safety and construction standards on a permanent foundation (and permanently connected to water and sewer utilities, where available), in all single-family residential zoning districts (§65852.3 of the *California Government Code*).

For purposes of permit issuance, Jurupa Valley permits mobile homes on a foundation system on all lots zoned to permit single-family dwellings. The installation of manufactured homes not on foundations is allowed whenever it is specifically provided for in the various zone classifications and is subject to the requirements and standards set forth in those zones. A mobile home permitted in the R-R and R-A zones, however, is subject to additional development standards regarding minimum floor area and lot size. These requirements are standard for most California jurisdictions and are like those of Riverside County.

In Jurupa Valley, 1,643 mobile home units encompass approximately 6.4% of all housing in the City. These mobile homes are a source of affordable units in the City and when they are under 1,000 square feet, they can be considered as an ADU on a parcel with an existing single-family home. They are permitted with a foundation and ADU site plan review through the Community Development Department at the City.

Approximately 50% of the mobile homes in Jurupa Valley were developed prior to 1980. The City of Jurupa Valley does not maintain a list of mobile homes in need of repair or replacement. However, Planning and Code Enforcement staff estimate that approximately 10% of all the mobile homes developed prior to 1980 will need some level of rehabilitation during the 2021-2029 planning period, and 1% will need replacement. This equates to 82 potential mobile homes in need of rehabilitation and 9 mobile homes in need of replacement.

Residential Care Facilities

The Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (§5115 and §5116 of the *California Welfare and Institutions Code*) declares that mentally and physically disabled persons are entitled to live in normal residential surroundings. The use of property for the care of six or fewer mentally disordered or otherwise handicapped persons is required by law. A state-authorized, certified, or authorized family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hour-a-day basis is considered a residential use to be permitted in all residential zones. No local agency can impose stricter zoning or building and safety standards on these homes (commonly referred to as “group” homes) for six or fewer persons than are required of other permitted residential uses in the zone. The Lanterman Act covers only licensed residential care facilities. California Housing Element law also addresses the provision of transitional and supportive housing, which covers non-licensed housing facilities for persons with disabilities that meet the statutory definitions for those terms. The City must ensure that, in addition to allowing smaller residential care facilities, larger group homes of seven or more persons are also allowed through a ministerial process, regardless of license.

The City of Jurupa Valley defines congregate care facilities as “a housing arrangement, developed pursuant to Article XIX of the Zoning Code, where nonmedical care and supervision are provided, including meals and social, recreational, homemaking and security services.” As part of this housing element update, the City’s provisions for licensed residential care facilities will be amended as needed to ensure consistency with the Lanterman Act.

Emergency Shelters

An emergency shelter is a facility that provides temporary shelter and feeding of indigents or disaster victims, operated by a public or nonprofit agency. State law requires jurisdictions to identify adequate sites for housing that will be made available through appropriate zoning and development standards to facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of housing types for all income levels, including emergency shelters and transitional housing (§65583(c)(1) of the *California Government Code*). State law (SB 2) requires that local jurisdictions make provisions in their zoning codes to permit emergency shelters by right in at least one zoning district where adequate capacity is available to accommodate at least one year-round shelter. Local jurisdictions may establish standards to regulate the development of emergency shelters.

The state also adopted State Housing Element Law restricting the requirements local jurisdictions can set as development standards for these emergency shelters. Housing Element Law requires that local governments impose only those development and management standards that apply to residential or commercial development within the same zone.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits emergency shelters in its Industrial Park (I-P) zone, subject to the development standards allowed under SB 2, such as minimum floor area for each client, minimum interior waiting and client intake areas, off-street parking and outdoor lighting requirements.

The City has a number of large, vacant I-P zoned sites totaling 439 acres. In February 2021, the City adopted an amendment to the existing emergency shelter codes to comply with the requirements and provisions of current state law. The sites are dispersed on the following parcels and can be found on Figure 5-6 below.

Figure 5-7 illustrates sites in the City of Jurupa Valley that are zoned I-P and permit emergency shelters. I-P-zoned sites are located through the City of Jurupa Valley and were determined to be appropriate for emergency shelters due to their proximity to commercial centers and transportation options. These I-P zoned parcels are located in proximity to commercial sites shown in the red/pink with transit and major freeways connecting them through to the neighboring communities. The only parcels on this map without any commercial zones and transit stops in its immediate vicinity is located on the western City border by Interstate 15. This site looks disconnected, but it is adjacent to the freeway and commercial amenities can be found just to the West in the City of Eastvale.

City of Jurupa Valley

Assessor Parcel Number	Street Address	Acreage
156030014	Not Addressed	3.67
156030016	Not Addressed	2.15
156040073	4155 Wineville Rd	20.08
156050007	4231 Wineville Rd	2.15
156360037	Not Addressed	0.59
156360038	3777 De Forest Cir	2.99
156360041	10395 Noble Ct	5.54
156370005	10302 Birtcher Dr	2.99
156370008	Not Addressed	0.49
156390006	Not Addressed	2.46
156210067	Not Addressed	3.07
156050006	4231 Wineville Rd	0.61
156370009	Not Addressed	2.13
156370004	10314 Birtcher Dr	1.88
156370014	10266 Birtcher Dr	4.81
156390007	Not Addressed	1.28
156360039	3725 Nobel Ct	5.89
156370010	Not Addressed	0.47
156391026	Not Addressed	1.2
156030017	Not Addressed	1.37
156030043	Not Addressed	0.39
156040072	11850 Riverside Dr	26.97
156370015	Not Addressed	4.67
156030042	4453 Parkhurst St	3.36
156040071	11900 Riverside Dr	28.81
156050027	Not Addressed	136.8
156370003	10317 Birtcher Dr	3.43
156370006	10290 Birtcher Dr	2.41
156390005	3675 De Forest Cir	2.05
160040045	Not Addressed	1.5
156030044	Not Addressed	0.1
156370001	10293 Birtcher Dr	2.28
156370002	10305 Birtcher Dr	2.35
156370011	Not Addressed	0.08
156390002	Not Addressed	1.84

Assessor Parcel Number	Street Address	Acreage
160040020	12087 Landon Dr	7
160040044	4685 Pier Enterprises Way	9.6
156360031	10395 Noble Ct	2.45
156390003	Not Addressed	1.78
156390004	Not Addressed	2
156390010	Not Addressed	0.19
156391023	Not Addressed	5.21
160040033	11911 Landon Dr	34.9
160040034	11811 Landon Dr	19.36
160040030	11905 Landon Dr	27.33
163400029	Not Addressed	1.03
163400051	Not Addressed	1.63
163400031	6250 Clay St	1.15
163400032	6212 Clay St	0.91
163400050	Not Addressed	2.59
163400028	Not Addressed	1.48
163400030	6280 Clay St	3.5
163400026	Not Addressed	1.61
167160027	Not Addressed	1
167160023	Not Addressed	3.5
167161020	Not Addressed	3.55
170350039	9251 Orco Parkway	1.12
170350042	9787 Orco Parkway	1.02
170350045	Not Addressed	1.12
170350046	Not Addressed	1.12
170350040	9263 Orco Parkway	1.12
170350041	9275 Orco Parkway	1.12
170350043	Not Addressed	1.25
170350044	Not Addressed	1.04
170350036	9215 Orco Parkway	2.67
170350037	9227 Orco Parkway	1.11
170350038	9239 Orco Parkway	1.12
170350047	Not Addressed	1.12
178150008	2610 Rubidoux Blvd	4.52

City of Jurupa Valley




Figure 5-6: I-P Zoned Sites in Jurupa Valley

City of Jurupa Valley




Figure 5-7: I-P Zones in Proximity/Access to Commercial Zones and Transit

In addition to emergency shelters, the I-P zone allows three other uses that support human habitation. These include a single mobile home or caretaker unit on a site during construction, caretaker units for industrial or commercial facilities, and motels. Action Item 1.1.17 of this document requires the City to revise its off-street parking requirements for emergency shelters within 18 months of adoption of the Housing Element. Off-street parking standards shall be revised to accommodate all staff working in emergency shelters, provided they do not require more parking for emergency shelters than other commercial uses in the I-P zone.

Transitional and Supportive Housing

State law requires local jurisdictions to address the provisions for transitional and supportive housing. Under Housing Element law, transitional housing means buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and reassignment of the assisted unit to another eligible program participant at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than 6 months from the beginning of the assistance (*California Government Code* §65582(h)). For example, a multi-family dwelling that is designated as a temporary (typically 6 months to 1 year) residence for abused women and children, pending relocation to more permanent housing.

State law addresses the requirements, local provisions and streamlining of transitional and supportive housing. State law currently requires local jurisdictions to address the provisions for transitional and supportive housing. It requires the city to address the criterion for assessing the need for emergency shelters and housing on a regional level and requires they be accounted for as part of the City's Housing Element to create an impactful change on the current homeless housing situation.

Currently, state housing law requires local jurisdictions to allow permanent supportive housing meeting specific conditions by right in all zones where mixed use and multi-family housing is permitted and to streamline the applications for permanent supportive housing. For such supportive housing located within one-half mile from transit, no minimum parking can be required.

Supportive housing means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an on-site or off-site service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. Target population means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 commencing

with §4500 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code*) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people (*California Government Code* §§65582(f) and (g)).

Accordingly, state law establishes transitional and supportive housing as residential uses and therefore, local governments cannot treat these uses differently from other similar types of residential uses (e.g., requiring a use permit when other residential uses of similar function do not require a use permit). As part of the development of this Housing Element, the City will include provisions for transitional and supportive housing, pursuant to current state law.

Permanent Supportive Housing and Low Barrier Navigation Centers

Similar to transitional and supportive housing, state law requires that permanent supportive housing and low barrier navigation centers be allowed by-right in multi-family and mixed-use zones, including non-residential zones permitting multi-family uses. Permanent supportive housing is permanent housing with voluntary supportive services such as health and mental health care for chronically homeless households. Low barrier navigation centers include housing and shelters where a resident at risk for homelessness can live temporarily and receive services while waiting to move into permanent housing. Local governments cannot treat these uses differently from other similar types of residential units. Accordingly, the City will include provisions for permanent supportive housing and low barrier navigation centers as part of this Housing Element.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO)

State law mandates that local jurisdictions address the provision of housing options for extremely low-income households, including Single Room Occupancy units (SRO). SRO units are typically one-room units intended for occupancy by a single individual. They are distinct from a studio or efficiency unit, in that a studio is a one-room unit that must contain a kitchen and a bathroom. Although SRO units are not required to have a kitchen or bathroom, many SROs have one or the other. There are minimum standards for SROs (including a minimum floor area requirement) under the *California Health and Safety Code*.

The City of Jurupa Valley's Zoning Code does not specifically address SROs. As part of this Housing Element, the City will include provisions to address SRO housing.

Farm Worker and Employee Housing

The California Employee Housing Act requires that housing for six or fewer employees be treated as a regular residential use. In general, the *California Health and Safety Code* §17008(a) defines “employee housing” as “any portion of any housing accommodation, or property upon which a housing accommodation is located, if all of the following factors exist:

- (1) The accommodations consist of any living quarters, dwelling, boardinghouse, tent, bunkhouse, maintenance-of-way car, mobile home, manufactured home, recreational vehicle, travel trailer, or other housing accommodations, maintained in one or more buildings or one or more sites, and the premises upon which they are situated or the area set aside and provided for parking of mobile homes or camping of five or more employees by the employer.
- (2) The accommodations are maintained in connection with any work or place where work is being performed, whether or not rent is involved.”

Section 17005 of the *California Health and Safety Code* identifies the few types of employees excluded, and Section 17008 provides a detailed definition of employee housing. The Employee Housing Act further defines housing for agricultural workers consisting of 36 beds or 12 units be treated as an agricultural use and permitted where agricultural uses are permitted.

The City of Jurupa Valley permits agricultural uses in several of its residential zones. The Zoning Code does not specifically address farm worker housing in residential zones but does allow farm worker housing in the City’s agricultural zones (A-1 and A-2) with SDP approval, and single-family dwellings are permitted by right in these zones. As part of the implementation of this Housing Element, the City will amend the Zoning Code to address the requirements of the Employee Housing Act.

D. HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND RESOURCES

State housing law requires that each jurisdiction in the state quantify the need for housing within its jurisdiction as part of the periodic process of updating local housing elements of the General Plan. As such, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has allocated the City of Jurupa Valley housing production goals for the 6th Cycle Housing Element update. The paragraphs below outline how the City of Jurupa Valley will accommodate its share of regional housing needs during the planning period.

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) developed and adopted by SCAG covers the growth projection period from June 30, 2021 through October 15, 2029. The RHNA assigns a housing production number to each jurisdiction in the region. Jurupa Valley must identify adequate land with appropriate zoning and development standards to accommodate its allocation of the regional housing need. The RHNA allocation is divided into four income categories: Very Low, Low, Moderate, and Above Moderate. *Table 5.34* outlines that Jurupa Valley’s share of regional future housing needs is a total of 4,497 new units between October 15, 2021 and October 15, 2029. This allocation is distributed into the four income categories identified above. The RHNA includes a fair share adjustment that allocates future (construction) need by each income category in a way that meets the state mandate to reduce over-concentration of lower income households in historically lower income communities or areas within the region.

Table 5.34: City of Jurupa Valley 6th Cycle RHNA Allocation

Income Category (% of County AMI)	Number of Units	Percent
Very Low (0 to 50%)	1,207*	26.8%
Low (51 to 80%)	749	16.7%
Moderate (81% to 120%)	731	16.3%
Above Moderate (Over 120%)	1,810	40.2%
Total:	4,497	100%

Source: SCAG 6th Cycle Final RHNA Allocation Plan, March 2021

AMI = Area Median Income

*The City has a RHNA allocation of 1,207 very low income units (inclusive of extremely low income units). This allocation is evenly split between extremely low and very low income groups pursuant to state law (AB 2634)

Credits toward RHNA

Several categories of housing are combined to meet the City of Jurupa Valley’s RHNA requirements. These include Approved Units, Units Pending Approval (Pipeline Projects), Accessory Dwelling Units, Specific Plans, and Vacant Sites. As outlined in detail below, when combined, these categories meet all the City’s Moderate and Above Moderate Income housing requirements and most of the Low and Very Low-Income requirements. Additional sites have been identified to meet the City’s RHNA, and the City has committed to undertaking a general plan amendment and rezone process following adoption of the 2021-2029 Housing Element to meet this requirement. For more detail about sites contributing to the City’s RHNA, please refer to Appendix A – Specific Plan Capacity and Vacant Sites Inventory and Appendix B– Proposed Redesignation/ Rezone Sites.

Approved Units Built and/or Entitled Since June 30, 2021

The 6th Cycle RHNA covers an 8-year planning period, beginning on October 15, 2021. Housing units built, under construction, or receiving building permits from June 30, 2021 onward can be credited towards meeting the City’s RHNA and subtracted from the City’s share of regional housing needs. As shown in *Table 5.35* below, between June 30, 2021 and September 30, 2021, the City entitled a total of 152 housing units, including 131 single-family units, 6 duplex units, and 15 accessory dwelling units (ADUs). None of the units have been designated affordable. However, the ADUs are considered partially affordable to low- and very-low-income households based on a SCAG survey of ADU affordability in Riverside County and outlined further below.

Table 5.35: Approved Units Built/Entitled June 30-September 30, 2021

Project	Income Level				Total
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
Single Family Units	–	–	–	131	131
Duplex Units	–	–	–	6	6
ADUs	4	5	5	1	15
Total	4	5	5	138	152

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2021

Units Pending Approval (Pipeline Projects)

As of October 4, 2021, eleven proposed projects totaling 1,126 units were at various stages of review and approval (*Table 5.36*). These projects include nine single-family residential subdivisions and two apartment projects. None of the proposed projects include a guaranteed affordable housing component, although one, Madone Collection, is exploring the inclusion of three single-family units affordable to moderate income households. The two proposed apartment projects, Vernola Marketplace Phase B, and Rexco Apartments, propose densities of 24 and 26.7 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), respectively. Based on apartment rent levels in the City, the apartment units are considered affordable to moderate-income households. The single-family units are presumed to be affordable to above-moderate income households.

Table 5.36: Pipeline Projects (Units Pending Approval) as of September 30, 2021

Project	Unit Type	Income Level				Total
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
9640 Philadelphia (MA16161)	SF	–	–	–	44	44
Philadelphia & Country Village (MA19029)	SF	–	–	–	54	54
Montecito Subdivision (MA20090)	SF	–	–	–	25	25
Pearl Communities (MA14143)	SF	–	–	–	74	74
Appaloosa Springs (MA20065)	SF	–	–	–	254	254
Madone Collection (MA20086)	SF	–	–	–	36	36
Sequanota Partners (PAR1314)	SF	–	–	–	78	78
Paradise Knolls PA-5 (MA20211)	SF	–	–	–	220	220
Saddlehorn Ranch (MA21158)	SF	–	–	–	31	31
Vernola Marketplace – Phase B (MA21046)	Apt.	–	–	200	–	200
Rexco (MA21083)	Apt.	–	–	110	–	110
Total		–	–	310	816	1,126

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

As previously identified, ADUs are units with complete independent living facilities for one or more persons built on the same lot as, or attached to, a primary residence. To promote ADUs as a means of providing affordable infill housing, the State of California enacted several laws since 2017 to streamline the ADU permitting processes and reduce restrictions on ADUs. The City of Jurupa Valley has modified its development regulations to meet state requirements and has experienced a corresponding increase in ADU activity. Due to the number of ADU permits tracked in the past, conflicting numbers have been reported to HCD about the number of ADU permits issued by the City for the years 2018-2020. However, the City is now utilizing Accela permit tracking software and has a more reliable system for tracking ADU permits going forward. In addition, the City has confirmed it issued 15 ADU permits in 2018 and 10 permits in 2019 and saw an increase in inquiries about ADUs in 2020 although only 5 permits were issued. Nonetheless, the City anticipates increased ADU activity in the future and is also in the process of preparing sample building plans that property owners can use to facilitate ADU construction and reduce the cost of the ADU development process. In addition, 15 ADUs were permitted between June 30, 2021 and September 30, 2021, further indicating increased ADU activity in the City. Based on these trends, the City has made a conservative estimate that at least 15 ADUs will be permitted in each year of the 2021-2029 Cycle for a total of 120 projected ADU units. This Housing Element includes a policy (HE-1.3) to encourage the development of ADUs throughout the creation of sample plans and development information packets.

To assist cities and counties determine affordability levels for ADUs, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) conducted an analysis of ADU affordability in the region. The analysis

included a survey of ADU rents by subarea. Based on this analysis, SCAG publishes ADU affordability assumptions that can be used by jurisdictions preparing site inventory analyses for the 6th Housing Element Planning Cycle. The final affordability assumptions for Riverside County are outlined in *Table 5.37* below, together with a breakdown of projected 6th Cycle ADUs in Jurupa Valley by income level.

Table 5.37: ADU Affordability Assumptions, 2021-2029

	Riverside County ADU Affordability Assumptions (%)	Jurupa Valley Total Projected 2021-2029 ADUs Based on Affordability Assumptions
Extremely Low	15.0%	18
Very Low	7.7%	9
Low	34.8%	42
Moderate	34.8%	42
Above Moderate	7.7%	9
Total	100%	120

Source: SCAG Regional Accessory Dwelling Unit Affordability Analysis, 2020

Development Potential in Specific Plans

Specific Plans are planning documents that outline the land use and development plan for an area of a city or county. As of 2021, there are four Specific Plans in the City of Jurupa Valley with remaining residential capacity: the I-15 Corridor, Paradise Knolls, Emerald Meadows Ranch, and Rio Vista Specific Plans. The location of each Specific Plan is outlined in Appendix A. It is anticipated that the remaining development capacity within each Specific Plans will be developed during the 2021-2029 planning cycle and thus will contribute toward the City’s ability to meet its RHNA allocation. The paragraphs below outline the current status of each Specific Plan and the assumptions for development within the planning cycle.

In considering market affordability of future development projects, the City has applied the following affordability categories, based on state and federal standards. The standards are based on surveys of local AMI and subject to adjustment using household size and other factors:

- Extremely Low Income (0-30% AMI)
- Very Low Income (31-50% AMI)
- Low Income (51-80% AMI)
- Lower Income: (0-80% AMI): Refers to a range of income levels that includes Extremely Low, Very Low and Low Income households. Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years, it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Highest Density Residential (HHDR - 20-25 dwelling units/

acre or du/a) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Lower Income households in Jurupa Valley.

- Moderate Income (80-120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years, it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of High Density Residential (HDR – 8-14 du/a) or Very High Density Residential (VHDR – 14-20 du/a) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to Moderate Income households in Jurupa Valley.
- Above Moderate Income (Over 120% AMI): Based on the analysis of the adequacy of density and actual housing production in the West Riverside County region during the past several years, it is assumed that sites with a general plan designation of Medium High Density (MHDR 5-8 du/acre or lower) are adequate to facilitate the construction of housing affordable to above-moderate income households in Jurupa Valley).

I-15 Corridor Specific Plan

The I-15 Corridor Specific Plan is an approved planned community of over 750 acres consisting of a mix of commercial and single-family detached and attached residential uses. It was adopted by the County of Riverside when Jurupa Valley was still a part of the unincorporated County. Upon buildout, the project will provide a total of 2,400 residential dwelling units—of which 1,100 units were originally approved within the boundaries of the City of Jurupa Valley. Most of the Jurupa Valley units have already been developed; however, there is a remaining capacity of 508 single-family units in Jurupa Valley north of Limonite Avenue based on the original Specific Plan. The units are expected to be market rate and thus could contribute to the City’s supply of above-moderate housing. Due to the progress of development within the I-15 Corridor Specific Plan to date, its location along the I-15 Corridor, and general interest in housing development in the area, the Specific Plan is expected to fully build out within the 2021-2029 planning period.

In addition, in 2015, the City approved an amendment to remove a 10.2-acre site from the southern limit of the Specific Plan that was designated for industrial use to accommodate the development of the Vernola Marketplace Project, a 397-unit luxury apartment project. As of the date of preparation of this Housing Element Update, the project is under construction and the property owner has submitted a second application for the Vernola Marketplace – Phase B project on an adjacent 8.3-acre site within the Specific Plan area that is designated for industrial use. The project would remove

the site from the Specific Plan and redesignate and rezone the site to accommodate 200 additional apartment units; the units are included in *Table 5.36*, Pipeline Projects. Because these two projects have been removed from the boundaries of the Specific Plan, they are not included in *Table 5.38*.

Table 5.38: Approved I-15 Corridor Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029

Planning Area	Remaining Dwelling Units	Unit Type	Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	Projected Dwelling Units 2021-2029	Projected Income Level
10 & 13	508	Single-Family	100%	508	Above Moderate
Total Units:	508			508	

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2021

Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

The Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan is located in the eastern portion of the City, south of SR-60, and was adopted prior to Jurupa Valley’s incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential single-family and multi-family uses. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,196 new dwelling units to the City, as shown in *Table 5.39*. Based on the densities proposed, 476 units, ranging from 12 to 16.2 du/ac, are considered moderate income with the remainder falling into the above-moderate category. As of October 2021, none of the units within the Specific Plan had been constructed, although the applicant is in preliminary negotiations with the City on revisions to the project’s land use distribution.

Table 5.39: Approved Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029

Planning Area	Remaining Dwelling Units	Unit Type	Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	Projected Dwelling Units 2021-2029	Projected Income Level
3A, 3B, 6A, 6B, 6C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15	720	Single-Family	50%	360	Above Moderate
16, 18, 19	476	Multi-Family	50%	238	Moderate
Total Units:	1,196			598	

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2021

Based on the property owner’s renewed interest in developing the property, and general interest in development in the area, Planning staff estimates that construction will begin in 2025 and that half (50%) of the units in each land use category will build out during the 2021-2029 planning period. This would result in an estimated 360 units of new above-moderate income housing and 238 new units of moderate income housing being approved and/or constructed within the 6th Cycle.

Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan

The Rio Vista Ranch Specific Plan located in the northeastern portion of the City was adopted prior to Jurupa Valley’s incorporation. The Plan area proposes a variety of uses, including a mix of residential

single-family and multi-family uses, retail and commercial services, parks, and open space covering 918 acres. Upon buildout, the Specific Plan will add a total of 1,697 new dwelling units consisting of single-family and multi-family units, as shown in *Table 5.40*. As of the date of this report, the property owner has had an application in process for several years for a Specific Plan Amendment to revise the land use distribution of the plan but maintain the overall total number of residential units. In addition, a draft environmental document and numerous technical reports have been prepared for the project although no hearings have been scheduled. Because the project is so far along in its process, the numbers below reflect the proposed Specific Plan Amendment land use plan rather than the approved Specific Plan. In addition, based on the developer’s recent activity in pursuing approvals and entitlements, it is estimated the project will receive building permits in 2023, commence construction in 2024, and achieve 60% completion across all land use categories by 2029.

Table 5.40: Proposed Rio Vista Specific Plan Amendment (2021) Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029

Planning Area	Remaining Dwelling Units	Unit Type	Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	Projected Dwelling Units 2021-2029	Projected Income Level
1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13	963	Single-Family/ Multi-Family	60%	578	Above Moderate
4, 11	734	Multi-Family	60%	440	Moderate
Total Units:	1,697			1,018	

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2021

Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

Approved in 2016, the Paradise Knolls Specific Plan was approved for a master planned residential community for the development of 650 dwelling units, plus commercial, recreational, and open space uses on about 107 acres in the Pedley Town Center area. Of about 71 acres to be developed with housing, just over 10 acres (about 15% of the housing area) is planned for Highest Density Residential (HHDR) uses at a density of 28 du/ac and qualifies as lower income housing based on density. As of October 2021, 107 single-family dwelling units were under construction in Planning Area 1, as shown in *Table 5.41*. In addition, an application has been submitted to subdivide Planning Area 5 into 220 single-family lots, as outlined above under “Pipeline Projects.” Due to the progress of development to date and the developer’s interest in pursuing the remaining entitlements, the Specific Plan is expected to fully build out within the 2021-2029 planning period.

Table 5.41: Approved Paradise Knolls Specific Plan Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2019

Planning Area	Remaining Dwelling Units	Unit Type	Anticipated Build-Out 2021-2029	Projected Dwelling Units 2021-2029	Projected Income Level
2	300	Multi-Family	100%	300	195 Very Low 105 Low
4	6	Single-Family	100%	6	Above Moderate
Total Units:	306			306	

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, 2021

Combined, the four Specific Plans outlined above are projected to add 2,430 dwelling units within the 6th cycle planning period, which are broken down by income level in Table 5.42.

Table 5.42: 2021-2029 Projected Specific Plan Development

Specific Plan	Income Level				Total (DUs)
	Very Low (DUs)	Low (DUs)	Moderate (DUs)	Above Moderate (DUs)	
I-15 Corridor (100%)	–	–	–	508	508
Emerald Meadows Ranch (50%)	–	–	238	360	598
Rio Vista (60%)	–	–	440	578	1,018
Paradise Knolls (100%)	195	105	–	6	306
Total	195	105	678	1,452	2,430

Vacant Sites

The City of Jurupa Valley conducted a city-wide inventory of vacant sites to identify additional residential development during the 2021-2029 housing cycle. This analysis built upon the sites inventory conducted during the 5th Cycle Housing Element Update process, removed sites that had been developed or entitled and added sites identified for the production of housing. Sites were assigned a housing income category based on a comprehensive survey of housing affordability conducted for the 5th Cycle, which resulted in the affordability levels outlined in Table 5.43 below. As shown in Table 5.43, only sites designated Highest Density Residential (HHDR) with a density range of 20-25 du/ac were assumed to contribute to Very Low and Low income housing.

Table 5.43: General Plan Affordability Level Assumptions

General Plan Land Use Designation	General Plan Density Range	Affordability Level
Ranch (EDR)	1 du/2 acres	Above Moderate (Over 120% AMI)
Rural Neighborhood (VLDR)	0-1 du/ac	Above Moderate (Over 120% AMI)
Country Neighborhood (LDR)	1-2 du/ac	Above Moderate (Over 120% AMI)
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	2-5 du/ac	Above Moderate (Over 120% AMI)
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	5-8 du/ac	Above Moderate (Over 120% AMI)
High Density Residential (HDR)	8-14 du/ac	Moderate (80-120% AMI)
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	14-20 du/ac	Moderate (80-120% AMI)
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	20-25 du/ac	Low (0-80% AMI)

To provide a realistic forecast, and account for the need to provide access and infrastructure, build-out of vacant sites was determined by taking 70% of the maximum permitted density allowed by the General Plan. This estimate is based on a survey of housing development projects approved by the Jurupa Valley City Council and Planning Commission between January 1, 2019 and October 15, 2021. Actual percentages ranged from 65% to 100% of the maximum density range with averages well over 75% depending on density and affordability level. Thus, the 70% of General Plan density used in this analysis is a conservative estimate that reflects actual development patterns in the City. Table 5.44 below outlines the projects included in this analysis, together with their densities and affordability levels, the latter of which also correspond with the affordability levels outlined in Table 5.43 above.

Table 5.44: City Council and Planning Commission Approved Projects by Density and Affordability, January 1, 2019-October 15, 2021

	General Plan Designation	Number/Type of Residential Units	Project Density (du/ac)	Density as a Percentage of Maximum General Plan Density	Anticipated Affordability Level
JM Built Residential Project MA 18153	LDR 1-2 du/ac	6 SF	1.29	65%	Above Moderate
Sequanota Heights MA 17099	MDR 2-5 du/ac	48 SF	4.6	92%	Above Moderate
Highland Park 2 MA 18089	MDR 2-5 du/ac	34 SF	5.0	100%	Above Moderate
Veteran's Housing MA 19008	MDR 2-5 du/ac	26 SF	4.9	98%	Low
Hudson Street Subdivision MA 16146	MDR 2-5 du/ac	25 SF	3.9	77%	Above Moderate
Montecito MA 20090	MDR 2-5 du/ac	25 SF	4.7	94%	Above Moderate
Emerald Ridge So (single family) MA 18141	MHDR 5-8 du/ac	97 SF	7.5	94%	Above Moderate
Emerald Ridge So (townhomes) MA 18141	HDR 8-14 du/ac	118 MF	9.9	71%	Moderate
Mission Gateway Villas MA 16224	HDR 8-14 du/ac	57 MF	11.0	78%	Very Low/Low/ Moderate

du/ac = dwelling units per acre; SF = Single Family; MF = Multi-Family; LDR = Low Density Residential; MDR = Medium Density Residential; MHDR = Medium High Density Residential; HDR = High Density Residential

Table 5.45 below summarizes the sites inventory for Jurupa Valley. Additional information on the sites inventory can be found in Appendix A.

Table 5.45: Sites Inventory

General Plan Land Use Designation	Income Level				Total (DUs)
	Very Low (DUs)	Low (DUs)	Moderate (DUs)	Above Moderate (DUs)	
Ranch Residential (EDR)	–	–	–	1	1
Country Neighborhood (LDR) & Rural Community – Low (RC-LDR)	–	–	–	274	274
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	–	–	–	207	207
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	–	–	–	109	109
High Density Residential (HDR)	–	–	58	–	58
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	–	–	–	–	0
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	452	243	–	–	695
Total	452	243	58	591	1,344

Progress in Meeting Housing Needs

Table 5.46 summarizes Jurupa Valley’s progress in meeting the 6th Cycle RHNA and its capacity for housing development. Overall, the land use inventory indicates that the City has the existing capacity needed to accommodate its RHNA in the Moderate and Above-Moderate categories with a combined surplus of 1,558 units in those categories. However, there is an unmet need of 354 units in the Low-Income category and an unmet need of 529 units in the Very Low/Extremely Low-Income Category as shown on Table 5.46.

Table 5.46: Progress in Meeting 6th Cycle Regional Housing Need Allocation

Unit Capacity	Income Category				Total Units
	Extremely/ Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
RHNA	1,207	749	731	1,810	4,497
1. Units Built and/or Entitled Since 6/30/2021	4	5	5	138	152
2. Pipeline Projects	–	–	310	816	1,126
3. Accessory Dwelling Units ¹ Total ADUs 2021-2029 (15/year)	27	42	42	9	120
4. Development Potential in Specific Plans					
I-15 Corridor Specific Plan	–	–	–	508	508
Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan	–	–	238	360	598
Rio Vista Specific Plan	–	–	440	578	1,018
Paradise Knolls Specific Plan	195	105	–	6	306
Subtotal	195	105	678	1,452	2,403
5. Development Potential on Vacant and Underutilized Parcels					
Ranch Residential (EDR)	–	–	–	1	1
Country Neighborhood (LDR) & Rural Community – Low (RC-LDR)	–	–	–	274	274
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	–	–	–	207	207
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	–	–	–	109	109
High Density Residential (HDR)	–	–	58	–	58
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	–	–	–	–	–
Highest Density Residential (HHDR) ²	452	243	–	–	695
Subtotals	452	243	58	591	1,344
Total RHNA Credits (Built + Potential)	678	395	1,093	3,006	5,172
RHNA Surplus/[Deficit]	(529)	(354)	+362	+1,196	

1 ADU affordability levels based on SCAG’s 2020 Affordability Analysis for San Bernardino and Riverside Counties

2 Assumes 65% of potential HHDR units on vacant or underutilized parcels applied to “Very Low/Extremely Low” housing need, with the remaining potential HHDR units allocated to meet “Low Income” need.

Additional Sites Needed to Meet RHNA

Based on the foregoing, the City identified additional sites to be redesignated and rezoned to make up for the shortfall of very low and low income housing units during the 2021-2029 cycle. As outlined in Action Item HE-1.1.1, following Housing Element adoption, the City will consider a proposal to redesignate 19 sites, totaling 69.2 acres, to the City’s highest density, HHDR. As shown on *Table 5.47* and based on a density range of 20-25 du/ac, these sites are projected to accommodate a minimum of 1,147 units, including 760 units of very low income housing and 409 units of low income housing, which will make up for the anticipated shortfall. The City will consider the redesignations/rezones within three years of the October 15, 2021 beginning of the 6th Cycle planning period. The summary of sites proposed to be redesignated is outlined in Appendix B.

Table 5.47: RHNA Summary With Redesignation Sites

Unit Capacity	Income Category				Total Units
	Extremely/ Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	
RHNA	1,207	749	731	1,810	4,497
Total RHNA Credits	678	395	1,093	3,006	5,172
RHNA Surplus/[Deficit] without Redesignation Sites	-529	-354	+362	+1,196	-
New Redesignation Sites	760	409	-	-22	1,147
RHNA Surplus with Redesignation Sites	+231	+55	+362	+1,174	+1,9822

E. FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING

As a young City with limited financial resources, Jurupa Valley has limited access to funding sources for affordable housing activities. In addition, the City does not have a housing authority. The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR) manages public housing programs in the City of Jurupa Valley and other participating jurisdictions in the County. The following paragraphs outline the three largest housing funding sources the City of Jurupa Valley can use for housing production, rehabilitation, or preservation.

SB 2/LEAP Grants

In 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed a 15-bill housing package aimed at addressing the state’s housing shortage and high housing costs. The package included the Building Homes and Jobs Act (SB 2, 2017), which established a \$75 recording fee on real estate documents to increase the supply of affordable homes in California. The funding was made available until the beginning of March of 2019 to update planning documents and land-use ordinances to streamline and promote the development of housing. During the first year of the program, the City of Jurupa Valley received \$310,000

in state funds for planning efforts to facilitate housing production. Funding was allocated for the preparation of objective residential design standards, rezoning of sites to accommodate higher density, and preparation of a town center area plan for the Pedley area.

For the second year and onward, 70% of SB 2 funding will be allocated to local governments for affordable housing purposes. A large portion of year two allocations will be distributed using the same formula used to allocate federal Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). Year Two affordable housing funds will be available for:

- Increasing the supply of housing for households at or below 60% of AMI
- Increasing assistance to affordable owner-occupied workforce housing
- Assisting persons experiencing or at risk of homelessness
- Facilitating housing affordability, particularly for lower and moderate income households
- Promoting projects and programs to meet the local government's unmet share of regional housing needs allocation

Another source of funding to help local jurisdictions to update their planning documents and implement process improvements that will facilitate housing construction is the Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) grants. The City received \$500,000 in LEAP grants in 2020 for the 6th Cycle Housing Element, a general plan consistency program, and programs to incentivize the development of ADUs. LEAP grants are a one-time-only program and are not expected to be offered again in the future.

Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program

The Housing Authority of the County of Riverside manages the federally funded Section 8 Housing Voucher Program in the City of Jurupa Valley. The program provides rental assistance to very low income persons in need of affordable housing. The program offers a voucher to income-qualified tenants that pays the difference between the payment standard (an exception to fair market rent) and what a tenant can afford to pay (e.g., 30% of their income). A voucher allows a tenant to find their own housing that meets the requirements of the program, including housing that may cost above the payment standard, with the tenant paying the extra cost. Approximately 344 households in Jurupa Valley receive assistance through the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds

In 2018, the City of Jurupa Valley became an “entitlement City” for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. The CDBG program is a grant-funded effort administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The CDBG program provides about \$1.2-\$1.3 million in funding for the City to carry out projects in three areas: infrastructure, social services, and housing initiatives. The City is utilizing its CDBG housing funding to assist households with housing rehabilitation through a grant program and to support the Housing Authority of Riverside County implement the Voucher Program outlined above.

Additional Resources

Described below are public agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations that have been involved or are interested in housing activities in Jurupa Valley. These agencies play important roles in meeting the housing needs of the community. In particular, these agencies and organizations have been or are currently involved in the improvement of the housing stock, expansion of affordable housing opportunities, preservation of existing affordable housing, and/or provision of housing assistance to households in need in Jurupa Valley:

- Housing Authority of Riverside County
- Riverside Housing Development Corporation
- Habitat for Humanity
- Jamboree Housing
- Palm Communities

The City will continue to work with these and other qualified housing developers and service providers to create affordable housing through new construction, acquisition/rehabilitation, and preservation.

F. OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

Construction of energy efficient buildings can add to the production costs of ownership and rental housing. Over time, however, housing with energy conservation features should reduce occupancy costs as the consumption of fuel and electricity is decreased. This can result in monthly housing costs that are equal to or less than what they otherwise would have been had no energy conservation devices been incorporated in the new residential buildings. This section provides an overview of opportunities for energy conservation during the 2021 through 2029 Housing Element planning period.

State Regulations

Title 24 of the California Administrative Code establishes energy conservation standards that must be applied to all new residential buildings. The regulations specify energy-saving design for walls, ceilings, and floor installations, as well as heating and cooling equipment and systems, gas cooling devices, conservation standards, and the use of non-depleting energy sources, such as solar energy or wind power. Compliance with the energy standards is achieved by satisfying certain conservation requirements and an energy budget. Among the alternative ways to meeting the energy standards are the following:

- **Alternative 1:** The passive solar approach, which requires proper solar orientation, appropriate levels of thermal mass, south-facing windows, and moderate insulation levels.
- **Alternative 2:** Generally, requires higher levels of insulation than Alternative 1, but has no thermal mass or window orientation requirements.
- **Alternative 3:** Requires active solar water heating in exchange for less stringent insulation and/or glazing requirements.

Residential developers must comply with these standards while localities are responsible for enforcing the energy conservation regulations.

State and Federal Programs

The California Department of Community Services and Development in partnership with the network of local community services agencies that assist lower-income households, administers the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP provides financial assistance to lower income households to offset the costs of heating and/or cooling their residences.

Private Sector Programs

The following private sector energy conservation programs are available to Jurupa Valley residents:

- **Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) Programs:** Lower-income customers enrolled in Southern California Edison's and/or Southern California Gas ESA program may be eligible to receive low- or no-cost products and installation: attic insulation; energy-efficient lighting; door weather-stripping; replacement of qualified appliances; caulking; minor home repairs; low-flow showerheads; and water heater blankets.

- **Gas Assistance Fund (GSF):** Lower-income residents having trouble paying their gas bill may receive a one-time grant up to \$200 through a joint program between Southern California Gas and United Way.

G. HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Governmental Constraints

Governmental constraints are policies, standards, requirements, and actions imposed by the government that affect the development and provision of housing. These constraints may include building codes, land use controls, growth management measures, development fees, processing and permit procedures, and site improvement costs. State and federal agencies play a role in the imposition of governmental constraints; however, these agencies are beyond the influence of local government and are therefore not addressed in this analysis. These governmental policies often have positive and negative effects on housing and thus contributing to the many constraints that are reviewed and used to developed housing objectives. While policies have the intention of encouraging availability and affordability of housing, these same policies can be seen as potentially constraining when met with other nongovernmental constraints.

Land Use Element

The Land Use Element of a General Plan designates the general distribution, location, and extent of uses for land planned for housing, business, industry, open space, and public or community facilities. As it applies to housing, the Land Use Element establishes a range of residential land use categories, specifies densities (typically expressed as dwelling units per acre), and suggests the types and locations of housing appropriate in a community. Residential development is implemented through the zoning districts, use classifications, development regulations, and design standards specified in the jurisdiction's zoning code.

The City of Jurupa Valley adopted the County of Riverside General Plan upon the City's incorporation in 2011. In 2017, the City then developed and adopted the current General Plan.

Types of Residential Communities

The governmental factor that most directly influences the types and character of residential communities, as well as market conditions, is the allowable density range of residentially designated land. These densities reflect the type of housing expected in each development, allowing for developers to build in larger scale. In general, higher densities allow developers to take advantage of economies of scale, reduce the per-unit cost of land and improvements, and reduce developments costs associated with new housing construction. Reasonable density standards ensure the opportunity for higher-density residential uses to be developed within a community, increasing the feasibility of producing affordable housing, and offer a variety of housing options that meet the needs of the community.

Table 5.48 summarizes the City's 2017 General Plan land use designations that will allow residential uses, as well as their permitted net densities (without density bonus). The 2017 General Plan provides a range of densities for single-family (up to 14 units per acre) and multi-family (14-25 units per acre) housing development to accommodate a wide range of housing options. Maximum allowed densities are established for all residential designations, and minimum densities are established to help ensure that land zoned for residential use will be developed as efficiently as possible.

The Zoning Code is the primary tool for implementing the General Plan Land Use and Housing elements. It is designed to protect and promote public health, safety and welfare, as well as to promote quality design and quality of life. The City of Jurupa Valley's residential zoning districts control both the use and development standards of each residential site or parcel, thereby influencing the location, design, quality, and cost of housing. Title 9 (Zoning) works with Title 7 (Subdivisions) to ensure that all codes are met when developing new housing communities and neighborhoods.

Table 5.48: Jurupa Valley General Plan Residential Land Use Designations, 2017

Designation	Description	Density Range (du/acre)	
		Minimum "Target"	Maximum Allowed
Small Farm (Rural Residential – RR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 5 acres. 	--	1 unit per 5 acres
Ranch (Estate Density Residential - EDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of at least 2 acres. 	--	1 unit per 2 acres
Rural Neighborhood (Very Low Density Residential – VLDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of 1 to 2 acres. 	--	1 unit per 1 acre
Country Neighborhood (Low Density Residential (LDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residences on large parcels of ½ to 1 acre. 	--	1 unit per ½ acre
Medium Density Residential (MDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached and attached residences with a density range of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre. 	2	5
Medium High Density Residential (MHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached and detached residences with a density range of 5 to 8 dwelling units per acre. 	5	8
High Density Residential (HDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached and detached residences, including townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard homes, patio homes, and zero lot line homes. 	8	14
Very High Density Residential (VHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family attached residences and all types of multi-family dwellings. 	14	20
Highest Density Residential (HHDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-family dwellings, includes apartments and condominium. Multi-level (3+) structures are allowed. 	20	25
Mixed Use Overlay (MUO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows a mix of residential, commercial, office and other compatible uses. Flexible residential density and development standards are applied to encourage compatible, attractive, high-quality development. 	8	20
*Town Center Overlay (TCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to three historic core areas, namely Rubidoux, Pedley, and Glen Avon. Promotes infill and improvement of established town centers a more urbanized, pedestrian-oriented mix of residential, commercial, office, entertainment, civic, transit, educational, and/or recreational uses, or other uses is encouraged. Special Design Guidelines apply to the Pedley, Rubidoux and Glen Avon Town Centers 	5	25

Source: Jurupa Valley General Plan

Development Requirements

Upon incorporation as a city, Jurupa Valley adopted the Riverside County Zoning Code by reference. *Table 5.49* summarizes the City’s residential zoning districts and their development standards, as established in the County Zoning Code adopted by the City. Jurupa Valley has historically been composed of much larger, ranch style residential development, and the current larger lot development standards are typical to the more rural areas of the State of California. These current development standards can be considered a constraint because it can create underutilized sites through the City. And when applied to new subdivisions, where smaller lot sizes are more compatible, the standards become restrictive to development. To resolve this issue, the City will be updating its Zoning Code to implement additional standards for multi-family and small lot subdivisions as part of the programs for this Housing Element.

Table 5.49: Summary of Residential Zoning Districts Development Standards

Zoning District	Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot			Maximum Building Height (stories/feet)	Minimum Front Yard (feet)	Minimum Interior Side Yard (feet)	Minimum Corner Side Yard (feet)	Minimum Rear Yard (feet)	Lot Coverage
		Width (feet)	Depth (feet)	Frontage (feet)						
RR	21,780	80	--	--	40-50	--	--	--	--	--
R-1/R-1A	7,200	60	100	60	3-story/40	20	10% of lot width	10	10	50%
R-A	20,000	100	150	--	40-50	20	--	--	--	--
R-2	7,200	--	--	--	3-story/40	20	10% of lot width	10	10	60%
R-2A	7,200	--	--	--	2-story/30	20	5	--	10	60%
R-3	7,200	60	100	--	50-75	10	5	10	10	50%
R-3A	9,000	--	--	--	50-75	10	5	10	10	50%
R-4	3,500	40	80	--	40-50	20	5	10	10	--
R-5	None	n/a	n/a	n/a	50-75	50	50	50	50	--
R-6	5,000	--	--	30	35-50	10	--	--	10	--
R-T	3,600/7,200	40/60	100	30/45	40	20	5	5	5	--
PUD	--	--	--	--	--	10	5	10	10	varies

Parking Requirements

Table 5.50 summarizes the residential parking requirements in Jurupa Valley. Parking requirements do not constrain the development of housing directly. However, parking requirements may reduce the amount of available lot areas for residential development. The City determines the required number of parking spaces based on the type and size of the residential unit and has found the required parking spaces to be necessary to accommodate the number of vehicles typically associated with each residence.

Table 5.50: Residential Parking Requirements

Type of Residential Development	Required Parking Spaces (off street)
Single-family	2 spaces per dwelling
Multi-family	Studio or 1 BR: 1.25 spaces per unit; 2 BR: 2.25 spaces per unit 3 BR: 2.75 spaces per unit (add 1 space per employee); Multi- Family Planned Residential Development: 1.5 spaces per unit
Planned residential development	1 BR: 1.5 spaces per unit; 2 BR or more: 2.5 spaces per unit
Senior housing	See Single-Family and Multi-Family requirements
Mobile home parks	2 spaces per trailer or mobile home space* (add 1 guest space per 8 mobile home spaces)
Accessory dwelling units	1 space per unit

Source: Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, 2021

Density Bonus Ordinance

California Government Code §65915 requires local governments to grant a density bonus and additional incentives and reductions in parking requirements to a developer of a qualifying housing project – for example, applicants that agree to provide a certain percentage of very low-income units, low-income units, or moderate income units. The density bonuses that the City has are the same as state law and will continue to be included in new housing developments.

Building Codes and Enforcement

Building and safety codes are adopted to preserve public health and safety and ensure the construction of safe and decent housing. These codes and standards also have the potential to increase the cost of housing construction or maintenance.

The City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2019 California Building Standards Code. Other codes commonly adopted by reference within the region include the California Mechanical Code, the California Plumbing Code, the California or National Electric Code, the Uniform Housing Code, and the California Fire Code. Less common are the California Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings, the Urban-Wildland Interface Code, and the Uniform Code for Building Conservation. The City has not adopted any local amendments that constrain the development, maintenance, or preservation of housing.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

Land Use Controls

As previously noted, the City will address the provision of residential care facilities as part of the action plan for this Housing Element through a Zoning Code update. After the update, Jurupa Valley will be able to accommodate all persons with disabilities as required by state law.

Reasonable Accommodation

Building and development standards may constrain the ability of persons with disabilities to live in housing units that are suited to their needs. Currently, the City considers requests for reasonable accommodation when requests are made, without a formal application and approval process. As part of this Housing Element’s Programs, the City will adopt a formal reasonable accommodation ordinance into the Zoning Code.

Building Code

As indicated above, the City of Jurupa Valley has adopted the 2019 California Building Standards Code and routinely adopts updates as they become available. The City has not adopted any special amendments to this Code that would impede housing for persons with disabilities.

Planning and Development Fees

Housing construction imposes certain short- and long-term costs upon local government, such as the cost of providing planning services and inspections. The City of Jurupa Valley relies upon various planning and development fees to recoup costs and ensure that essential services and infrastructure are available when needed. Current planning fees for Jurupa Valley, which may be updated by the City Council by resolution from time to time, are summarized in *Table 5.51*.

Table 5.51: Planning Fees

Application	Initial Deposit Fee
General Plan Amendment	\$7,479.66
Conditional Use Permit	\$9,646.14+\$5.10 per lot or site
Variance (filed alone)	\$2,625.48
Site Development Permit (Plot Plan)	\$4,791.96
Tentative Tract Map (Single-Family Residential)	\$11,368.92 + \$102 per unit
Tentative Tract Map (Multi-Family Residential)	\$11,368.92 + \$102.00 per lot + \$19.38 per acre
Tentative Parcel Map (without waiver of Final Parcel Map)	\$5,621.22 + \$104.04 per lot
Zone Change	\$3,648.54
Accessory Dwelling Unit	\$550

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, January 1, 2021
 Fees vary due to location of the units.

A funding source widely used among local governments in California is the development impact fee, which is collected for a variety of improvements including street and drainage improvements. The City of Jurupa Valley collects development impact fees from developers of new housing units, as well as commercial, office, retail, and industrial development. These fees are used to offset

costs primarily associated with traffic impacts and City street improvements that are necessitated by the proposed developments. *Table 5.52* summarizes the development impact fees required by the City and by other relevant agencies in 2017 for residential developments. Based on 2020 development applications, development impact fees are in the order of \$15,500 per unit for a market-rate single-family development and \$12,000 per unit for market-rate multi-family apartment projects.

Table 5.52: Residential Development Impact Fees (Per Unit)

Fee Type	Area 1: Jurupa			
	Single-Family		Multi-Family	
Public Facilities Fee	\$1,207		\$1,011	
Fire Facilities Fee	\$705		\$590	
Transportation (Roads, Bridges) Fee	\$1,001		\$ 791	
Transportation (Signals) Fee	\$420		\$378	
Regional Parks	\$563		\$472	
Regional Trails Fee	\$316		\$264	
Libraries Fee	\$341		\$286	
Program Administration Fee	\$60		\$50	
Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF)	Single-family: \$8,873		Multi-family: \$6,231	
Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Fee	Less than 8.0 units per acre: \$1,952/unit Between 8.0-14.0 units per acre: \$1,250/unit Greater than 14.0 units per acre: \$1,015/unit			
Mira Loma Road and Bridge Benefit District (RBBB) Fee	Zone A: \$1,667 MF*: \$417	Zone B: \$884 MF*: \$612	Zone D: \$2,681 MF*: \$1,857	Zone E: \$1,644 MF*: \$1,139

Source: City of Jurupa Valley, reassessed in 2021
Fees for senior single-family units are reduced by 33%.

Code and Fee Transparency

California Government Code §659401(a)(1) requires that every city or county make all information regarding development processing applications, regulations, and fees readily available to all applicants for development projects and any person requesting the information. The City of Jurupa Valley provides information its development processes, regulations and fees available on its website. Many of the development regulations and fees were inherited from the County of Riverside and still refer to County documents. At the time of preparation of this Housing Element, the City is reviewing the website to ensure that all processes, regulations, and fees are provided on the website and are easy to navigate to, and that systems are in place to regularly update and maintain the information.

Local Processing and Permit Procedures

Considerable holding costs are associated with delays in processing development applications and plans. At times, these holding costs are passed through to renters and homeowners in the price/rent of housing, thus affecting affordability. The City of Jurupa Valley's

development review process is designed to accommodate housing development applications of various levels of complexity and requiring different entitlements. Processing times vary with the complexity of the project. Currently, state law requires specific review times and project completion for certain types of ministerial housing related applications. These laws streamline the time and review process each project can go through, but the timelines still depend on the type of housing and size of the overall development and total units proposed.

Ministerial Site Development Permits (SDPs)

In 2020, the City adopted objective multifamily residential development standards (MMC 92.40.545) to facilitate the ministerial review of multifamily housing projects that reserve a minimum of 10% of the units affordable to lower income households. As of the preparation of this document, the City is in the process of formalizing the process through the preparation of an application and other procedures. Applicants for affordable multi-family projects that conform with underlying general plan and zoning designations need only to submit for building permits. Applications are routed to the Community Development Department to determine conformance with the City's objective multifamily development standards. Staff works with applicants directly on any minor design changes needed to ensure conformance thus allowing projects to remain in an expedited ministerial building permit review process. This process eliminates the need for a discretionary Site Development Permit and CEQA for affordable housing projects, but still requires impact studies where site conditions warrant them.

Objective Residential Development Standards

The City's multifamily residential design standards were prepared to be objective and not subject to varying interpretations or opinions in accordance with State law. A recent review conducted with the preparation of this Housing Element confirmed their objectivity. For instance, most of the standards are numerically based and require a minimum size such as requiring washer and dryer hook-ups in each dwelling unit (or garage) for projects of eight units or more. Other standards provide clear direction on requirements and are not subject to interpretation.

As of 2021, the City has also been working with an affordable housing developer to relax some of the multifamily development standards to be more conducive to affordable housing development. The Planning Commission and City Council are considering changes to the standards including reduced setbacks from industrial, commercial, and institutional uses; reduced landscape buffer requirements, more flexibility with building articulation, removal of

pad-mounted mechanical equipment attenuation requirements, and a reduction in private open space requirements.

Parcel Maps

A parcel map will be required if a housing project either spans multiple small parcels that need to be merged or for projects that are on large parcels and need to be subdivided for single family homes. Permits for a tract home or an apartment complex will require elevation approvals through a professional services application with the City. These applications often review the color, design, and style sheets associated with each development. In some cases, these elevation reviews include landscaping, materials, design elements, and wall/fence designs. This process, if it does not include environmental review, can take about 3 to 5 months for staff review and approval at public hearing. Then it goes through the Building Permit process. If the project is for a multi-family development, it can take about 6 months to 1 year including interagency review of parcel maps, and environmental studies before it goes to building permitting. After the approval of the planning permits, developers will move forward with grading permits and environmental surveys, and will serve letters prior to obtaining the building permits, which typically take 3 to 5 months of processing and analysis by Engineering and outside agencies.

Building Permit Processing Timeline

Residential projects typically take 3 to 6 months to complete the Building Permit plan check process, sometimes longer depending upon the size of the project and whether any impact studies are required. The City's permit procedures expedite planning and building approvals where possible and are not likely to unduly constrain housing development. The following discussion describes in detail the City's administrative development review procedures (such as discretionary Site Development Plan Review) as well as other discretionary review and approval processes.

Pre-Application Review

Prospective discretionary permit applicants are encouraged to meet with a City Planner prior to submitting an application. This preliminary meeting helps to expedite the development process. Applicants may also request a more detailed, formal pre-application review. This type of review can be helpful for large or more complex projects, and when the applicant desires review by multiple City departments, such as Engineering, Building, and Public Works. Pre-Application Review requires submittal of an application, fee, plans, and background information and can take from 5 to 8 weeks to process depending on the complexity of the project.

Following submittal, the application is routed to all City departments and outside agencies that need to review the formal entitlement application. For example, a Tentative Tract Map would be transmitted to utility companies (e.g., Southern California Edison, SoCal Gas), special districts (JCSD/RCSD/JARPD) and the County of Riverside.

Discretionary Site Development Permits (SDPs)

The City of Jurupa Valley requires a discretionary Site Development Permit for all residential projects with the exception of affordable housing developments that qualify for ministerial review. There are three basic levels of review for site development permits. Projects that are not subject to CEQA and are not combined with a general plan amendment, rezone or subdivision map, may be approved by the Community Development Director without the need for a public hearing. Site development projects that require a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), but are not combined with a general plan amendment, rezone or subdivision map, may be approved at a Community Development Director hearing. Site Development Permit projects which have policy implications, public controversy or include a general plan amendment, rezone or subdivision action, are considered by the Planning Commission and City Council at noticed public hearings.

At a minimum, projects needing an SDP require submittal of an application, fee, checklist, site plan and other exhibits, and supporting information to the Community Development Department. All SDPs require written notice to owners of property located within at least 300 feet of the proposed project boundaries. The time for processing an SDP varies with the complexity of the proposal. However, the review process for a minor SDP that is exempt from CEQA can usually be accomplished within 90 to 120 days. This process usually includes one to two rounds of plan reviews, which can last about 30 days each plan resubmittal, and a 21-day noticing period for public comments, after which the Community Development Director will take action. Projects subject to CEQA and those requiring approval by the Planning Commission and City Council typically take two to four rounds of review. The total processing time for these projects is variable and largely dependent on the completeness of project applications and supporting technical information as well as applicant's responsiveness to reviewer comments.

Land Use Controls Analysis

The City of Jurupa Valley's development approval process is designed to accommodate, not hinder, residential development. For example, developments of single-family homes and manufactured

homes on existing, individual lots in any residential zones that meet development standards (setbacks, lot size and coverage, building height, parking) do not require discretionary approval. They require only a building permit – a ministerial process – to allow construction. Similarly, multi-family housing is allowed “by right” in the R-3 Zone (General Residential). In all residential zones that do not allow multi-family by right would require a Site Development Permit (SDP). As described above, the SDP process provides a discretionary review process that allows most residential development projects to be evaluated for compliance with General Plan and Zoning Ordinance standards. The SDP will review the architectural designs and materials, landscaping, fencing, lighting, and parking in the process before evaluating for the necessary findings for the permit approval. The primary decision-making criteria to approve an SDP are:

1. The proposed use must conform to all the requirements of the Jurupa Valley General Plan and with all applicable requirements of state law and the ordinances of the city.
2. The overall development of the land shall be designed for the protection of the public health, safety and general welfare; to conform to the logical development of the land, and to be compatible with the present and future logical development of the surrounding property. The plan shall consider the location and need for dedication and improvement of necessary streets and sidewalks, including the avoidance of traffic congestion; and shall take into account topographical and drainage conditions, including the need for dedication and improvements of necessary structures as a part thereof.
3. All site development permits that permit the construction of more than one structure on a single legally divided parcel shall, in addition to all other requirements, be subject to a condition that prohibits the sale of any existing or subsequently constructed structures on the parcel until the parcel is divided and a final map is recorded in accordance with Title 7 in such a manner that each building is located on a separate legally divided parcel. The City’s processing and permit procedures are consistent with state planning and zoning law and are not considered to be an unreasonable constraint on the cost or supply of housing.

Applicants are given clear advice and direction during pre-application reviews on project processing requirements and timelines. Staff also advises applicants of potential issue areas and suggests changes that could be made prior to submittal of formal applications to minimize conflicts and/or processing times. Many projects are also scheduled for Planning Commission study sessions early in the process to gain input from decisionmakers about

potential issues. In making SDP findings, the Community Development Director, Planning Commission and City Council generally consider projects that are consistent with the General Plan to be “compatible with the present and future logical development of the surrounding property.” Where issues exist, the City seeks to work with project applicants on project modifications and revisions that are mutually beneficial in order to enable projects to move forward with minimal delays.

Conditional Use Permits (CUP)

A CUP is required for certain limited residential uses that are conditionally permitted in non-residential districts (e.g., General Commercial “C-1/C-P” zone district), such as congregate care residential facilities. CUPs can be approved, approved with conditions, or denied based on specific findings. Typically, the Planning Commission reviews and takes final action on CUPs, and appeals are considered by the City Council, who would then take final action on the matter. Any permit that is granted is subject to such conditions of approval as may be necessary to protect the health, safety, or general welfare of the community. Conditions of approval may include, but are not limited to, hours of operation, duration, site improvements (e.g., access, parking, landscaping, fencing, signage), off-site improvements (e.g., trails, frontage improvements, street trees), and architectural design. The City’s CUP process typically allows the Planning Commission to consider conditional uses within approximately 90 to 150 days if the project is exempt from environmental review requirements.

Development within Density Range

The decision on what residential densities to build to are largely market-driven as private developers strive to produce the most marketable housing. The City does not enforce minimum densities, meaning that developers may propose any density up to the maximum permitted by the underlying General or Specific Plan designation. However, development in Jurupa Valley generally falls at 75% of the maximum allowable density or above. In addition, City staff and decisionmakers, increasingly aware of the need to increase housing choice within the City, are generally encourage applicants to propose within the upper limits of the allowable density range.

Environmental Constraints

Potential environmental constraints to future development in the City include seismic and liquefaction hazards, urban and limited wildland fire hazards, and historical contamination by hazardous materials such as the Stringfellow property in the northern portion of the City. All sites identified in the Sites Inventory (Appendix A) that are intended to meet the City's RHNA needs are not within these areas that have development restrictions due to risk of damage from disasters (such as floods, wildfires, seismic events, or hazardous material contamination).

The sites inventory has land use designations that were determined based on surrounding land uses and has already examined potential environmental constraints. Aside from the typical constraints mentioned above, there are no additional constraints that would impede the development of new housing units in the future on the identified sites.

Seismic Hazards

As stated in the General Plan Community Safety, Services and Facilities Element, the entire City, as well as all of Southern California, is a seismically active region that has been subject to major earthquakes in the past. There are no known active faults in Jurupa Valley. However, the Rialto-Colton, San Jacinto, and Chino Faults are all located close to the City (i.e., within 5 miles). The greatest damage from earthquakes results from ground shaking. Although ground shaking is generally most severe near a quake epicenter, property not immediately adjacent to the epicenter may be subject to extreme damage due to liquefaction. The greatest potential danger is the collapse of older residential units constructed from unreinforced masonry, and explosions of petroleum and fuel lines. Some parts of the City have a combination of silts and sandy soil types and a relatively high water table that are conducive for liquefaction to occur during intense ground shaking. The State Mining and Geology Board has designated some areas in the City within a liquefaction zone. Most of these areas are along the Santa Ana River, but the far eastern and southwestern portions of the City are also susceptible to liquefaction. Much of the northern portion of the City, north of the SR 60 freeway, has moderate to very high susceptibility to landslides and soil slumps. There are also areas in the central portion of the City with steeper slopes that may be subject to soil block slides.

Development in much of the City will require geotechnical or soil constraints reports to mitigate the potential undermining of structural integrity during earthquakes or due to geologic or soil limitations.

Flooding

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) publishes maps that identify areas of the City subject to flooding in the event of a major storm. These Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) indicate areas that may be inundated in the event of a 100-year or a 500-year storm. In addition, the maps indicate the base flood elevations at selected intervals of the floodway. The City had been subject to periodic and historic flooding and flood insurance requirements imposed by FEMA until improvements were constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers on the Santa Ana River and other major flood control channels within the City. FEMA Flood Maps show that the City's main flood hazard zone lies in the southern portions of the City near the Santa Ana River, along Pyrite Creek, and in the far northwestern and western portions of the City just east of the I-15 freeway.

Some areas of the City that are designated for future residential development fall within the 100-year floodplain and would be subject to specialized flood construction requirements.

Fire Hazards

The most serious fire threat within the City is building and structure fires. However, like most Southern California cities adjacent to wildland areas (e.g., steep hills in the northern portion of the City), the late summer fires that result from the accumulation of this brush have the potential to spread into the City proper. Since the City center is largely developed, there is less potential for wildland fires in the more central portions of the City. Other fire hazards within the City may be associated with heavy industrial uses, older commercial and residential structures, the presence of hazardous materials, and arson. Only a small portion of the City is located within a designated Very High Fire Hazard Zone; and the sites identified to accommodate the City's 2021-2029 RHNA allocation are located outside of the high fire hazard zone and in largely developed urban or suburban areas that are not generally prone to wildland fire hazards.

Noise

Noise generated from mobile sources such as traffic will continue to have the greatest potential impact on land use (e.g., I-15 and SR 60 freeways, Mission Boulevard). In addition, noise from rail and aviation sources will also affect some community residents. The General Plan Noise Element describes the existing noise environment using maps that indicate high levels of noise and also contains goals and policies to reduce the effects of noise, if not the actual intensity of noise. Land use policy discourages the placement of noise-sensitive land uses in areas that are subject to high noise levels. The City regulates noise through the Jurupa Valley Ordinance

No. 2012-01: Noise Regulations, under the authority of §50022.9 of the *California Government Code*.

Each potential development that would occur as a result of the Housing Element and subsequent implementation would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and be required to adhere to the noise regulations set forth in the General Plan, and when applicable, mitigation measures as part of the CEQA documentation process, which would identify potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation measures at the individual project level.

Hazardous Materials

The City contains a number of industrial uses that produce, handle, store, or transport various hazardous materials at various times. However, the use and handling of these materials are governed by a variety of federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and should not pose a significant impediment to development in non-industrial portions of the City.

Portions of the City overlie an historical plume of groundwater contamination from the Stringfellow Class I Site located in Pyrite Canyon in the northern portion of the City at the headwater of Pyrite Creek. The Pyrite Channel runs through the central portion of the City in a northeast-southwest direction toward the Santa Ana River. The Stringfellow site is a major historical regional source of contamination in the Jurupa Valley and was one of the first designated federal “Superfund” sites. It is listed on many governmental databases regarding hazardous materials (e.g., NPL, CERCLIS, U.S. Engineering Controls, ROD, RCRA-SQC, CONCENT, and PRP databases). According to the Chino Basin Watermaster, the Stringfellow groundwater contamination plume consists primarily of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and perchlorate; however, the VOCs extend approximately 1 mile from the source area in the down-gradient direction with the remainder of the plume consisting of perchlorate. The presence of perchlorate represents a potential health hazard if the public were to encounter the contaminated Stringfellow groundwater plume; however, none of the sites identified to accommodate the City’s 2021-2029 RHNA allocation would be directly affected by the Stringfellow groundwater plume.

Infrastructure Constraints

The 2021-2029 Housing Element promotes the production of housing, which in turn may result in population growth. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is responsible for producing socioeconomic projections and developing, refining, and maintaining the SCAG regional and small area forecasting models. These forecast numbers are used to

forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Air Quality Management Plan, and the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations. The U.S. Census as reported by the California Department of Finance estimates the City’s 2015 population was 98,855 persons. SCAG’s most recently adopted demographics and growth forecast projects that the City’s population will grow to 117,800 persons by the year 2045.

With the exception of public streets, Jurupa Valley’s infrastructure, including parks, flood control, sewer and domestic water treatment and facilities are provided and maintained by the County of Riverside and by community service districts (CSDs), primarily the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the Rubidoux Community Services District (RCSD). These agencies were asked to provide input and received the 2021 Housing Element, as required by law. In addition, the City refers all pertinent development applications to the CSDs and requires that they be reviewed for adequate infrastructure and service capacity. Applications are evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure there is enough capacity to service new developments. The CSDs’ development requirements and comments are addressed as part of City approvals of planning applications.

The City has established standard street widths for different road types and *Table 5.53* summaries these requirements. In addition to requiring improvements to public streets, the City may also require on- and off-site improvements related to water supply, fire protection, sewage disposal, fences, and electrical and communication facilities.

Table 5.53: Street Design Standards

Street Type	Street Width (feet)	Number of Lanes
Expressway	184 to 220	6 to 8
Urban Arterial	152 minimum	6 to 8
Arterial	128 minimum	4 to 6
Major	118 minimum	4
Secondary	100 minimum	4
Collector	74 minimum	2
General Local	44-60	2

Source: City of Jurupa Valley Municipal Code, (2015)

Water Supply

Jurupa Valley’s domestic water is supplied primarily by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the Rubidoux Community Services District, with a small portion of old Mira Loma served by the Santa Ana Water Company. The JCSD service area comprises about 26,000 acres within the City of Jurupa Valley and the eastern portion of the City of Eastvale, while the RCSD service area includes

approximately 4,907 acres located in the northeastern portion of Jurupa Valley. Water sources for the JCSD and RCSD come primarily from the Chino Groundwater Basin and the Chino Basin Desalter Authority.

The Chino Basin is designated as a High Priority Basin under the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring (CASGEM) Program. The Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Bernardino adjudicated the Chino Groundwater Basin on January 27, 1978. The principal function of the adjudication is to control the use of the water source in order to ensure the source is utilized in an optimum manner. Operation of the basin is governed by the Judgment and agreement among producers, whereby producers are allotted a “Base Water Right” to a certain amount of the operating “Safe Yield” of the basin. According to the Judgment, participating entities including JCSD, can pump in excess of their allotted “Base Water Right” but must pay a replenishment assessment to the Watermaster to cover the cost to replenish any overdraft caused by the excess pumping. The provisions of the Judgment and the monitoring of the basin are carried out by the court-appointed Chino Basin Watermaster. The Watermaster files an annual report to the court that addresses pumping and replenishment.

In June 2021, JCSD and RCSD adopted their 2020 Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs), which detail each district’s current and future water supplies. The UWMPs found that with all of its existing and planned supplies, JCSD and RCSD can meet 100% of projected demand of growth in the City through 2045 under normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year demand conditions for expected growth. Projected demand was based on known projects and build-out under the Jurupa Valley and Eastvale General Plan land use designations including pipeline projects and housing on the sites inventory list contained in this Housing Element Update. As such, the districts will have adequate water supplies and infrastructure to serve pipeline projects and sites on the sites inventory list.

Regarding the proposed redesignation/rezone sites, Sites G and H are located within the RCSD service area with the remaining located within the JCSD service area. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Addendum prepared for this Housing Element Update includes an analysis of the additional water demand for the proposed redesignation/rezone sites. Based on water demand factors contained in the UWMPs, the increased water demands from the proposed redesignation/rezone sites would be within the current and projected supplies available from the JCSD and RCSD through the year 2045. Thus, adequate water supplies and infrastructure would be available to accommodate the City’s RHNA.

Wastewater Treatment

JCSD and RCSD also provide wastewater service to most of Jurupa Valley although, some areas in the City, particularly in Old Mira Loma and Sky Country, still rely on private septic systems. 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. The JCSD sends approximately 41% of wastewater to the Riverside County's Regional Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP) and 38% to the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) Treatment Plant, the remaining 13% is conveyed to the Inland Empire Brine Line (IEBL), whereas all of RCSD wastewater is transferred to the RWQCP.

Both JCSD and RCSD have existing and future capacity rights to the wastewater treatment facilities based on general plan build-out projections. Thus, the agencies will have adequate wastewater capacity to serve the pipeline projects ADUs, Specific Plans and sites inventory list outlined in this Housing Element Update.

The environmental Addendum prepared for this Housing Element Update includes an analysis of the additional wastewater demand for the proposed redesignation/rezone sites. Based on district wastewater generation rates, the Addendum determined that demand would not significantly impact wastewater flows to either treatment facility and development fees will offset the future expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. Thus, adequate wastewater supplies and infrastructure would be available to accommodate the City's RHNA.

Market Constraints

Land Prices

Land costs have a demonstrable influence on the cost and availability of affordable housing. Land prices are determined by a number of factors, most important of which are land availability and permitted development density. As land becomes less available, the price of land increases.

According to Lennar Homes, in 2020 unentitled multi-family land in the region typically sells for about \$400,000 per acre. By comparison, unentitled single-family land costs between \$300,000 and \$500,000 per acre, which only increases when developed. However, land cost is very site-specific; many factors such as location, size, shape, entitlement processes required, and environmental factors can impact land cost significantly. In general, land costs in Riverside County are significantly lower than in more urbanized counties of San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles counties.

Construction Costs

Current construction costs are primarily determined by the costs of materials and labor. They are also influenced by market demands and market-based changes in the cost of materials. Construction costs depend on the type of unit being built and the quality of the product being produced. However, construction costs are set by regional and national factors that rarely impede housing development in specific localities.

In Jurupa Valley, construction costs vary for single-family homes and multi-family homes. Different types of buildings are often considered when developing in Jurupa Valley, and there is a trend to develop housing through master planned and prefabricated units, where the cost is minimized. The California Building Standards Code 2019 adopted by the City of Jurupa Valley is updated to include the option to recertify older prefabricated or manufactured homes as long as they have been updated to meet the adopted Building Standards Code.

Financing

Mortgage interest rates have a large influence over the affordability of housing. Higher interest rates increase a homebuyer's monthly payment and decrease the range of housing that a household can afford. Lower interest rates result in lower monthly payments for the homebuyer and can increase the buyer's purchasing ability. With the market being affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, the current mortgage interest rates have dropped while price of homes holding steady in the medium range of \$540,000.

The availability of financing affects a person's ability to purchase or improve a home. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of the applicants. This applies to all loan applications for home purchases, improvements, and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance.

Table 5.54 summarizes the disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2017 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Jurupa Valley and the County of Riverside. Included is information on loan outcomes (i.e., the number of applications that were approved and originated, denied, withdrawn by the applicant, and incomplete).

Table 5.54: Disposition of Home Loans, 2019

Loan Type	Total Applicants	Percent Approved	Percent Denied
Jurupa Valley			
Government-backed	460	91.1%	8.9%
Conventional	1,637	82.6%	17.4%
Refinance	2,277	73.2%	26.8%
Home improvement	401	63.6%	36.4%
Total	4,775	77.3%	22.7%
Riverside County (Unincorporated)			
Government-backed	995	21.6%	78.4%
Conventional	1,143	72.4%	27.6%
Refinance	2,590	56.3%	43.7%
Home improvement	512	42.0%	58.0%
Total	5,420	62.7%	37.4%

Source: www.LendingPatterns.com™, July 2019

Home Purchase Loans

In 2019, 1,637 Jurupa Valley households applied for conventional loans to purchase homes, as shown in *Table 5.54*. Approximately 83% of these applications were approved and 17% were denied. The City’s approval rate was moderately higher than the approval rate for Riverside County. By comparison, 72% of conventional home loan applications countywide were approved while 28% were denied.

460 applications were submitted for the purchase of homes in Jurupa Valley through government-backed loans (e.g., FHA, VA) in 2019. Among applications for government-backed home purchase loans in the City, 91% were approved and 9% were denied. Again, the City’s approval rate for this loan type was much lower than that of Riverside County, where the approval rate for government-backed home purchase loans was 22%.

Refinance Loans

The vast majority of loan applications filed by Jurupa Valley residents in 2019 were for home refinance loans (2,277 applications). About 73% of these applications were approved, while 27% were denied. For the County, 56% of refinancing applications were approved.

Home Improvement Loans

Within the City of Jurupa Valley, home improvement loans were the least likely to be approved. Approximately 36% of home-improvement loan applications were denied and 64% were approved by lending institutions in 2019. The high proportion of denials may be explained by the nature of these loans. Most home improvement loans are second loans and therefore more difficult to qualify for due to high income-to-debt ratio requirements.

Energy Conservation Constraints

The City of Jurupa Valley is committed to conserving energy and reducing pollution associated with the production of electricity. The City continues to require compliance with Title 24 of the *California Administrative Code* on the use of energy efficient appliances and insulation. Through compliance with Title 24, new residential development has produced reduced energy demands. While local governments are limited in the impact they can have in this area, there are some significant steps cities can take to support this goal. The state mandate in 2019 started the implementation of solar panels inclusion on new structures and buildings in the California as of January 2020. Legislation like this includes aids in the City's effort to ensure that development in the community continues to grow in a sustainable fashion.

To further its energy conservation objectives, in September 2015, the City adopted an ordinance that establishes an expedited, streamlined permitting process for small residential rooftop solar energy systems.

The Jurupa Unified School District improved the energy efficiency of school campuses by implementing a comprehensive organizational behavior-driven energy conservation program in partnership with Energy Education starting in December of 2009.

Southern California Edison, which provides electrical service in Jurupa Valley, offers public information and technical assistance to developers and homeowners regarding energy conservation. Southern California Edison also provides a number of rebate programs for energy efficient new construction and home improvements. Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing is also available in Southern California to help homeowners finance energy efficiency upgrades or renewable energy installations.

In January 2020, the state mandated that all new construction required solar panels unless it was in a qualifying category of exemption. As a result, with this housing developers have started to offer solar packages as part of the sale price for a new single-family home with some exemptions when roof area and solar is not possible. The associated Green Code requirements should not constrain the developer; however, the cost of this requirement will likely be shouldered by the consumer, making the cost of purchasing a home increase.

H. HOUSING ELEMENT GOALS, AND POLICIES

The condition, availability, and cost of Jurupa Valley's housing stock are of vital importance to its residents and employers, and the City's

economy as a whole. The primary housing goals are meeting housing needs for all income groups, including market rate housing needs, housing conservation and improvement, equal housing opportunity, neighborhood improvement and removal of blight, energy conservation, and housing policy implementation. Policies and programs for each goal are described below.

Goals

- HE 1 Encourage and, where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.
- HE 2 Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.
- HE 3 Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.
- HE 4 Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.
- HE 5 Reduce residential energy and water use.
- HE 6 Affirmatively further fair housing.

Policies

HE 1 – Encourage Development of Quality Housing That Meets the City's Affordable Housing Needs

Policies

- HE 1.1 **Regional Housing Needs Allocation.** Changes to the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and Map shall provide and/or maintain sufficient land at appropriate densities to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the 2021-2029 Planning Period.
- HE 1.2 **Affordable Housing.** Encourage affordable residential development on sites zoned to allow multi-family residential uses and identified in the vacant land inventory, the City will adopt development incentives and standards to encourage lot consolidation, and to allow residential development at a density of up to 25 dwelling units per acre in the Highest Density Residential (HHDR) designation, where appropriate.
- HE 1.3 **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).** Encourage the development of ADUs on residentially zoned parcels, where appropriate through the creation of sample plans and development information packets.

- HE 1.4 **Housing Diversity.** Encourage the development of diverse housing types and housing densities to best meet the needs of the community.
- HE 1.5 **Preservation of Affordable Housing.** All residential development projects that receive City financial incentives shall be required to remain affordable, in compliance with the specific requirements of the program in which they participate.
- HE 1.6 **Availability of Suitable Sites.** Ensure the availability of suitable sites for the development of affordable housing to meet the needs of all household income levels, including special needs populations.
- HE 1.7 **Housing for Mentally Disabled.** Encourage the development of additional housing for the mentally disabled.
- HE 1.8 **Housing for Homeless Persons and Those at Risk of Homelessness.** In cooperation with other cities and/or the County of Riverside, assist in the development of emergency, transitional, permanent supportive housing and low barrier navigation centers for homeless persons and families and those at risk of homelessness.
- HE 1.9 **Housing for All Special Needs Groups.** Ensure and encourage the availability of housing to all Special needs populations and income levels.
- HE 1.10 **Self-Help Housing.** City will promote self-help housing programs (e.g., Habitat for Humanity) and, as budget allows, provide financial assistance.
- HE 1.11 **Innovative Housing.** Encourage innovative housing, site plan design, and construction techniques to promote new affordable housing, improve energy efficiency, and reduce housing costs.
- HE 1.12 **Starter Housing.** Consider allowing construction of high quality “starter housing” (single-family units up to 1,600 square feet) on smaller lots in Medium-High Density and High-density zones, and consider providing incentives such as flexible development standards, permit fast tracking, and City fee reductions.
- HE 1.13 **Code and Fee Transparency.** Ensure the City’s planning and development processes regulations and fees are readily accessible and transparent.
- HE 1.14 **Development Within Density Range.** Encourage development at the upper limits of the applicable general plan density range to increase housing choice in the City.

HE 2 – Conserve and Improve the Housing Stock, Particularly Housing Affordable to Lower Income and Special Housing Needs Households

Policies

- HE 2.1 **Retain Housing.** Where feasible and appropriate, older, sound housing should be retained, rehabilitated, and maintained as a significant part of the City’s affordable housing stock, rather than demolishing it. Demolition of non-historic housing may be permitted where conservation of existing housing would preclude the achievement of other housing objectives or adopted City goals.
- HE 2.2 **Removal of Affordable Housing.** Discourage the removal or replacement of sound housing that is affordable to extremely low, very-low, low- and moderate income households, and avoid discretionary approvals or other municipal actions that remove or adversely impact such housing unless: 1) it can be demonstrated that rehabilitation of lower-cost units at risk of replacement is financially or physically infeasible, or 2) an equivalent number of new units comparable or better in affordability and amenities to those being replaced is provided, or 3) the project will remove substandard, blighted, or unsafe housing.
- HE 2.3 **Public Housing.** Encourage the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue federal and state funds to modernize public housing affordable to very low and low-income households.
- HE 2.4 **Tax-Exempt Bonds.** Consider using tax-exempt private activity bonds for the financing of multi-family housing rehabilitation.
- HE 2.5 **Historic Residential Properties.** Consider adopting incentives for the preservation of historic residential structures, such as the Mills Act Program, which provides property tax relief for rehabilitation of historic properties, as well as grants for the identification of historic structures.
- HE 2.6 **Housing Rehabilitation Funding.** Pursue all available federal, state, and local funds to assist housing rehabilitation.
- HE 2.7 **Neighborhood Quality.** The condition and quality of residential neighborhoods is a key measure of a community’s housing health. The City will consider and promote the safety, appearance, and quality of

residential neighborhoods by preserving the fabric, amenities, spacing (i.e., building heights and setbacks), and overall character and quality of life in established neighborhoods.

- HE 2.8 **At-Risk Housing Preservation.** Work with Riverside County Housing Authority and other housing agencies to preserve the affordability of assisted housing and other affordable housing resources at risk of conversion to market rate housing utilizing federal, state, and local financing and subsidies, as City resources allow.

HE 3 – Promote Equal Housing Opportunities for All Persons

Policies

- HE 3.1 **Fair Housing Program.** Continue to support fair housing laws and organizations that provide fair housing information and enforcement.
- HE 3.2 **Housing Information.** Provide referrals to low-income households and households with special housing needs on how to obtain housing counseling, financing, and other housing information.
- HE 3.3 **Housing Opportunities for Seniors, Disabled Persons, Single Parent Households, Farmworkers, Veterans, Homeless, and all other Special Needs Groups.** Encourage and, as budget allows, help support programs and activities that promote affordable housing opportunities for seniors, disabled persons, single parent household, farm workers, homeless, veterans, and all other special needs groups.

HE 4 – Maintain and Enhance Residential Neighborhoods and Remove Blight

Policies

- HE 4.1 **Removal of Blight.** As part of development approvals, City budget and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) program and other municipal actions, give high priority to removing and reversing the effects of blight, particularly in residential neighborhoods and highly visible locations along major street and highway corridors. Within established neighborhoods, new residential development shall be of a character, scale, and quality that preserve the neighborhood character and maintain the quality of life for existing and future residents.

- HE 4.2 **Design Compatibility.** Higher density housing should maintain high quality standards for unit design, privacy, security, on-site amenities, and public and private open space. Such standards should be flexible enough to allow innovative and affordable design solutions and shall be designed to enhance prevailing neighborhood architectural and site character.
- HE 4.3 **Neighborhood Integration.** New neighborhoods should be an integral part of an existing neighborhood or should establish pedestrian, bicycle, and, where appropriate, equestrian linkages that provide direct, convenient, and safe access to adjacent neighborhoods, schools, parks and shopping.

HE 5 – Reduce Residential Energy and Water Use

Policies

- HE 5.1 **New Construction.** Encourage the development of dwellings with energy-efficient designs, utilizing passive and active solar features and energy-saving features that exceed minimum requirements in state law.
- HE 5.2 **Sustainable Design.** Residential developments should promote sustainability in their design, placement, and use. Sustainability can be promoted through a variety of housing strategies, including the following:
1. Maximize use of renewable, recycled-content and recycled materials, and minimize use of building materials that require high levels of energy to produce or that cause significant, adverse environmental impacts.
 2. Incorporate renewable energy features into new homes, including passive solar design, solar hot water, solar power, and natural ventilation and cooling.
 3. Minimize thermal island effects through reduction of heat-absorbing pavement and increased tree shading.
 4. Avoid building materials that may contribute to health problems through the release of gases or glass fibers into indoor air.
 5. Design dwellings for quiet, indoors and out, including appropriate noise mitigation for residential uses near noise sources such as highways, major streets, railroad tracks, and industrial uses.
 6. Design dwellings to be economical to live in due to reduced energy or resource use, ease of maintenance, floor area, or durability of materials.

7. Help inform residents, staff, and builders of the advantages and methods of sustainable design, and thereby develop consumer demand for sustainable housing.
8. Consider adopting a sustainable development rating system, such as the LEED® or Green Globes program.

HE 5.3 **Site and Neighborhood Design.** Residential site, subdivision, and neighborhood designs should consider sustainability. Some ways to do this include:

1. Design subdivisions to maximize solar access for each dwelling and site.
2. Design sites so residents have usable outdoor space with access to sun and shade.
3. Streets and access ways should minimize pavement devoted to vehicular use.
4. Use multi-purpose neighborhood “pocket parks”/ retention basins to purify street runoff prior to its entering creeks. Retention basins shall be designed to be visually attractive as well as functional. Fenced-off retention basins should be avoided.
5. Encourage cluster developments with dwellings grouped around significantly sized, shared open space in return for City approval of smaller individual lots.
6. Treat public streets as landscaped parkways, using continuous plantings at least 6 feet wide and, where feasible, median planters to enhance, define, and buffer residential neighborhoods of all densities from the effects of vehicle traffic.

HE 6 – Affirmatively further fair housing

Policies

HE 6.1 **Take Meaningful Action.** Take meaningful action to affirmatively further fair housing by implementing measures to improve housing mobility, provide new opportunities in higher opportunity areas, encourage place-based strategies for community revitalization and discourage displacement.

I. HOUSING ACTION PLAN

An important component of the Housing Element is the City's description of what it hopes to achieve during the current planning period. This is accomplished with a statement of goals, policies, actions, and quantified objectives on the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing to help meet the housing needs of all residents.

This section of the Housing Element presents the City's Housing Action Plan for the period 2021- 2029. The objectives and actions described in *Table 5.55* reflect the assessment of the City's housing needs and summarize Housing Element programs, responsible parties, and anticipated time frames for their implementation. Time frames are intended to be achieved unless determined by the City Council to be infeasible due to budget or staffing constraints. All items in *Table 5.55* are developed to further the goals set forth by the city and to meet newly implemented state and federal housing laws for the requirements of the 6th cycle and the needs of the growing community.

In addition to the Housing Action Plan, the City conducted a Fair Housing Assessment, as outlined in Appendix E. As required by HCD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) guidelines, the analysis includes a specific matrix of Fair Housing action items as outlined in Appendix E and *Table 5.55* below:

1. AFFH Issues
2. Contributing Factors
3. City Actions
4. Time frame and Priority



Figure 5-8: Housing construction in Jurupa Valley

Table 5.55: Housing Action Plan Summary, 2021-2029

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Goal HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for all special needs populations.			
Ensure that the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map designate sufficient land at appropriate densities and in appropriate locations to accommodate the City's fair share of regional housing needs.	HE 1.1.1. General Plan and Zoning Amendments. Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate 69.2 additional acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs; address all by-right requirements pursuant to Government Code section 65583.2, subdivisions (h) and (i); and amend the Zoning Ordinance as appropriate to be consistent with the General Plan.	Community Development Department / Planning Commission / City Council.	Initiate and adopt within by October 15, 2023.
Provide incentives to encourage development of Opportunity Sites and adaptive reuse of properties in all Residential Zones, with emphasis on Medium-High, High, Very High, and Highest Density Residential zones.	HE 1.1.2. Housing Authority Coordination. Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the nonprofit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Coordinate annually with the Riverside County Housing Authority.
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 1.1.3. Mobile Homeowner Assistance. As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups, including the development of multi-family affordable units.	HE 1.1.4. Affordable Housing Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least <u>10%</u> of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).	Community Development Department	Implement within 18 months of Housing Element Adoption.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Encourage and assist in the expedited housing development of affordable housing through state law qualification process to promote the production of affordable housing.	HE 1.1.5 Employee Housing Act Ordinance. Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code to include provisions for work force housing/ employee housing to ensure consistency with state law, including all requirements for the Employee Housing Act.	Community Development Department	Initiate within 6 months of Housing Element Adoption and adopt within 18 months of initiation.
	HE 1.1.6 Affordable Housing Development Review. Develop SB35 expedited review process guide and qualification checklist for the development of affordable housing units in the City for developers.	Community Development Department	Complete within 2022, monitor annually for updates.
Encourage the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in appropriate locations to expand housing opportunities for all income levels and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units. Develop ADU informational materials and 'as built' sample plans to promote the development of ADUs in the City; monitor the production and affordability of ADU's annually to ensure meeting the assumptions outlined in this element; and revisit the RHNA strategy mid-cycle if ADU production and affordability falls short of assumptions.	Community Development Department and Building and Safety Department	Complete ADU informational materials and 'as built' sample plans within 2022. Annually monitor ADUs permitted at the time of the Annual Progress Reports (APRs). If needed, revisit and adapt the RHNA strategy mid-cycle.
Maintain consistency with state law and encourage production of smaller, affordable housing where appropriate.	HE 1.1.8. Density Provisions. Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with government codes, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Complete by October 15, 2023.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and all special needs groups.	HE 1.1.9. Affordable Housing In-Lieu Fees. Establish a City affordable housing fund and affordable housing in-lieu fee program. Work with private housing developers to include affordable units and/or make in-lieu contribution to City's affordable housing fund.	Community Development Department	Establish affordable housing fund and in-lieu fee program within calendar year 2022. On an ongoing basis, work with private developers to include affordable units and/or make in-lieu contributions to the affordable housing fund.
	HE 1.1.10. City Development Fees. Develop a sliding scale fee assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).	Community Development Department	Adopt sliding scale fee assistance program within Fiscal Year 2022-2023.
Utilize grant funding to assist in the development of affordable housing and to improve neighborhoods.	HE 1.1.11. Assistance Programs. Create programs and grant application program to provide the CDBG funds obtained by the City to the community for neighborhood development.	Community Development Department	Ongoing for the 2021- 2029 planning period in coordination annually with the City's CDBG Program.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and all special needs groups.	HE 1.1.12. Site Identification. Work with public, private and nonprofit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs, and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of qualified projects determined by the City.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Assist developers, decision makers, and the public in identifying housing opportunities.	HE 1.1.13. Updated Land Use Inventory and Map. Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City's GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Establish Land Use Inventory and map within 2022-2023. Monitor annually within the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 1.1.14. Candidate Sites Mapping. Collaborate with developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.	Community Development Department	Complete within 18 months of Housing Element adoption.
Establish a shelter to help meet local needs for safe housing for homeless adults and children.	HE 1.1.15. Homeless Shelter. In cooperation with nonprofit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley's and adjacent communities' homeless shelter needs.	Community Development Department	Adopt a plan within 24 months of Housing Element adoption.
Address the broad range of needs of homeless persons.	HE 1.1.16. Homelessness Strategy. Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established within the City, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services. The strategy shall address all special needs categories including, but not limited to, persons with developmental disabilities and farmworkers.	Community Development Department	Adopt a strategy within 18 months of Housing Element adoption.
	HE 1.1.17. Update the I-P Zone Parking Standards for Emergency Shelters. Update the I-P Zone parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for Emergency Shelters to accommodate all staff working in emergency shelters, provided they do not require more parking for emergency shelters than other commercial uses within the I-P zone.	Community Development Department	Update the parking standards of the I-P zone for emergency shelters within 18 months of adoption of the Housing Element.
Provide government incentives to promote creative, private- and public sector housing products, particularly for lower income households and all special needs groups.	HE 1.1.18. Creative Housing Solutions. Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called "tiny houses," and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers. Incentives shall address all	Community Development Department	Adopt incentives within 24 months of Housing Element adoption.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
	special needs categories including, but not limited to, persons with developmental disabilities and farm workers.		
Encourage and coordinate activities of nonprofit housing providers in Jurupa Valley.	HE 1.1.19. Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers. Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for all special needs groups.	Community Development Department	Ongoing, 2021-2029 City will continue to consult with nonprofit housing providers at least annually and on an on-going basis as part of its annual CDBG outreach.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets including those for mobile homes, special development and multifamily dwellings.	HE 1.1.20. Flexible Standards. Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 1.1.21 Inclusionary housing Ordinance. Study the feasibility of adopting an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.	Community Development Department	Initiate study within 6 months of adoption of 6 th cycle housing element and adopt within 18 months from initiation
Encourage and assist the development of high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets, including needs for disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.22. Mixed Housing Types and Densities. Continue to work with residential developers to develop a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including affordable housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, small lot subdivisions, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 1.1.23 Lanterman Act Ordinance. Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code disability accessibility provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including all requirements for the Lanterman Act. In addition to allowing residential care facilities of six or fewer persons through a ministerial process, larger group homes of seven or more persons must be permitted ministerially, regardless of license.		Adopt in 18 months of adoption of 6 th cycle housing element
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.24. Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons. Apply for grant money and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.		Continued from 5 th Cycle and Ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Ensure the City's planning and development processes, regulations and fees are readily accessible and transparent.	HE 1.1.25 Code and Fee Transparency. Regularly review and update the City's website and other materials to ensure that planning and development processes, regulations and fees are readily accessible and transparent.	Community Development Department and Building and Safety Department.	Ongoing 2021-2029.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Encourage the development of transitional, temporary and permanent supportive housing, and low-barrier navigation centers for homeless adults and children and those at risk of homelessness.	HE 1.1.26 Transitional, Temporary and Permanent Supportive Housing, and Low Barrier Navigation Centers. Review and update the City's Zoning Code to ensure that transitional, temporary and permanent supportive housing and low barrier navigation centers are allowed by-right in zones allowing similar types of residential development as required by state law.	Community Development Department	Initiate within 12 months of adoption of the 6 th Cycle Housing Element.
Encourage development at the upper levels of the applicable General Plan density range.	HE 1.1.27 Development within Density Range. Encourage development at the upper limits of the allowable General Plan density range to increase housing choice in the City. Requests for densities below the allowable density range should generally be discouraged except where environmental constraints or other factors limit the development potential of a site.	Community Development Department	Ongoing 2021-2029.
GOAL HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.			
Conserve housing resources, particularly for historic resources and to provide cost- and resource-efficient, high quality affordable housing.	HE 2.1.1. Adaptive Housing Strategies. Develop program to assist in creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Work with HOME/CDBG Programs and develop adaptive housing strategies program by 2024.
Protect public health, safety and neighborhood quality for all persons; administer codes in a fair, consistent and community-responsive manner.	HE 2.1.2. Code Enforcement. Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.	Building and Safety Department and Code Enforcement Department	Ongoing 2021-2029.
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for special needs groups, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 2.1.3. Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation. Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through periodic outreach and mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.	Community Development Department	Work with FHCRC to develop a program for annual outreach to mobile home owners, non-profits and other agencies and fund three mobile home improvements per year beginning in FY 23/24 with CDBG funds.
Preserve affordable homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for special needs groups, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 2.1.4. Affordable Homes Conservation. Conserve affordable housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available. In addition, where affordable homes are in need of replacement, help with replacement through CDBG and other funds.	Community Development Department	Develop a program for affordable home repair and replacement within 36 months of Housing Element adoption.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Offer all persons an equal opportunity to participate in planning and housing decisions that affect them.	HE 2.1.5. Bilingual Outreach. As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and Ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.	HE 2.1.6. Monitor Assisted Units. Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Create inventory within Fiscal Year 2022-2023, monitor regularly for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 2.1.7. Preserve At-Risk Housing Units. Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by working with the Riverside County Housing Authority or other nonprofit housing entities to 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Create inventory within Fiscal Year 2022-2023, monitor regularly for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Preserve affordable housing as required by the funding agency or source of funds providing assistance to the project.	HE 2.1.8 Affordability Covenants. As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.	Community Development Department / City Council	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Remove or mitigate governmental constraints to housing such as outmoded, unnecessary, conflicting and excessive requirements.	HE 2.1.9 Remove Government Constraints. Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the City's density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.	Community Development Department, assisted by Building and Safety Department and Engineering Departments	Ongoing action for 2021-2029 planning period and annually assessed.
GOAL HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.			
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.1. Fair Housing Council. Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.2. Education and Outreach. Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (also see HE 3.1.1 above).	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Preserve existing public housing.	HE 3.1.3. Public Housing and Rental Assistance. Develop program to assist in creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Develop program within Fiscal Year 2022-2023 and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers.	HE 3.1.4. First-Time Homebuyers Assistance. Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Explore within Fiscal Year 2022-2023 and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
Ensure new multi-family housing meets the same high quality standards for safety, quality and environmental health that other housing types must meet for all income levels.	HE 3.1.5 Multi-Family Dwellings Standards. Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle. Adopt within Fiscal Year 2021-2021.
Ensure fair treatment of all persons in securing safe housing and to promote equal housing opportunities.	HE 3.1.6. Fair Housing Council. Collaborate with the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to continue to provide services to the community and accept requests, complaints and assistance for fair housing needs.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 3.1.7 Reasonable Accommodations. Establish a written procedure for providing reasonable accommodations in zoning code and land use.	Community Development Department	Initiate and complete in 18 months of Housing Element certification with HCD
GOAL HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.			
Enhance the quality of life in all residential areas and promote residents' active involvement in and support for neighborhood pride and improvement activities.	HE 4.1.1. Neighborhood Participation. Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.	Community Development Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 4.1.2. Neighborhood Needs. Identify specific neighborhood needs, problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.		
	HE 4.1.3. Neighborhood Improvements. As budget allows, help fund neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs,		

Objective	Action	Responsible Party	Time Frame
	sidewalks, pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways, street trees and other public facilities to improve aesthetics, safety, and accessibility.		
Establish a proactive code enforcement program to identify housing in need of repair and make owners aware of resources for financial assistance	HE 4.1.4. Neighborhood Pride. Working with Riverside County, CSDs and nonprofit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.	Community Development Department, Code Enforcement Department and Engineering Department	Develop within 18 months of Housing Element adoption and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
GOAL HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.			
Conserve resources, reuse and recycle solid waste, and improve environmental sustainability.	HE 5.1.1. Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.	Building and Safety Department, Community Development Department, and Engineering Department	Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 5.1.2. Energy Programs for Lower Income Households. Encourage and participate in Riverside County's and utility providers' programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.	Engineering Department, assisted by Community Development Department and Building and Safety Departments.	
	HE 5.1.3. Energy Conservation Grants. Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.		Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 5.1.4. City Requests for Proposals. City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.		Continued from 5 th Cycle and ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning period.
	HE 5.1.5. Sustainable Design. Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.		Adopt within 18 months of Housing Element adoption.
GOAL HE 6: Affirmatively further fair housing.			
Implement measures to affirmatively further fair housing.	HE 6.1.1. AFFH Actions. Address the AFFH issues outlined in Appendix E by implementing the AFFH action items contained in Table 5.56.	City Manager's Office, and Community Development Department.	On-going for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

The City complies with the State Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements by taking meaningful actions to address impediments identified in the Fair Housing Assessment located in Appendix E. In summary, the City of Jurupa Valley offers high opportunity areas but faces challenges in promoting and providing a range of housing types and prices suitable for lower-income households. Providing a range of affordable housing can help foster more inclusive communities and increase access to opportunities for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. *Table 5.56* summarizes fair housing issues, contributing factors, and implementing actions.

The actions listed below, along with the other programs identified in this section, were developed to cumulatively address the AFFH goals to counter act the disparities and issues that were identified in the AFFH analysis located in Appendix E. The timeframes and priority levels are added to ensure the implementation of these actions in a timely manner. The priority levels for these actions are defined as the following:

- High Priority contributing factors are those that have a direct and substantial impact on fair housing, and are core municipal functions that the City can control;
- Medium Priority factors are those that have a direct and substantial impact on fair housing, but the City has limited capacity to control their implementation;
- Low Priority factors may have a direct and substantial impact on fair housing choice, but the City lacks capacity to address it, or the factor may have only a slight or indirect impact on fair housing choice.

As shown in *Table 5.56*, the City intends to complete the necessary actions to meet the requirements of State AFFH requirements. These actions are integrated into the action plan for the overall 6th Cycle Housing Element with the specialized time frames for expedited implementation. The rationale for identifying these actions is to ensure they are implemented in a timely manner to better serve the community of Jurupa Valley. These actions are intended to alleviate the main issues identified in the Fair Housing Assessment and the City intends to implement these and all the action items outlined above during the 2021-2029 planning period. In addition, the City intends to monitor the AFFH actions on an annual basis in conjunction with the preparation of Annual Progress Reports (APRs) to ensure the goals are being met. If any action items are not being achieved, the City will adjust its metrics, timeframes and commitments as necessary in FY 24/25 to ensure it meets its AFFH goals.

Table 5.56 – Fair Housing Program Action Items

Action Area	Programs	Specific Commitment	Timeframe	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
Housing Mobility					
Accessory Dwelling Units	Encourage the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in appropriate locations to expand housing opportunities for all income levels and special needs groups.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop ADU informational materials and 'as built' sample plans to promote the development of ADUs in the City. 2. Monitor the production and affordability of ADUs annually to ensure the City is meeting the assumption of 15 ADUs per year as outlined in this Housing Element. 	High priority / within 18 months of Housing Element adoption.	Citywide, target marketing and outreach efforts in higher opportunity areas.	Complete ADU informational materials and 'as built' sample plans within 2022. Annually monitor ADUs permitted at the time of the Annual Progress Reports (APRs). Target 20% of ADUs in higher opportunity areas.
Public Housing and Rental Assistance	Support HACR's Housing Choice Voucher Assistance Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage the HARC to continue to provide housing choice vouchers to a minimum of 344 households in Jurupa Valley and increase voucher usage in higher opportunity areas. 2. Work with HARC and FHCRC to encourage small property owners to participate in HACR's Housing Choice Voucher Assistance Program 	Low priority / within 36 months of Housing Element adoption	Increase the number of voucher assistance recipients in higher opportunity areas. Target education and marketing efforts throughout the community with an emphasis on higher opportunity areas.	Increase the number of low-income recipients in receiving voucher assistance in higher opportunity areas by 5% by FY 24/25.

Action Area	Programs	Specific Commitment	Timeframe	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
New Opportunities in Higher Opportunity Areas					
Provide Housing Opportunities in Higher Opportunity Areas for all Members of the Community	Provide government incentives to promote creative private and public-sector housing products, particularly for lower income households and all special needs groups.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), prefabricated housing, tiny houses, and other emerging housing products through fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting funding applications, etc. 2. Work with local developers to include affordable housing units in all new housing developments during the entitlement process. 3. Develop an inclusionary housing ordinance to increase the variety of affordable housing to provide for special needs groups that aren't being reached right now according to the AFFH. 4. Allocate funding for Infrastructure improvements citywide including, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, complete streets and corridor beautification, ADA improvements, and Safe Routes to School enhancements with a priority in the most economically impacted neighborhoods. 	Medium priority / within 24 months of Housing Element adoption	Target creative housing types throughout the City with an emphasis on higher opportunity areas. Provide affordable housing throughout the City with an emphasis on higher opportunity areas and areas of concentrated poverty. Prioritize funding for infrastructure improvements in areas of concentrated poverty.	Creative incentive packages for creative housing solutions in FY23/24. Develop an inclusionary housing ordinance and promote the inclusion of affordable units in every housing project in entitlement beginning in FY22/23. Target 30% of new affordable housing in higher opportunity areas and 30% in areas of concentrated poverty. Prioritize funding for infrastructure improvements in the most impacted areas beginning in FY 23/24.

Action Area	Programs	Specific Commitment	Timeframe	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
Traditional Neighborhood Design Standards	Adopt and implement Traditional Neighborhood Design Standards ordinance to allow smaller single-family homes on smaller lots and increase housing choice and affordability.	Promote the development of smaller single-family homes on smaller lots using the Traditional Neighborhood Design Standards to developers through the entitlement process. Also develop promotional materials such as educational fliers/handouts on Traditional Neighborhood Design Standards for dissemination to the development community and in meetings with developers.	High Priority / adopt ordinance in FY 21/22, Medium Priority / implementation ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning cycle.	Higher opportunity areas designated for single-family residential development at 2+ dwelling units per acre.	Increase the affordability of new single-family residential subdivisions by 5% in high opportunity areas and throughout the City by the end of the 2021-2029 planning period.
Place-based Strategies for Community Revitalization					
Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation	Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for special needs groups	1. Conservation. Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through periodic outreach and mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.	Medium priority / within 24 months of Housing Element adoption.	Existing mobile home parks and areas of concentrated poverty and higher need.	Work with FHCRC to develop a program for annual outreach to mobile home owners, non-profits and other agencies and fund three mobile home improvements per year beginning in FY 23/24 with CDBG funds.
Substandard Housing Conditions	Undertake efforts to correct disparities in the provision of standard housing conditions due to the lack of new housing affordability, age of housing stock and cost of repairs or rehabilitation.	1. Allocate CDBG grant for housing update and rehabilitation for most aged housing stock for homes older than 50 years.	Medium priority / within 24 months of Housing Element adoption.	Census tracts 404.02, 405.03, and 406.04 and other areas of concentrated poverty and higher need.	Allocate CDBG funding for five houses per year beginning in FY23/24.
Enforcement and Outreach to Reduce Discrimination	Reduce fair housing discrimination by small landlords resulting from the lack of local private fair housing outreach and enforcement, resources for fair housing agencies and organizations, and state or local fair housing laws to support strong enforcement.	1. Allocate CDBG funding to creating locally hosted educational workshops on fair housing to reduce the amount of discrimination 2. Provide social media and fact sheets/resource alternatives to access fair housing info with links to the City website 3. Collaborate with Fair Housing Council of Riverside County for continued	Medium priority / within 24 months of Housing Element adoption	Citywide	Allocate CDBG funding for a minimum of two educational workshops per year and provide social media and fact sheets on fair housing beginning in FY23/24.

Action Area	Programs	Specific Commitment	Timeframe	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
		tracking of fair housing enforcement for discrimination cases.			
Support At-Risk Children and Youth	Support the Rubidoux Youth Opportunity Center provide support, encouragement and opportunities to at-risk youth facing abandonment and neglect.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide informational materials on the Youth Opportunity Center at City Hall and promote the Center through social media platforms and regular updates at City Council meetings. 2. Make meeting rooms available to the Center at the City's Jurupa Valley Operations Center located in the Rubidoux area. 3. Assist the Center in the preparation of grant applications as needed. 4. Work with the Rubidoux Youth Opportunity Center to promote their services in census tracts with concentrated poverty and highest need. 	Medium priority / within 24 months of Housing Element adoption	Census tracts 404.02, 405.03, and 406.04 and other areas of concentrated poverty and higher need.	Promote and provide assistance to the Center beginning in FY 23/24. Target promotion of resources twice a year. Please note, it is difficult to quantify the outcomes of this action item but the City is committed to supporting at-risk youth in the Rubidoux community and throughout the City.
Provide Additional Parkland in Areas of Concentrated Poverty	Support the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District's acquisition and development of a neighborhood park in the Rubidoux Community.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical support and assistance to JARPD to acquire and develop a ¼ acre park in the Mission / Wallace / Daly area. 	Low priority / within 36 months of Housing Element adoption	Areas of concentrated poverty and higher need within the Rubidoux Community	Provide a new neighborhood park in the Rubidoux Community by FY 24/25.
Promote Meaningful Engagement in the Public Decision-Making Process	Continue to implement the policies of the Environmental Justice Element to promote meaningful engagement in the public decision-making process among disadvantaged populations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that affected residents have the opportunity to participate in decisions that affect their health (EJ 1.1). 2. Schedule public meetings on key issues affecting the public at times and locations most convenient to community members (EJ 1.4). 3. Provide translation and interpretation services at public meetings on issues affecting populations whose primary language is not English. Translation time should not be taken from the person's time limit for comments (EJ 1.6). 	High priority / ongoing for the 2021-2029 planning cycle	Areas of concentrated poverty and higher need.	Increase participation in the public decision-making process by disadvantaged persons by 10% by the end of the 2021-2029 planning cycle.

Action Area	Programs	Specific Commitment	Timeframe	Geographic Targeting	Metrics
Displacement					
Displacement Risk of Low Income Residents Due to Economic Pressures	Reduce disparities in the loss of affordable units and encourage the development of affordable units to reduce the displacement of residents due to unaffordable rents, the concentration of poverty in some tracts, and the availability of affordable housing.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with FHCRC to continue to provide access to aid and financial counseling for residents and develop an outreach plan for the neighborhoods with the greatest concentration of poverty. 2. Promote development of affordable units through City policies and State Law on every housing project in entitlement 	Low priority / within 36 months of Housing Element adoption	Target financial aid and counseling on areas of concentrated poverty and higher need. Promote the development of affordable units in higher opportunity areas.	Provide financial aid and counseling through FHCRC to a minimum 5 households per year beginning in FY24/25; promote the inclusion of affordable units on every housing project in entitlement in FY22/23.

J. QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

The State requires that the Housing Element include an assessment of quantified objectives during the 6th Cycle planning period. Quantified objectives are estimates of the number of housing units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated, or preserved by income level between 2021 and 2029. Estimates are based on the trends, goals, policies and objectives outlined throughout this Housing Element and may differ from the City’s RHNA requirement. They represent the City’s best assessment on what is likely to be built during the planning period based on needs, resources, and constraints. *Table 5.57* below summarizes the City’s Quantified Objectives for the 2021-2029 planning period.

Table 5.57: Quantified Objectives

Income Category	RHNA Targets 2021-2029	Units that Could be Constructed 2021-2029	Units that Could be Rehabilitated 2021-2029	Units that Could be Preserved 2021-2029
Extremely Low	604	180	8	12
Very Low	603	180	8	12
Low	749	450	16	16
Moderate	731	625	18	--
Above Moderate	1,810	1,810	--	--
Total	4,497	3,245	50	40

###

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Specific Plan Capacity and Vacant Sites Inventory

Appendix B – Proposed Redesignation/Rezone Sites

Appendix C – Public Participation

Appendix D – Evaluation of Previous Housing Element/Past Accomplishments

Appendix E – Fair Housing Assessment

Appendix A – Specific Plan Capacity and Vacant Sites Inventory

1. Specific Plans

As outlined in the Housing Element, as of 2021, there are four Specific Plans in the City of Jurupa Valley with remaining residential capacity: the I-15 Corridor, Emerald Meadows Ranch, Rio Vista and Paradise Knolls Specific Plans. The remaining residential capacity and projected build-out of each Specific Plan within the 2021-2029 planning period varies by area as outlined in Table A-1.

Table A-1 2021-2029 Projected Specific Plan Development

Specific Plan	Income Level				Total (DUs)
	Very Low (DUs)	Low (DUs)	Moderate (DUs)	Above Moderate (DUs)	
I-15 Corridor (100%)	–	–	–	508	508
Emerald Meadows Ranch (50%)	–	–	238	360	598
Rio Vista (60%)	–	–	440	578	1,018
Paradise Knolls (100%)	195	105	–	6	306
Total	195	105	678	1,452	2,430

Development of the I-15 Corridor and Paradise Knolls Specific Plans is well underway, and these areas are anticipated to completely build out within the 2021-2029 planning period. Development of the Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan has not started, and the property owner has just initiated conversations with the City about land use changes and ultimate build-out as of the date of preparation of this document. It is anticipated that the area will begin construction in 2025 and achieve 50% build-out within the planning period. Similarly, development of the Rio Vista Specific Plan has not begun although the property owner is much further along in pursuing entitlements. As such, development of the Rio Vista Specific Plan is anticipated to begin in 2024 and achieve 60% build out within the planning period. Figure A-1 through Figure A-4 illustrate the land use plans for each Specific Plan. A detailed land use summary by parcel number and income assumption is included in Table A-2.

Figure A-1 Land Use Plan, I-15 Corridor Specific Plan




Figure A-2 Land Use Plan, Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan




Figure A-3 Rio Vista Specific Plan




Figure A-4 Land Use Plan, Paradise Knolls




Table A-2 Specific Plans with Remaining Residential Capacity

Jurupa Valley Housing Element Sites Inventory Specific Plans with Remaining Residential Capacity 9/24/2021												
SP Planning Area	Site Size (acres)	Assessor Parcel No.	Notes	Exist. GP Desig.	Exist. Zone	Developable Acreage	Min Density	Max Density	Density Assumption	Potential Units	RHNA Category	
I-15 CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN												
10	5.0	160050005	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	5.0	3	5	4.3	21	Abv Mod	
10	3.2	160050068	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	3.2	3	5	4.3	14	Abv Mod	
10	1.1	160050067	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	1.1	3	5	4.3	5	Abv Mod	
10	5.5	160050023	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	5.5	3	5	4.3	24	Abv Mod	
10	6.4	160050074	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	6.4	3	5	4.3	28	Abv Mod	
10	7.4	160050073	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	7.4	3	5	4.3	32	Abv Mod	
10	1.1	160050072	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	1.1	3	5	4.3	5	Abv Mod	
13	4.7	160050067	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	4.7	3	5	4.3	20	Abv Mod	
13	3.6	160050063	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	3.6	3	5	4.3	15	Abv Mod	
13	76.3	160050070	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	76.3	3	5	4.29	327	Abv Mod	
13	4.2	160050072	Per SP	Med R-1	SP	4.2	3	5	4.3	18	Abv Mod	
SUBTOTAL I-15 CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN										508		
Very Low/Extremely Low										0		
Low										0		
Mod										0		
Above Mod										508		
SUBTOTAL:										508		
Anticipated 2021-2029 Build-Out:										100%		
Above Mod										508		
Total Anticipated Development 2021-2029:										508		

EMERALD MEADOWS RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN											
3A	4.31	178310023	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	4.31		4.3	18	Abv Mod	
3A	0.56	178310005	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	0.56		4.3	2	Abv Mod	
3A	0.88	178310024	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	0.88		4.3	4	Abv Mod	
3A	0.01	179270001	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	0.01		4.3	0	Abv Mod	
3A	1.77	179310001	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	1.77		4.3	8	Abv Mod	
3A	0.14	179310004	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	0.14		4.3	1	Abv Mod	
3A	0.95	179310005	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	0.95		4.3	4	Abv Mod	
			Subtotal P.A. 3A						37	Abv Mod	
3B	14.65	179310001	Per SP	Med-SFD 7000 SF Lots	SP	14.65			60	Abv Mod	
			Subtotal P.A. 3B						60	Abv Mod	
6A	0.33	179230019	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.33		7.1	2	Abv Mod	
6A	0.26	179270016	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.26		7.1	2	Abv Mod	
6A	2.88	179270018	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	2.88		7.1	20	Abv Mod	
6A	2.19	179270033	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	2.19		7.1	16	Abv Mod	
6A	2.69	179270017	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	2.69		7.1	19	Abv Mod	
6A	2.46	179270001	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	2.46		7.1	17	Abv Mod	
6A	0.00	179270014	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.00		0.0	0	Abv Mod	
6A	0.66	179270034	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.66		7.1	5	Abv Mod	
6A	0.15	179270028	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.15		7.1	1	Abv Mod	
6A	9.57	179170016	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	9.57		7.1	68	Abv Mod	
6A	0.08	179270015	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.08		7.1	1	Abv Mod	
6A	0.02	179270026	Per SP	Med High-SFD 2240 SF Lots	SP	0.02		7.1	0	Abv Mod	
			Subtotal P.A. 6A						151	Abv Mod	
6B	0.00	179270013	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.00		0.0	0	Abv Mod	
6B	0.31	179270016	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.31		5.5	2	Abv Mod	
6B	0.21	179270001	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.21		5.5	1	Abv Mod	
6B	0.39	179270014	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.39		5.5	2	Abv Mod	
6B	9.14	179310001	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	9.14		5.5	50	Abv Mod	
6B	1.51	179340005	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	1.51		5.5	8	Abv Mod	
6B	0.34	179270015	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.34		5.5	2	Abv Mod	
6B	0.50	179310005	Per SP	Med -SFD 6000 SF Lots	SP	0.50		5.5	3	Abv Mod	
			Subtotal P.A. 6B						68	Abv Mod	
6C	0.32	179230019	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.32		5.1	2	Abv Mod	
6C	0.33	179270018	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.33		5.1	2	Abv Mod	
6C	0.08	179270033	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.08		5.1	0	Abv Mod	
6C	0.59	179270017	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.59		5.1	3	Abv Mod	
6C	0.21	179270020	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.21		5.1	1	Abv Mod	
6C	0.20	179270035	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.20		5.1	1	Abv Mod	
6C	0.54	179270028	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.54		5.1	3	Abv Mod	
6C	0.48	179270026	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.48		5.1	2	Abv Mod	
			Subtotal P.A. 6C						14	Abv Mod	

7	1.03	179230018	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	1.03		4.2	4	Abv Mod
7	0.88	179230010	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.88		4.2	4	Abv Mod
7	0.24	179230019	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.24		4.2	1	Abv Mod
7	0.17	179230003	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.17		4.2	1	Abv Mod
7	0.54	179230013	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.54		4.2	2	Abv Mod
7	0.26	179230015	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.26		4.2	1	Abv Mod
7	0.72	179230016	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.72		4.2	3	Abv Mod
7	0.83	179230011	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.83		4.2	4	Abv Mod
7	0.81	179230017	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.81		4.2	3	Abv Mod
7	0.41	179230014	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.41		4.2	2	Abv Mod
7	0.73	179230012	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.73		4.2	3	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 7						28	Abv Mod
9	0.13	179180005	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.13		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.13	179180006	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.13		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.14	179180003	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.14		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.14	179180013	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.14		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.13	179180002	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.13		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	1.01	179170018	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	1.01		4.7	5	Abv Mod
9	0.15	179180010	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.15		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.14	179180004	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.14		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.18	179180011	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.18		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.02	179180014	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.02		4.7	0	Abv Mod
9	0.04	179180001	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.04		4.7	0	Abv Mod
9	0.09	179180015	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.09		4.7	0	Abv Mod
9	0.13	179180007	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.13		4.7	1	Abv Mod
9	0.14	179180008	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.14		4.7	1	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 9						12	Abv Mod
10	0.21	179140021	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.21		5.1	1	Abv Mod
10	5.35	179170020	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	5.35		5.1	27	Abv Mod
10	0.17	179170001	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.17		5.1	1	Abv Mod
10	0.11	179170007	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.11		5.1	1	Abv Mod
10	0.48	179170019	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.48		5.1	2	Abv Mod
10	0.03	179170004	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.03		5.1	0	Abv Mod
10	1.59	179170005	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	1.59		5.1	8	Abv Mod
10	0.43	179140008	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	0.43		5.1	2	Abv Mod
10	5.82	179170018	Per SP	Med SFD-5500 SF Lots	SP	5.82		5.1	30	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 10						72	Abv Mod

11	1.43	179140011	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	1.43		5.0	7	Abv Mod
11	0.35	179140014	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.35		5.0	2	Abv Mod
11	0.51	179140017	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.51		5.0	3	Abv Mod
11	0.62	179140021	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.62		5.0	3	Abv Mod
11	0.05	179170020	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.05		5.0	0	Abv Mod
11	1.87	179140009	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	1.87		5.0	9	Abv Mod
11	0.65	179140013	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.65		5.0	3	Abv Mod
11	0.24	179140005	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.24		5.0	1	Abv Mod
11	0.36	179140007	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.36		5.0	2	Abv Mod
11	3.36	179140008	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	3.36		5.0	17	Abv Mod
11	1.38	179140015	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	1.38		5.0	7	Abv Mod
11	0.27	179140006	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.27		5.0	1	Abv Mod
11	0.06	179140016	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	0.06		5.0	0	Abv Mod
11	1.46	179140020	Per SP	Med SFD-6000 SF Lots	SP	1.46		5.0	7	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 11						63	Abv Mod
13	0.15	178310033	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.15		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.31	178310017	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.31		5.3	2	Abv Mod
13	0.16	178310040	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.16		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.41	178310043	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.41		5.3	2	Abv Mod
13	0.15	178310039	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.15		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.38	178310018	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.38		5.3	2	Abv Mod
13	0.22	178310047	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.22		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.21	178310049	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.21		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	1.19	179170015	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	1.19		5.3	6	Abv Mod
13	0.21	178310034	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.21		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.17	178310030	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.17		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	0.20	178310045	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	0.20		5.3	1	Abv Mod
13	1.01	179170016	Per SP	Med SFD-7000 SF Lots	SP	1.01		5.3	5	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 13						25	Abv Mod
14	0.87	178310014	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.87		5.4	5	Abv Mod
14	0.18	178261002	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.18		5.4	1	Abv Mod
14	0.47	179170001	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.47		5.4	3	Abv Mod
14	2.60	179170007	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	2.60		5.4	14	Abv Mod
14	1.19	178310011	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	1.19		5.4	6	Abv Mod
14	0.17	178310032	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.17		5.4	1	Abv Mod
14	0.72	179170003	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.72		5.4	4	Abv Mod
14	5.76	179170008	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	5.76		5.4	31	Abv Mod
14	0.17	179170004	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.17		5.4	1	Abv Mod
14	1.03	178310013	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	1.03		5.4	6	Abv Mod
14	0.86	178310015	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.86		5.4	5	Abv Mod
14	0.23	178310007	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.23		5.4	1	Abv Mod
14	1.74	178310009	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	1.74		5.4	9	Abv Mod
14	0.47	178310012	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.47		5.4	3	Abv Mod
14	4.04	178310031	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	4.04		5.4	22	Abv Mod
			SUBTOTAL P.A. 14						111	Abv Mod

15	1.41	178310023	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	1.41	5.6	8	Abv Mod
15	4.95	178310006	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	4.95	5.6	28	Abv Mod
15	0.25	178310041	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.25	5.6	1	Abv Mod
15	0.51	178310005	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.51	5.6	3	Abv Mod
15	0.98	178310008	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.98	5.6	5	Abv Mod
15	0.41	178310042	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.41	5.6	2	Abv Mod
15	0.89	178310051	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.89	5.6	5	Abv Mod
15	4.30	178310009	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	4.30	5.6	24	Abv Mod
15	0.30	178310031	Per SP	Med Hi SFD-5000 SF Lots	SP	0.30	5.6	2	Abv Mod
			SUBTOTAL P.A. 15					78	Abv Mod
16	0.86	178300005	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.86	13.3	11	Mod
16	0.31	178300006	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.31	13.3	4	Mod
16	0.38	178300007	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.38	13.3	5	Mod
16	0.28	178310002	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.28	13.3	4	Mod
16	0.02	178300001	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.02	13.3	0	Mod
16	0.89	178310004	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.89	13.3	12	Mod
16	0.79	178310006	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.79	13.3	10	Mod
16	1.85	178310001	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.85	13.3	25	Mod
16	0.97	178310003	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.97	13.3	13	Mod
16	0.82	178310005	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.82	13.3	11	Mod
16	1.00	178300003	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.00	13.3	13	Mod
16	0.47	178300004	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.47	13.3	6	Mod
16	0.12	178300002	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.12	13.3	2	Mod
16	0.55	178300008	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.55	13.3	7	Mod
16	2.47	178310007	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	2.47	13.3	33	Mod
16	0.02	178310009	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.02	13.3	0	Mod
			SUBTOTAL P.A. 16					157	Mod
18	1.19	178262001	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.19	13.8	16	Mod
18	0.74	178262005	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.74	13.8	10	Mod
18	0.72	178262006	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.72	13.8	10	Mod
18	0.22	178262007	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.22	13.8	3	Mod
18	0.01	178300001	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.01	13.8	0	Mod
18	0.14	178261002	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.14	13.8	2	Mod
18	0.03	178262008	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.03	13.8	0	Mod
18	1.04	178262002	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.04	13.8	14	Mod
18	0.95	178262003	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	0.95	13.8	13	Mod
18	1.85	178262004	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.85	13.8	25	Mod
18	1.43	178310007	Per SP	High SFA-12 du/ac	SP	1.43	13.8	20	Mod
			SUBTOTAL P.A. 18					115	Mod

19	0.77	178252004	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	0.77		17.7	14	Mod
19	0.78	178262001	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	0.78		17.7	14	Mod
19	4.55	178261001	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	4.55		17.7	80	Mod
19	1.87	178261002	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	1.87		17.7	33	Mod
19	2.42	179170001	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	2.42		17.7	43	Mod
19	1.04	178252003	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	1.04		17.7	18	Mod
19	0.00	178262002	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	0.00		17.7	0	Mod
19	0.10	179130007	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	0.10		17.7	2	Mod
19	0.04	178310007	Per SP	Very Hi-MF	SP	0.04		17.7	1	Mod
SUBTOTAL P.A. 19									204	Mod
SUBTOTAL EMERALD MEADOWS RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN										
Very Low/Extremely Low									0	
Low									0	
Mod									476	
Above Mod									720	
SUBTOTAL:									1196	
Anticipated 2021-2029 Build-Out:										
Mod									50%	
Above Mod									238	
Total Anticipated Development 2021-2029:									360	
									598	

RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN										
1	25.36	177030014	Per SP	MDR	SP	25.36	5	4.4	113	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 1						113	Abv Mod
2	10.98	177030014	Per SP	MDR	SP	10.98	5	4.4	52	Abv Mod
2	11.73	175080010	Per SP	MDR	SP	11.73	5	4.4	55	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 2						107	Abv Mod
3	13.00	175080010	Per SP	HDR	SP	13.00	14	8.8	99	Abv Mod
3	6.64	175090004	Per SP	HDR	SP	6.64	14	8.8	50	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 3						149	Abv Mod
4	18.48	175080010		HHDR	SP	18.48	25	18.4	314	Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 4						314	Mod
5	14.02	175080010	Per SP	MHDR	SP	14.02	8	8.7	116	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 5						116	Abv Mod
6	11.73	175090001	Per SP	HDR	SP	11.73	14	8.8	101	Abv Mod
6	18.11	175080010	Per SP	HDR	SP	18.11	14	8.8	157	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 6						258	Abv Mod
7	10.97	175080021		MDR	SP	10.97	5	4.4	45	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 7						45	Abv Mod
8	9.78	175090001		MDR	SP	9.78	5	4.4	41	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 8						41	Abv Mod
9	13.37	175090001		MDR	SP	13.37	5	4.4	44	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 9						44	Abv Mod
10	19.15	175090001		MDR	SP	19.15	5	4.4	85	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 11						85	Abv Mod
11	0.50	175080010		HHDR	SP	0.50	25	18.4	9	Mod
11	2.07	175090003		HHDR	SP	2.07	25	18.4	36	Mod
11	21.30	175090004		HHDR	SP	21.30	25	18.4	375	Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 6						420	Mod
12	2.62	175100003		VLDR	SP	2.62	1	0.8	2	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 12						2	
13	3.67	175150002		VLDR	SP	3.67	1	0.8	3	Abv Mod
			Subtotal P.A. 13						3	Abv Mod

SUBTOTAL RIO VISTA SPECIFIC PLAN										
										0
										0
										734
										963
										SUBTOTAL:
										1697
										Anticipated 2021-2029 Build-Out:
										60%
										440
										578
										Total Anticipated Development
										2021-2029:
										1018

PARADISE KNOLLS SPECIFIC PLAN											
PA 2	8.0	162230012	Per SP	Highest Density Resid.	SP	8	20	20+	28	225	35% Low 65% VLow
PA 2	2.6	162230014	Per SP	Highest Density Resid.	SP	2.6	20	20+	28	75	35% Low 65% VLow
PA 4	4.6	162220019	Per SP	Low Density Resid.	SP	4.6	0	2	1.3	6	Abv Mod
SUBTOTAL PARADISE KNOLLS SPECIFIC PLAN										306	
Very Low/Extremely Low										195	
Low										105	
Mod										0	
Above Mod										6	
SUBTOTAL:										306	
Anticipated 2021-2029 Build-Out:										100%	
Very Low/Extremely Low										195	
Low										105	
Above Mod										6	
Total Anticipated Development 2021-2029:										306	
TOTAL ANTICIPATED BUILD-OUT ALL SPECIFIC PLANS 2021-2029											
Total Specific Plan Development 2021-2029				Income Level				Total			
				Very Low (DUs)	Low (DUs)	Moderate (DUs)	Abv Mod (DUs)	(DUs)			
				0	0	0	508	508			
				0	0	238	360	598			
				0	0	440	578	1,018			
				195	105	0	6	306			
				TOTALS:	195	105	678	1,452	2,430		

2. Vacant Sites Inventory

Table A-3 contains an inventory of vacant underutilized sites to identify additional residential development during the 2021-2029 housing cycle. All of the sites are vacant, although some are used for storage. Sites were assigned a housing income category based on the allowable general plan and zoning designations. Development potential was determined by taking 70% of the maximum permitted density allowed by the General Plan to account for potential development constraints and infrastructure. Only sites designated Highest Density Residential (HHDR) with a density range of 20-25 du/ac were assumed to contribute to Very Low and Low income housing. Figure A-5 illustrates the location of each site.

Table A-3 Existing Site Designations/Zones


Jurupa Valley Housing Element Vacant Sites Inventory Existing Site General Plan Designations/Zones 9/22/2021											
Site No.	Site Size (acres)	Assessor Parcel No.	Factors Affecting Development	Exist. GP Desig.	Exist. Zone	Developable Acreage	Min Density	Max Density	Reduced Density 70% ¹	Potential Units ²	RHNA Category
RANCH (EDR)											
62	3.70	181210015	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	EDR	A-1	3.7	0.2	0.5	0.35	1	Abv Mod
SUBTOTAL EDR:											1
COUNTRY NEIGHBORHOOD and RURAL COMMUNITY-LOW (LDR)											
1	8.04	183080021		LDR	R-R	7.8	1	2	1.4	11	Abv Mod
2	2.61	166120003	soil block slides and slumps	LDR	A-1-4	2.7	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
3	3.92	183080024		LDR	A-1	3.8	1	2	1.4	5	Abv Mod
9	1.33	186260018	soil block slides, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-2A	1.3	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
13	2.89	166090029		LDR	A-1	2.9	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
14	5.01	173130001	moderate landslide risk	LDR	W-2	5	1	2	1.4	7	Abv Mod
15	1.09	157190008		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
16	1.07	161260008		LDR	A-1	1.1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
17	0.95	157190009		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
18	4.86	162110004		LDR	R-A-20	5	1	2	1.4	6	Abv Mod
19	1.49	165020004	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1-4	1.5	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
20	0.97	159202014		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
21	1.06	157190007		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
22	2.47	170220013		LDR	R-1	0.7	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
23	3.52	173082016	soil block slides and slumps	LDR	W-2	3.2	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
24	0.97	157041015	in 100-year flood zone	LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
25	1.63	173050014	soil block slides	LDR	A-1	1.7	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
26	2.64	173090008	soil block slides and slumps, moderate landslide risks	LDR	W-2	2.8	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
27	4.91	159242011		LDR	C-1/C-P	4.9	1	2	1.4	6	Abv Mod
28	0.96	159322004		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
29	1.02	161300015		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
30	2.46	161082008		LDR	A-1	2.4	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
31	1.08	162170041		LDR	R-A-20	1.1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
32	1.92	159030002		LDR	A-1	2.1	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
33	2.41	170220012		LDR	R-1	0.7	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
34	4.68	162170001		LDR	A-1-4	4.7	1	2	1.4	6	Abv Mod
35	1.51	165020007		LDR	A-1-4	1.5	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod


Site No.	Site Size (acres)	Assessor Parcel No.	Factors Affecting Development	Exist. GP Desig.	Developable Exist. Zone	Developable Acreage	Min Density	Max Density	Reduced Density 70% ¹	Potential Units ²	RHNA Category
36	4.16	165080002	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1	4.4	1	2	1.4	5	Abv Mod
37	2.53	169290003	soil block slides	LDR	R-A	3	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
38	9.09	169290013		LDR	A-1	10	1	2	1.4	12	Abv Mod
39	2.81	165070005		LDR	A-1-4	2	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
40	3.12	169310040		LDR	A-1	3.1	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
41	3.23	165150021	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1	3.2	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
42	5.01	169290012		LDR	BP	5	1	2	1.4	7	Abv Mod
43	4.61	171150008		LDR	A-1	4.6	1	2	1.4	6	Abv Mod
44	2.72	165140027	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1	2.7	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
45	2.20	165150022	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1	2.1	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
48	21.45	169300012	in 100-year flood zone, soil block slides	LDR	R-A	11	1	2	1.4	30	Abv Mod
49	2.31	165060015	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-2	2.4	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
50	4.78	165080008	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	A-1-1	5	1	2	1.4	6	Abv Mod
51	1.47	174250003		LDR	W-2	1.4	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
53	8.33	169300005	in 100-year flood zone	LDR	A-1	8.4	1	2	1.4	11	Abv Mod
55	3.31	165140028	in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	R-1	3.3	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
57	1.16	169300006		LDR	A-1	1.2	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
59	9.56	166120001	soil block slides	LDR	A-1	9.7	1	2	1.4	13	Abv Mod
64	3.73	166070035		LDR	A-1	3.8	1	2	1.4	5	Abv Mod
71	1.50	165020010		LDR	A-1-4	1.5	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
75	0.98	183132013	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1	0.9	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
77	1.05	183131010	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1	1.1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
80	0.95	169181018		LDR	A-1	1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
81	2.77	161332003		LDR	A-1	2.8	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
82	1.34	159242013		LDR	C-1/C-P	0.3	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
83	1.46	157150001		LDR	A-1	1.5	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
86	4.07	173090003	moderate landslide risk	LDR	W-2	4.2	1	2	1.4	5	Abv Mod
87	1.47	157240001	Flood zone	LDR	W-1	1.4	1	2	1.4	2	Abv Mod
88	4.21	159030001		LDR	A-1	4.2	1	2	1.4	5	Abv Mod
91	6.13	183230002	moderate landslide risk, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	LDR	A-1	6.6	1	2	1.4	8	Abv Mod
92	1.06	174250001	soil block slides	LDR	W-2	1.1	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod


Site No.	Site Size (acres)	Assessor Parcel No.	Factors Affecting Development	Exist. GP Desig.	Exist. Zone	Developable Acreage	Min Density	Max Density	Reduced Density 70% ¹	Potential Units ²	RHNA Category
93	2.98	183230001	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1	2.8	1	2	1.4	4	Abv Mod
94	2.81	174260016	soil block slides	LDR	W-2	2.9	1	2	1.4	3	Abv Mod
95	8.15	183220006	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1	7.2	1	2	1.4	11	Abv Mod
96	1.35	183131011	moderate landslide risk	LDR	A-1	1.4	1	2	1.4	1	Abv Mod
97	5.27	162032008		LDR	R-A-20	5.3	1	2	1.4	7	Abv Mod
98	6.81	166090030		LDR	A-1	6.7	1	2	1.4	9	Abv Mod
SUBTOTAL LDR:										274	
MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)											
6	1.18	183112058		MDR	C-P-S	1.2	2	5	3.5	4	Abv Mod
7	3.85	186080011	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-3	3.5	2	5	3.5	13	Abv Mod
8	4.35	183173001	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MDR	R-1	4.35	2	5	3.5	15	Abv Mod
12	8.58	186172001	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D and has drainage.	MDR	R-1-100	6	2	5	3.5	30	Abv Mod
47	1.83	171082018		MDR	A-1	1.83	2	5	3.5	6	Abv Mod
56	0.96	177231019		MDR	R-1	0.96	2	5	3.5	3	Abv Mod
65	1.00	183090009		MDR	C-P-S	1	2	5	3.5	3	Abv Mod
66	21.68	177110016	paved, former lumberyard (LUA?15B)	MDR	M-SC	21.68	2	5	3.5	75	Abv Mod
67	2.06	182242009	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	2.06	2	5	3.5	7	Abv Mod
68	1.31	182190015	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.31	2	5	3.5	4	Abv Mod
69	1.24	182190017	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.24	2	5	3.5	4	Abv Mod
72	1.51	182244006	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.51	2	5	3.5	5	Abv Mod
76	1.30	182190016	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	MDR	R-1	1.3	2	5	3.5	4	Abv Mod
89	1.95	173020026		MDR	R-2	1.95	2	5	3.5	6	Abv Mod
90	3.07	170030004		MDR	R-3	3.07	2	5	3.5	10	Abv Mod
102	2.72	171040044	Topo/rocks, freeway noise.	MDR	R-T	2.73	2	5	3.5	9	Abv Mod
103	2.68	183030045		MDR	A-1	2.68	2	5	3.5	9	Abv Mod
SUBTOTAL MDR:										207	
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL											
4	1.02	179082013	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	R-1	1	5	8	5.6	5	Abv Mod
10	2.53	169070006		MHDR	R-T	2.5	5	8	5.6	14	Abv Mod
54	1.11	177250029	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone E	MHDR	R-3	1.1	5	8	5.6	6	Abv Mod


Site No.	Site Size (acres)	Assessor Parcel No.	Factors Affecting Development	Exist. GP Desig.	Exist. Zone	Developable Acreage	Min Density	Max Density	Reduced Density 70% ¹	Potential Units ²	RHNA Category
61	2.03	178271001	soil block slides	MHDR	R-3	2	5	8	5.6	11	Abv Mod
63	0.98	179330002	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone C	MHDR	R-3	0.6	5	8	5.6	5	Abv Mod
79	1.25	169080003	owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E. May be in VHFHZ.	MHDR	R-1	1.2	5	8	5.6	6	Abv Mod
84	2.74	185470001	owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E. May be in VHFHZ.	MHDR	R-3	2.7	5	8	5.6	15	Abv Mod
85	3.07	185470002	owned by County Housing Authority, in Riverside Airport Compatibility Zone E. May be in VHFHZ.	MHDR	R-3	3.1	5	8	5.6	17	Abv Mod
106	5.38	179060027		MHDR	R-1	5.4	5	8	5.6	30	Abv Mod
SUBTOTAL MHDR:										109	
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL											
70	1.82	182331007	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D soil block slides, in Flabob Airport	HDR	R-1	1.7	8	14	9.8	17	Mod
74	2.27	182342010	Compatibility Zone D	HDR	R-3	1.9	8	14	9.8	22	Mod
78	2.00	182350005	in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D, in 55-60 dB CNEL contour	HDR	R-3	1.7	8	14	9.8	19	Mod
SUBTOTAL HDR:										58	
HIGHEST DENSITY RESIDENTIAL											
5	9.92	171020030		HHDR	R-3	8.9	20	25	17.5	173	35% Low 65% VLow
11	1.23	171020028	flood ctrl channel	HHDR	R-3	0.9	20	25	17.5	21	35% Low 65% VLow
52	2.67	177210005	freeway noise	HHDR	R-3	2.2	20	25	17.5	46	35% Low 65% VLow
58	4.07	177210003	freeway noise	HHDR	R-3	3.9	20	25	17.5	71	35% Low 65% VLow
60	4.38	177210002	building on north end of parcel	HHDR	R-3	3.9	20	25	17.5	76	35% Low 65% VLow
73	3.27	179021001	freeway noise	HHDR	R-1	3	20	25	17.5	57	35% Low 65% VLow
99	1.20	181041014	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HHDR	R-3	1.2	20	25	17.5	20	35% Low 65% VLow
100	0.82	181030011	owned by County Housing Authority, in Flabob Airport Compatibility Zone D	HHDR	R-3	0.8	20	25	17.5	14	35% Low 65% VLow


Figure A-5 Site Locations









































Appendix B – Proposed Redesignation/Rezone Sites

As outlined in the Housing Element, the City has identified 19 sites, totaling 69.2 acres, for redesignation to the City’s highest density, HHDR (20-25 du/ac) and rezoning to R-3. These sites are projected to accommodate a total of 1,169 gross dwelling units, or 1,147 net units after accounting for an overlap with another site. The remaining units will include 760 units of very low-income housing and 409 units of low-income housing, and will enable the City to adequately meet its RHNA in all income levels. Table B-1 below outlines the City’s ability to meet its RHNA. The sites proposed for redesignation are outlined on the following pages. The City will consider the redesignation and rezoning of these sites within one year of Housing Element adoption, as outlined in Action Item HE-1.1.1.


Table B-1 Jurupa Valley RHNA Summary


	Very Low Income Housing (DUs)	Low Income Housing (DUs)	Moderate Income Housing (DUs)	Above Moderate Income Housing (DUs)	Total (DUs)
RHNA	1,207	749	731	1,810	4,497
Approved Projects, Pipeline Projects, ADUs, Specific Plans, Site Inventory	678	395	1,093	3,006	5,172
New Redesignation Sites	760	409		-22	1,147
Surplus Dwelling Units Over RHNA	+231	+55	+362	+1,174	+1,822



Total Rezone: 19 Sites
 Total Acres: 69.2 Acres
 Potential Units: 1,169

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites










Rezone Area: B
 Total Acres: 5.80
 Potential Units: 101

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area B



Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
B-01	156230004	2.3	PF	R-A-20	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	40	Vacant
B-02	156220002	3.5	PF	R-A-20	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	61	Vacant






Rezone Area: C
 Total Acres: 7.29
 Potential Units: 127

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area C



Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
C-01	173160002	0.8	LDR	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	14	Vacant
C-02	173160003	0.3	LDR	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	5	Vacant
C-04*	173160029	2.76	CR	C-P-S	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	48	Vacant
C-05*	173160030	3.43	CR	C-P-S	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	60	Vacant

* These sites would be developed as mixed-use projects with commercial development on the southern half of each property and residential development on the northern half.






Rezone Area: D
 Total Acres: 29.90
 Potential Units: 445

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area D



Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
D-01	173120005	6.4	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	112	Vacant
D-02	173120006	6.4	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	112	Vacant
D-03*	173120007	13	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	150	Vacant
D-04**	169040003	0.2	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	3	Vacant
D-05	169040004	0.8	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	14	Vacant
D-06	169040005	3.1	LI	W-2	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	54	Vacant


* Although site size could result in unit count of 228 under the HHDR a more realistic unit count of 150 has been assumed.
 ** Although < 0.5 acres, this analysis assumes site would be consolidated with D-01.






Rezone Area: E
 Total Acres: 5.40
 Potential Units: 93

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area E



Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
E-01	169070002	1.9	MHDR	R-D	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	33	Vacant
E-02	169070031	1	CR	C-1/C-P	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	17	Vacant
E-03	169172075	2.5	CR	C-P-S	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	43	Vacant






Rezone Area: F
 Total Acres: 4.70
 Potential Units: 82

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area F



Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
F-01	171020006	4.7	BP	A-1	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	82	Vacant









Rezone Area: H
 Total Acres: 7.40
 Potential Units: 129

City of Jurupa Valley 2021 - 2029 Housing Element Potential Redesignation/Rezone Sites Area H




Map ID	APN	Acres	Existing GP	Existing Zone	Proposed GP	Proposed	Min. Density	Max. Density	Reduced	Potential	Status
H-01	182350002	7.4	MDR	R-3	HHDR	R-3	20	25	17.5	129	Vacant



Appendix C – Public Participation

The following materials were used to promote the Housing Element website, public participation opportunities include the community housing survey and two virtual community housing outreach meetings. These materials included promotional posters and flyers for the different public participation opportunities throughout the process of the Housing Element Update. These materials were posted in the City Hall, Facebook, and libraries, and sent to local agencies, utility companies, community groups and nonprofits in Jurupa Valley.

1. Housing Element Update Webpage on the City of Jurupa Valley Website



Housing Element Community Workshops

Two virtual Housing Element Community Workshops were held on April 5th and 6th, 2021 via Zoom. These meetings were designed to inform community members about the Housing Element Update for the 2021 to 2029 planning period, and discuss housing needs and opportunities in Jurupa Valley. Please click below for presentations from the Community Workshops (English and Spanish).

View the presentation(s) here: [English](#)

View the virtual Housing Element Community Workshop(s) here: [Spanish Workshop](#)

What is the Housing Element?

The Housing Element is one of nine State-required components of every city's General Plan, and a city's primary planning document to address its housing needs for the future. California state law requires that in order for the private market to adequately address housing needs, local governments must adopt plans that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development, and demonstrate how the City's share of regional growth will be accommodated for in the planning period that the Housing Element addresses.

As Jurupa Valley continues to grow, we need to plan for where future residents will live by updating the City's housing policies and designating space by 2021 to accommodate the City's share of regional housing allocation of 4,485 new housing units for the 2021-2029 planning period. This includes designating sites for market rate housing, and housing that is affordable to very low, low and moderate incomes. The City doesn't have to build the housing units but must provide appropriate zoning on sites that offer real development potential, fair process and fees.

The Housing Element sets goals, policies, and programs that are implemented after the plan is adopted to achieve this objective. The Housing Element must remain consistent with the other elements of the General Plan, which was adopted in 2017.

Why Update the Housing Element?

The Housing Element must be updated every eight years and certified by the State, and this update will address the period from 2021 to 2029. The current [Jurupa Valley Housing Element](#) addresses the City's

Select Language

housing needs for the period from 2013 to 2021, and provides a baseline for this update. This update gives us the opportunity to evaluate the current goals, policies, and programs, and determine the revisions needed to improve the effectiveness of the City's housing plan.

It is important to note that if we don't update our Housing Element or fall significantly behind on our housing targets, the City could be deemed out of compliance and risk losing important sources of funding currently provided by the State. In addition, by proactively planning for new housing and identifying potential sites where new housing development should occur, Jurupa Valley maintains local control to regulate housing development in a manner consistent with our local character and quality of life. The outcome of successfully planning for housing is to provide for housing choice and viable neighborhoods where the attainment of a decent home and suitable living environment for every member of our community is possible.

We Want to Hear from You!

Public input is important to help the City develop a plan that best meets our community's needs and priorities when it comes to providing housing for all members of our community. There will be multiple opportunities to participate throughout the update process. Please [sign up](#) to be notified of the next meeting or opportunity for online input. Please respond to the online housing survey below.

- [Housing Element Update Survey Here.](#)
- [En Español Aquí.](#)

Process/Schedule




Related Information

- [California Department of Housing & Community Development - Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Housing Elements](#)
- [Southern California Association of Governments \(SCAG\) - Regional Housing Needs Assessment](#)

Project Contact

Jean Ward
 Housing Element Update Manager
 P: 949-489-1442
 E: jward@jurupavalley.org

2. Community Survey Facebook and Email Image- 1st Push



3. Community Survey Flyer- 1st Push

JURUPA VALLEY

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

As Jurupa Valley continues to grow, we need to plan for you and future residents by updating the City’s housing policies and designating space to accommodate the City’s share of regional housing for the 2021-2029 planning period.

This update helps set goals, policies, and programs to achieve the housing needs of this community.

We invite you to join us in our efforts to plan for our city’s housing. Join us and seize your opportunity to participate in the ongoing conversation on housing.


JOIN US! LET YOUR VOICE BE HEARD!

WAYS TO PARTICIPATE:

1. TAKE OUR SURVEY [HERE](#) OR [AQUI](#)
2. ATTEND PUBLIC MEETINGS
3. COMMENT ON DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT IN 2021.

MORE INFORMATION:

[HOUSING ELEMENT WEBSITE](#)

 **City of JURUPA VALLEY**
California

4. Community Survey Facebook and Email Image- 2nd Push

JURUPA VALLEY


HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

More than 100 of you have already participated in this survey but we want to hear from more of you!

Participate in the housing survey and help us set the goals to achieve the housing needs of this community.

More information on Jurupavalley.org.

TAKE THE HOUSING SURVEY TODAY!

 *City of*
JURUPA VALLEY
California

5. Community Survey Flyer- 2nd Push (English and Spanish)

JURUPA VALLEY

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

As Jurupa Valley continues to grow, we need to plan for you and future residents by updating the City’s housing policies and designating space to accommodate the City’s share of regional housing for the 2021-2029 planning period.

This update helps set goals, policies, and programs to achieve the housing needs of this community.

We invite you to join us in our efforts to plan for our city’s housing. Join us and seize your opportunity to participate in the ongoing conversation on housing.


WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU! TAKE THE SURVEY TODAY!

WAYS TO PARTICIPATE:

1. TAKE OUR SURVEY HERE:
<https://forms.gle/fypuwHbpodkWttLS7>
2. ATTEND PUBLIC MEETINGS
3. COMMENT ON DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT IN 2021.

MORE INFORMATION:

HOUSING ELEMENT WEBSITE:
<https://www.jurupavalley.org/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=140>

 **City of**
JURUPA VALLEY
California



JURUPA VALLEY

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU! TAKE THE SURVEY TODAY!

As Jurupa Valley continues to grow, we need to plan for you and future residents by updating the City's housing policies and designating space to accommodate the City's share of regional housing for the 2021-2029 planning period.

This update helps set goals, policies, and programs to achieve the housing needs of this community.

We invite you to join us in our efforts to plan for our city's housing. Join us and seize your opportunity to participate in the ongoing conversation on housing.

WAYS TO PARTICIPATE:


1. TAKE OUR SURVEY HERE:
<https://forms.gle/fypuwHbpodkWttLS7>
2. ATTEND PUBLIC MEETINGS
3. COMMENT ON DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT IN 2021.

MORE INFORMATION:

HOUSING ELEMENT WEBSITE:
<https://www.jurupavalley.org/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=140>




6. Community Survey (English and Spanish)




3. Please select all that apply to you.

226 responses




4. What is your age range?

226 responses




5. Which best describes your current living situation?

226 responses




6. Which best describes your household composition?

226 responses




7. Do you or any of your family/friends/coworkers struggle with finding or maintaining adequate housing?

226 responses




8. Do you think it is difficult to find AVAILABLE rental housing in Jurupa Valley?

226 responses




9. Do you think it is difficult to find AFFORDABLE rental housing in Jurupa Valley?

226 responses




10. Do you think it is difficult to find AVAILABLE homes for purchase in Jurupa Valley?

226 responses




11. Do you think it is difficult to find AFFORDABLE homes for purchase in Jurupa Valley?

226 responses




12. Please rank the following groups by order of their need for housing and related services in the community.



13. Jurupa Valley will continue to grow and evolve over the next decade. What do you feel are the top housing issues/priorities to address in Jurupa Valley? Pick four (4) from the options below.

226 responses



14. Are there any examples of new housing (in Jurupa Valley or elsewhere) that you like and that seem to “fit” Jurupa Valley? Why? What features do you like?

226 responses

1. not that i know of
2. Affordable housing
3. More single family homes and more shopping centers
4. No
5. More single family homes.
6. the track that is going to be build off Camino seems to fit both of both worlds -city and country- Large lots enough space to "breathe" where you're not so close to neighbors and model updated homes.
7. Jurupa Valley has pushed it's limits.
8. Detached mother law house perfect for big families
9. Homeless needs to be taken care of! So many homeless camping out and bugging family's for money ! You can't even go to the store without them harassing you for money!
10. More houses like sky country
11. The newer houses by Del Sol Academy are a wonderful addition to Jurupa Valley. There are many parks in the area and it's a more desirable area of Jurupa Valley.
12. none
13. I don't like new housing because the roads have not been designed for high volumes of traffic, which creates SIGNIFICANT congestion at intersections such as Mission and Valley Way, Mission Inn Ave heading to Riverside, Van Buren heading into Riverside, etc.
14. Del Sol area
15. Single story condos or apartments will be a great fit for Jurupa Valley as there are many families/couples living with others or in ADUs that would love their own space.
16. All new housing is to close to each other.....should have been 2 or 4 houses per acre...
17. N/A
18. I like what Eastvale is doing, providing multiple restaurant, shopping and entertainment venues. They're building housing communities around these venues. Which in turn gets people to spend more money locally, at the same time providing the city with tax revenue.
19. Sky country is an amazing little community. Great neighborhood
20. Frontier Homes - community amenities
21. Rural
22. Lofts/condominiums to attract young professionals.
23. Clean housing communities that are being built
24. No
25. Larger lots
26. Slow the growth !
27. More Horse Property
28. Need more “starter homes” which can also be good for seniors looking to downsize.
29. Sky country with single story homes, horse property, walking trails and a strong sense of community seems representative, as does areas of Jurupa Hills with single story homes, larger properties for privacy, views, and open areas. The condos are a small complex, many handicapped accessible and single story, tucked in unseen without fences, views but locate them away from Limonite, Van Buren, Jurupa Rd, to not increase density and traffic congestion.
30. I love the neighborhood around the Soccer sports park, the closeness to nature and large yards are exactly what people expect in this town.
31. I like the new Lennar homes in Jurupa valley, but they are too expensive for the average homeowner around here. Need more affordable housing. Good quality but under 300,000.
32. No. The new homes have no to little backyards and over priced.
33. Sidewalks on all neighborhoods. Encourage the community to take walks in their own neighborhoods. It would also improve the look of the city overall.
34. NA
35. None
36. Need housing development where public sidewalks and walkways are better maintained by the city and better materials are selected for landscaping. The upkeep in our neighborhood(Sage Pointe and Vintage- DR Horton) is terrible. Ground cover, trees and plants are not well maintained.
37. None
38. no

39. Vesada apartments are nice but too expensive
40. No. All the new housing is not zoned for horses and the lots are too small.
41. I would love to see mixed use development that includes apartments, condos and entry level single family (2 to 4) bedrooms no larger than 2,000 sq ft.
42. No, new housing needs to have bigger lots and preserve the rural community that we all moved here for. Too many high density homes. We're not Eastvale!
43. Sky Country 1/2 ac lots horse property
44. Granite Ridge community has a nice mix of property types (single family homes and condos). Cantera has large lots.
45. More family friendly streets
46. Street lighting
47. No
48. Country Village senior homes
49. No answer
50. Western Jurupa Valley. Modern, large homes in a planned community near the convenience of top retailers (in Eastvale)
51. No, they are too close together. No yards for family to enjoy.
52. Along Mission Blvd and Philadelphia. Why not build homes there
53. The next gen homes should come to JV. we live in an older home in Pedley Hills, and love it. I would like to see more focus on the area around us. Camino Real / Limonite
54. I don't have an answer.
55. Stone Ave 1/2 acre lots
56. no
57. N/A
58. No
59. No
60. Don't know.
61. What is being done to protect new and older homes from flooding in the mountainous areas? Did the City attempt to protect its residences?
62. The new houses across from Sky Country, it adds to the improvement of the community
63. New housing need to be like sky country homes.
64. No
65. Apartments located over retail, including grocery option with public transit nearby. Can provide housing option to non car residents.
66. N/A
67. Eastvale
68. Need to maintain rural atmosphere, control high density housing.
69. "New Housing track next to
70. Patriot High School and new housing tracks next to the 15 freeway. They are beautiful neighborhoods and convenient to be next to schools."
71. Sky Park, Loring Ranch - nice neighborhoods
72. Granny houses
73. No
74. I like the new housing development by Lennar in the Sunnyslope area. Wished they had more nextgen housing at a lower price.
75. No
76. Large lots. Option for animals/horses.
77. No
78. We need more homes with large yards that allow animals
79. more light
80. Not really. New houses going up at Shadow Rock but will it create more traffic?
81. Bigger lots
82. "Single family homes that are under 2000 square feet on an adequate lot that allows for outdoor recreation for the family living in the home. "
83. Ranch homes
84. "I can not give a fair answer!"
85. No
86. Stone Ranch homes and houses on Hallbrook Terrace that are half acre and rv parking. They are animal friendly and provide garage parking for recreational toys.

87. Just purchased a new home in Vista Cielo. There's a style and level of living conditions we're expecting. Our community is quiet replete with hardworking families. Now I want to see higher end business attracted to our community.
88. No
89. No
90. More house
91. No
92. Parks
93. Large lots, ?townhouses with community stables, No HOA, informant of laws no rooster
94. I'm glad there are some small developments of single story homes.
95. Features regarding weather.
96. None
97. SFR
98. We need affordable homes built. Not rentals!
99. The Enlclave at Homecoming Terra Vista in Rancho Cucamonga.
100. We need single-family dwellings. Three bedrooms two bathrooms. 1002 1500 ft.²
101. I don't know
102. N/A
103. don't know.
104. Rural "horse" property
105. I don't know
106. I don't know
107. Horse property
108. We need smaller 1500sqft or less affordable homes for young single adults, under \$400000.
109. All the New housing I have seen are too expensive
110. I don't know
111. No
112. Additional parks, shopping centers in the Rubidoux area.
113. More single afford housing
114. Affordable housing for single parents with one income.
115. The new housing in Jurupa Valley is too much like Eastvale. Not a good fit.
116. No
117. Yes, Stone Ranch. Single story on half acre lot. The way Jurupa Valley was meant to be.
118. Sky County Community. Good size houses, good size lots, horse property, horse trail, good parks, nice school.
119. I don't know
120. I love the ranch life
121. Nothing comes to mind.
122. None
123. Homes with accessory dwelling unit (ADU or "Granny Flat")
124. None that I can think of
125. Homes with adequate yards
126. Housing for young professionals that are looking for a high-quality lifestyle.
127. Née developments on Jurupa Rd/Tyrolite and at the end of Stone Ave seem to be nice. But very expensive.
128. As a senior, I like the Esperanza housing community.
129. Don't know
130. The new houses that went in in the wineville area seem nice and the type of neighborhoods I like to see. They are newer and well maintained.
131. New homes on Granite Hill give the area an uplift look.
132. Yes the ones near the Indian Hills golf course. I also like housing that is multi-generational.
133. The older housing is better. Anything resembling Sky Country is the closest fit to Jurupa Valley. (One story, large lots.) Two story close together doesn't fit the community as well.
134. No
135. high density housing seems rather out of place, I think we have enough
136. safe communities with tiny homes for young adults
137. Homes past Jurupa Valley High - more space between
138. No
139. More shops to shop at
140. None
141. No


142. Higher standards for the materials used to build the homes. Too many new homes being built quickly and cheaply.
143. low income
144. N
145. Eastvale,ca , the streets are clean and have no homeless encampments
146. Na
147. Need housing that is under \$400,000 so young adults can afford to buy. Hoping Paradise Knolls will offer this in single family homes.
148. Don't know
149. I like property with home not sitting on top of each other
150. Houses with yards not built so close together
151. No. There new houses are priced too high for most residents in Jurupa Valley.
152. Horse friendly, large lots similar to Norco should be added.
153. I like property with home not sitting on top of each other
154. Just more affordable housing.
155. Need to have more standard single family homes reasonably priced in good locations not the ghetto) instead of the huge expensive homes.
156. There are none
157. Aside from the housing, Jurupa valley needs more commercial, shopping and dinning centers. It's not fair and right that I have to travel to nearby cities to do business. As housing grows retail, commercial and dinning must keep up as well.
158. I noticed that some communities offer club houses with community pools. This is a great idea.
159. Serve people
160. N/A
161. Eastvale larger size property's home doesn't homes by camino elementary but no HOA
162. Low housing apartment or town houses
163. Closed gated communities, Supposedly safe
164. Don't know
165. Don't know
166. The new homes coming in are beautiful and improve Jurupa Valley.
167. Baldwin park metro stop. Has housing , stores walking distance , park near by , community center nearby, restaurants , all is a two to three mile radius
168. Lower rent
169. less section 8
170. New developments are nice but need to be on larger lots.
171. Na
172. None
173. Smaller single story cottages within a small secure community, Nicer industrial condos with elevators near freeway access for comuters, senior or adult only areas,
174. Larger Lots are needed, the new developments are too close together.
175. Eastvale
176. I think the new homes off of Stone Avenue fit the city well because they have larger properties. There needs to be a consistent mix of horse property/larger property neighborhoods to maintain the spirit of the city. The perfect example of a neighborhood would be Arabella Ranch, with large homes but 1/2 acre properties. While there needs to be adorable homes, too many apartments or dense/low income neighborhoods require a lot of strict rules and regulations. Our city should work on improving streets, and adding waking trails and areas for the existing homes. There is also a lot of homes that are not kept up and run down that need to be addressed.
177. Need more handicapped accessible housing. Near the freeway, some modern type condos with offices underneath and residences above. Single level condos with elevators like in Rancho. Also nice multi office buildings for Drs right by on and off ramps to increase revenue to city. Gated single level cottages. Also need areas with larger lots, horse property where burrtrec trash isn't on the street. Get rid of the multi neighborhood, tiny mailboxes that people break into. We need more multi use paths to have access for equestrians to ride through the city. Camino real need a path way it's not safe for kids to walk to school. Wish we were more like Norco than a slum.
178. Single family homes. Apartments attract more traffic
179. "properties with space for animals, when Jurupa became a city, we were promised it would remain animal friendly, and try to maintain the rural feel. I have lived here all my life and feel extremely encroached upon."
180. N/A
181. At the corner of Cherry and Jurupa in Fontana, there is a development that has small single family residences. These are great starter houses without being attached.
182. Larger ranch style homes, property with side yard access for RV and horses

183. Rural, horse-friendly homes like Norco.
184. Single family homes
185. New horse properties for rural living in Mira Loma it fits the character of the city. I would like to see more affordable housing in Rubidoux and revitalization of that street. Maybe build some multi-use facilities. Housing/storefront walkable community with transport hub.
186. Homestead, Bellegrave & Hamner. Services provided on-site and in surrounding area
187. In Jurupa Valley, there are not many new housing developments. The houses across from Camino Real Elementary are nice. Lots that have horse property are a draw
188. NA
189. Country Village
190. Building of single family residences on a minimum quarter acre properties.
191. Condominiums in Rancho Cucamonga and other areas instead of apartments that cause transitional tenants that use city resources and then move on. Get homes so property taxes are collected.
192. Jurupa Valley used to be more rural, we moved here because we appreciate that life style
193. Community with HOA to maintain home and surrounding areas esthetics
194. I don't have a particular one in mind but have then look nice and have their own pool and park.
195. no
196. Unknown
197. Single family homes.
198. Turnleaf and serrano ranch homes. nice, well maintained, and safe
199. N/A
200. I am excited about The Shadow Rock Community being built. The single family homes and new recreational activities integrated into the landscape look promising.
201. Vista Cielo because the lots are a decent size and home values will help the community.
202. Jurupa Valley, Crestwood at Stone Ranch - 2,500 - 3,000 sq ft, single story, 1/2 - 1 acre lots, w/side access to the backyard..
203. New homes, traffic issues
204. N/a
205. N/A
206. Na
207. None
208. No, ore and more cookie cutter houses on tiny lots. We moved here for the rural feel.
209. Arabella Ranch in Mira Loma. These homes are in high demand. People who want land cant find it. These homes are high dollar and never for sale. You cant get into one. We have a demand, but we dont cater to these homes. Instead we build more homes than our infrastructure can handle.
210. I think we are loosing the attributes of Jurupa Valley that most people like in thid are, I have a large Jurupa community connection and we all would like more horse properties. That is what Jurupa Valley once was. I am a 32 women with a growing family and would like to see new developments with larger lots for horse properties.
211. I like how Jurupa valley homes have yard space with decent size houses.
212. I like the new neighborhood off of Jurupa Rd.
213. Beaumont/Coachella/San Diego and various other communities that made cooperative living care facilities that allowed transitional living skills and/or multi home land acquisition with easements allowing disabled community and the elderly community to live together and support one another using public grant funding for development and funding so that the disabled adult could be self-sufficient and live independently while offering employment to In Home Service Providers and other community based program funding. Thus decreasing indigent communities and increasing workforce and maintaining real property value and care.
214. New, parks, and walking paths.
215. No. All the new housing is too crammed together. JV should have larger lots.
216. I like our horse-keeping properties.
217. N/A
218. Unknown
219. lennar
220. h
221. Serrano Ranch neighborhood NO HOA
222. Haven't seen any but from living here we need gated communities too much homeless people coming into communities
223. Houses that young adults can afford. Not 2,000 square feet homes, but smaller like 1,300 so that they can have a starter home like we did back then. We want them to be independent not have to live with parents or in laws forever. We also are not used to so many tráfico lights. We were a small torneos back then and not a city, so we want to keep the horse Property homes around all Jurupa Valley.

Housing

224. I believe Jurupa Valley is beautiful place but we have lost so much of our beautiful ranch town since the cows left and the city of Eastvale became neighbors. Please do not add more traffic lights. We were a small town and since we became a city we have seen more road work but that just means we pay more taxes for this. We don't want ever piece of land to be new housing development. We lose the beauty of our city. Instead leave flat lands where the community can enjoy walks, RIDE bikes, or horses
225. No. Need larger lots, how the area was intended.

15. How adequate is Jurupa Valley's supply of the following housing types?



16. Do you have any additional information or observations you would like to share about housing in Jurupa Valley?

226 responses

- Question 3 says "select all that apply to you..." but will only let you select 1 option.
- No
- NA
- Fires are becoming a concern
- Variety of models would be nice. Less HOA's.
- there's no townhomes or duplexes to rent- when just starting the family this would have increased the quality of life for my family. Since I couldn't afford to purchase a home in the beginning. Having option to rent in "good " areas was hard or impossible to find here in jurupa valley
- No
- We need new bigger houses with big lots
- There are way to many homeless people in our city! That needs to be addressed
- no
- I do not want to see more multi family housing.
- none
- Please designate some open spaces for hiking and species conservation
- I love the newer areas of JV
- Many neighborhoods I have seen do not have sidewalks or street lights. I have personally refrained from purchasing a beautiful home in a neighborhood like this because I would like to live somewhere where the home is up kept as well as the community and neighborhood. It was a deal breaker and I would love to see the city improve the already existing neighborhoods as well.
- Improvements for the older areas, street lighting, sidewalks, incentives to improve the property, traffic control (still not enough patrol, people are blowing through stops and lights knowing nothing happens)
- You can't have more housing without more businesses, this should be the priority.

18. I can't stress enough the need for more restaurants, shopping and entertainment. We also need more single family homes, condos and apartments. However, if there's no restaurants, shopping and entertainment, you're not gonna attract people to the city. If they have to drive 15-30 minutes away to eat or shop, they're not gonna move to our city.
19. More affordable housing
20. More new large home builds and shopping centers
21. Needs better upkeep
22. Have developers create recreational spaces for the community when building homes.
23. I would like to see areas of JV repaired, it seems like certain areas are very undesirable. We need more business like restaurants and stores to make this a desirable city, like Eastvale.
24. Work in Jurupa Valley regularly. Was not able to find affordable rental in or near city so commute 2-3 hours round trip. In addition to unaffordability, parts of JV look run down or unsafe, making me unsure if I want to live there anyway.
25. Our area looks worse since becoming a city. Take Care of us!
26. Quit taking away from the core promises made to become a city. no trucking .
27. ?
28. No
29. We were open spaces, low density living, large lots, horse property, horse facilities, and public arenas, wildlife areas, few fires in the riverbed, no crowds, or traffic congestion, maintained properties, safe areas. That has changed. We have seas of congested housing, more theft, junky properties, congested roads in and out, many fires. We should go back to our roots, create a master plan for the residents of Jurupa and strict zoning so property buyers know what can and cannot be built on that property before they buy. No change from low density to medium or high density, or commercial to housing.
30. Two story homes are more in demand. There needs to also be attractive jobs so that people can live where the work, Californians are tired of commuting.
31. Need more affordable housing.
32. Create more family friendly housing with yards, and improve current apt. Housing. Make it affordable, ie. One bedroom for 900-1k.
33. There is too many empty lots that eventually get occupied by homeless who makes the neighborhood look trashy! We need regular clean ups of the neighborhoods. I regret moving to Jurupa Valley. There are no sidewalks where we can walk on down our street. 37th street to be precise. The dirt is horrible to our children who suffer from asthma.
34. Clean up our neighborhood and don't allow these homeless encampments out in the open
35. None
36. "Landscape services used for City responsible areas of upkeep need improved vendors. Areas are not well maintained and workmanship is poor
37. Need to promote ca's ADU laws to increase low income housing in family neighborhoods, while also bringing noncompliant ADUs up to safety standards.
38. We don't have enough businesses to warrant calling this place a city.
39. No
40. Keep horse zoning
41. We need to make the development process easier and faster. Work with developers instead of creating more road blocks.
42. Preserve our rural communities. All the high density homes are pushing those of us who moved here to have our livestock and run our businesses out of our homes. I can't even park an RV in front of my home.
43. More horse property
44. Homeowners need to be provided with incentives and assistance to maintain their property, if at all possible. Too many properties in the city are in need of maintenance and look terrible.
45. No
46. There is not enough street lights. Some areas are really dark.
47. Code enforcement of laws needed., provide permit parking for neighborhoods affected by the beach visitors.
48. More help for homeless and mentally ill
49. Planning neighborhoods and communities to meet each need is important. Holding on to our equestrian heritage around equestrian amenities and trails should have co-lo aged ranch house with large lots. While areas around commercial, parks and civic amenities should be surround by suburban and mixed use neighborhoods. Regional connections between these neighborhoods and communities with shared use paths would serve the community well.
50. None
51. Many homes, not enough amenities.
52. It looks like only eastvale developed with expensive homes to buy .what about people who want something decent and not all those old out dated homes no options here except for the homes on granite hill theres more land to build there
53. Yes! Please add more street lights. Streets are dark. JUrupa Valley is a great place to live! But needs some TLC!
54. No
55. No

Housing

56. no
57. Housing is only affordable when living wages are fair otherwise more than two families need to get together to buy a single house which makes it not a good environmental to live in.
58. No
59. No
60. Create an atmosphere that will draw families of ALL levels to JV. I'm leaving.
61. Are existing homes protected when building new homes in mountainous areas due to the flow of water or rain being altered in a new direction?
62. We need more restaurants/commercial
63. More lighting needed
64. New housing is not very affordable for a lot of single parents out there and with high prices you will have 2,3 or 4 families will move in these homes causing a lot of vehicles on the streets.
65. ADUs would benefit some of needs
66. N/A
67. Poor planning department. Inefficiency to attract new businesses
68. None
69. No
70. Too many homeless and no one does anything about it.
71. Need affordable housing
72. Building new housing to fast and causing more traffic. Need to have additional outlets to major streets and fairways.
73. More affordable housing for young adults or young families.
74. No
75. High density housing not needed
76. I feel that some more apartment complexes are needed, as well as emergency housing.
77. Stop building in the area, already too many people. If you do build then make single family homes with large yards and spaced apart
78. Cleanup the city, there is too much trash
79. Alot of new houses going up. My concern is theres going to be even mote congestion on our already busy streets. More road maintenance. Need to create more outlets to ease the traffic.
80. It's getting to big
81. Gated communities, especially for single family homes, should be limited. They do not build community and they interfere with regular and emergency access.
82. More street lights
83. More code enforcement , less fences and more sidewalks for homes!
84. No
85. There is not enough off street parking for existing housing.
86. I want to see the city move away from too many apartments, mobile home parks, etc. We've just invested approximately 3/4 of a million dollars. I don't want to regret our investment in the city.
87. The homeless situation is bad
88. Na
89. "More hours
90. Cleaning up mess of people who illegally dump trash
91. No more houses
92. Stop the import of cheap stores, but in good stores. Need to upper class our town
93. No
94. Need more affordable 1 bedrooms. Covered parking to protect vehicles from the elements.
95. No
96. Need more upper class SFR homes to turn this city around. Look at Eastvale's model. Higher tax bracket homes increase property tax revenue to help improve our schools.
97. No
98. No
99. We do not need any more monster homes. It creates a chaotic neighborhood.
100. I think this community is really lacking 55+ communities, my in-laws would've moved into this city had there been that kind of facility instead I drive to Beaumont twice a week to help them.
101. Too costly for even just a 1 bed and 1 bath housing
102. need parks in Robidoux area, need affordable rentals for low income singles,
103. no

104. I think this community is really lacking 55+ communities, my in-laws would've moved into this city had there been that kind of facility instead I drive to Beaumont twice a week to help them.
105. Clean up the streets
106. No
107. No
108. I would want there to be adequate streets for housing
109. n/a
110. No
111. Rubidoux area is in need of street lighting and sidewalks. Additional parks and shopping centers in that area would improve the neighborhood and bring additional jobs into that specific community. I feel that all efforts go into improving the Limonite/Eastvale areas as I've seen new housing continue to grow in that area yet, the Rubidoux area is lacking. I ask that you look into creating new housing in the Rubidoux area as there are plenty of vacant lots that can be used for new housing/shopping centers.
112. Low rent
113. It is not affordable for a single income.
114. 1,200 sq. ft. to 1,500 sq. ft. housing with a nice yard would be best for families starting out. The housing available is too dense and expensive made worse by mello-roos tax.
115. "It's difficult to be placed in affordable housing when they say you make too much but are barely meeting ends meet. I feel like that's something that needs
116. To be looked into more. "
117. No.
118. More affordable quality housing.
119. Put a CAP on price gauging by mobile home park owners--they are forcing us out of our homes
120. reason we moved out of the city was to live better.
121. No.
122. Developers seem to dictate to the City as opposed to the opposite
123. no
124. None
125. No
126. Need more parks and recreation areas
127. Need more affordable apartments or condos. Need somewhere for ALL THE HOMELESS to live....and you should NOT be able to "live" outside all of our businesses and NOT in motorhomes parked all over the city!!!!!!
128. I'm still fairly new to this area so I hesitate to comment too much.
129. No
130. There doesn't seem to be too many nice apartments to rent.
131. Would like to see sidewalks on the older housing off of Granite Hill and the home owners improve the curb appeal of their house. And stop all the trash burning which we have to put up with because they refuse to pay for trash pickup. Trash burning should be banned.
132. There needs to be a lot of code enforcement to make neighborhoods look like places people want to live. Broken chain linked fences and junk in yards do not attract people. Also, there needs to be big improvements to conditions of streets and sidewalks.
133. No
134. I'd like to see the older neighborhoods upgraded. It's nice there are 34 parks in JV, but only one baseball park and I unkept horse arena between Van Buren and Etiwanda in Pedley and Mira Loma.
135. can we turn an empty store or warehouse into a homeless shelter?
136. homes with plenty land or opportunity for additional units on property
137. Adding housing is expected but roads and access are congested. Takes 30 minutes to cross the city.
138. No
139. Handle the homelessness
140. Need more stores and restaurants and less houses
141. No
142. Clean up the tent cities. I understand homelessness is hard but the eye sores all over the city is what will push people to live elsewhere
143. low income
144. N
145. Too many homeless people & encampments — it looks embarrassing — I don't show people Jurupa valley because of the homeless population
146. Na

147. Jurupa needs housing that is single homes > 1400 sq ft that are affordable for young single income adults or we will loose them to surrounding areas.
148. no
149. No apartment are needed/ single family dwelling only
150. Need starter homes. 2 to 3 bedrooms not McMansions
151. No.
152. You shouldn't approve additional housing without increasing lanes on well traveled roads. Congestion is too great already.
153. No apartment are needed/ single family dwelling only
154. Not at this time.
155. Need more affordably priced homes in good locations for the average family to purchase or for seniors to purchase. \$500,000 homes every where is not it.
156. Before developing more housing your need to clean/ bring up to code(if one exist as it doesn't appear so) up the one that are in existence .
157. N/A
158. I noticed there aren't very many community health centers in my area.
159. Very nice community
160. We need sidewalks.
161. I live by limonite and clay and the area is nice quiet feels safe to go out at night and day. There is space by linares and clay to build homes, it would be a good addition to the area but no apartments as it may overcrowd the area. Also instead of building no commercial space in the center by the jurupa 14 theater there are alot of spaces open for new businesses. Also older parks I feel need a major update in comparison to eastvale. And not sure if this is possible but making a park near river bottom with parking or a parking fee will be a nice added feature for locals. I personally enjoy the area but I do know if apartments or other housing similar will start attracting the wrong type of good citizens and possibly start overcrowding areas. Overall I am interested and happy i found this area. And if any way possible to be involved with further discussion i would be happy to help. I want the city to thrive in a good way.
162. I would like affordable housing for single parents.
163. Streets and housing area clean and street lights to make the place safer at night , before anything
164. There are a lot of homeless encampments. We need to find ways to meet their needs.
165. There are a lot of homeless encampments. We need to find ways to meet their needs.
166. Would like housing with bigger yards.
167. Wondering what kind of support there is for a homeless person?? Services??
168. We need less rent
169. none "
170. None
171. Na
172. Need to maintain equestrian options. Not too many houses. This is why we moved here and it seems to be phasing out with all the new construction.
173. People don't maintain their properties. Many areas look bad and junked up, many neighbors are rude and don't care about anyone but themselves. We have a lot of issues with car theft, mail theft and package theft. Jurupa Valley is mostly run down, mismatched, where poor people live and don't take care of anything. There shouldn't be Butec trash bins in front of houses, or other eye sores. There is inadequate parking especially around schools. Our houses don't appreciate as much as they would in neighboring cities.
174. Sidewalks and lighting in older parts of the city, old Mira Loma, Rubidoux
175. Need commercial plazas
176. "Please continue to address the transient issue, whole empathy for the homeless and those in need is important, the higher existence of chronically unaddressed substance abuse and mental health issues in these communities cannot be ignored. The public health concerns of transients camping throughout our city and its natural habitats affect our citizens quality of life. Aid those in need and refer them to adequate resources, but do not allow camps and people living in vehicles/RVs to overwhelm our community. Nor ignore the increase in petty theft and crimes that come with chronic substance abusers and those with untreated mental health.
177. The Horseshoe Park was a great addition, and I would like to see us have something like Mt. Rubidoux and more trails and nature walks to benefit from our city's existing river/creeks and hills."
178. Our city has more petty theft, stolen vehicles, junky yards, illegal fireworks, houses deteriorating, than nicer surrounding areas. Our property values aren't going up. We need to attract people that have nicer properties, want to be part of the community and keep their places nice. People park in other people's parking, let properties go, rental properties are not good neighbors, pannhandliners, death shrines they do not attract higher end people.
179. Please don't overdevelop this city with apartment complexes. There is already enough traffic and roadkill. So sad :(

180. Like I said previously, when Jurupa Valley was becoming a city, those of us who lived here already were promised it would be rural, animal feel would be protected. It really doesn't seem like that is happening.
181. Help first time renters. A lot of apartment complexes expect renters insurance and renter history
182. Many properties have encroached on the right of way easement in front of their houses (especially in the older sections). We need to reclaim those easements and convert that space to multi-use D.G. trails. D.G. is much softer on your feet for walking or horse riding than concrete. And less costly and lower maintenance. It is not safe to see the children walking in the street to get to school when there could be a safe path with a ranch fence separating them from the traffic by having the City exercise its rights to that easement.
183. "Too many misc signs all over
184. Build some new 1/2 acre lots with side yard access for people w/RV's and horses"
185. It's important to keep horse country safe for horses and high-density housing brings more vehicles with drivers who speed and scare the horses with little or no concern for the horses or riders.
186. We need more retail rather than housing
187. Old farm properties should be conserved and be given a chance for rehabilitation before demolition for new housing or industrialization.
188. Affordable!
189. No
190. The new houses being built on Sierra and Valley way have no close shopping centers we will lose revenue to Fontana for families to do their shopping
191. The city is a dump. Poor Code enforcement.
192. I would like Jurupa Valley to continue to offer a semi-rural environment as it continues to grow.
193. Do not push your low income housing to the outskirts of the city because you don't have to see them. Put them near shopping, transportation and away from dispensaries so they can walk to the things they need and not bring the issues surrounding that to unsupported areas
194. none
195. NA
196. Many streets don't have any lighting or sidewalks. Please work on improving streets. Safety is key, need street lighting.
197. no
198. There needs to be better land use planning so that commercial needs (specifically grocery) are within walking distance to residential neighborhoods.
199. No
200. None
201. N/A
202. Please consider the noise pollution that comes with building new neighborhoods. It would be beneficial to strengthen walls surrounding streets that have become new major commuting streets. (Armstrong, 60 to Sierra)
203. I think the retail development is missing to attract more buyers into our city. Many locations on Limonite remain vacant like the old Albertsons and Kmart.
204. There is not much availability of 1/2 - 1 acre buildable lots for those who want to build their own home.
205. General city improvements.
206. N/a
207. Need more shelters for the homeless people in the area
208. Na
209. No
210. Stop listening to Sacramento who wants everyone crammed into tiny, high density cheap housing, to control people. We need and want larger lots, wide open spaces in our neighborhoods.
211. Too much traffic.
212. Yes I would like to be informed and involved on a Jurupa Valley housing resident committee if any are available to voice my concerns about future developments in the area.
213. The new houses on granite hill shoulda had more yard space. I feel like Jurupa valley is more like a western living with livestock.
214. I like the senior apartments on Mission, near the market. I'm extremely interested in seeing the property on the southwest corner of Camino Real and Jurupa Rd developed into a nice neighborhood of single family residences, given the location next door to Camino Real elementary school.
215. I am a single mother of four disabled children. I have access to purchase a family dwelling and housing for each of my disabled children yet can not afford a typical "single-family" dwelling within Jurupa Valley in stead I have to go to Indio, Coachella, Palamar etc. disabled community should be able to access housing within Jurupa Valley when Jurupa Valley has documented students registered with physical and mental disabilities (with IEPs and 504s) that are potentially the future generations residents. I would explore the committee to consider the projected number of registered residents within

Housing

Jurupa Valley and with the potential growth of funding under DDS - Person Centered Funding and other County Funded resources for Transitional / Supportive Housing and Licensed Assisted Livings or Licensed Cared Facilities. Please if you need further information reach out to Inland Regional housing liason and/or Department of Social Services housing and urban developmental council. I am a mother of four disabled children but an advocate for the community. I would be happy to share educate and/or participate or work alongside any committee.

216. N/A

217. Additional housing in JV should not be added without significant infrastructure improvement first!

218. I don't mind our city looking modest but I sure don't want it looking trashy: code enforcement is important.

219. N/A

220. The new housing near wineville and bellegrave needs retail and shopping centers. There are many new residents and although not far, we have to drive across the freeway to east vale to shop and dine

221. n/a

222. h

223. N/A


224. Don't know

225. We were a small town and now are turning into a big city. We don't need Jurupa Valley to be the next Orange county or LA county. Please think about what we already have and don't add more traffic in our small city.

226. Please do not add more apartment. INSTEAD just add nature walks


227. No

Spanish Survey Results:




2. Cuanto tiempo a vivido en la Ciudad de Jurupa Valley? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican.)

4 responses




3. Profavor seleccione todos que apliquen a usted. (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)

4 responses




4. Cual es su rango de edad? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)

4 responses




5. Cual mejor describe su situacion de vivienda? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)

4 responses



6. Cual mayor describe su composicion de hogar? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)

4 responses




7. Es dificil allar o mantener vivienda adecuada para usted o familiares/amigos/ companeros? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican.)

4 responses




8. Usted cree que es difícil encontrar viviendas de renta en la Ciudad de Jurupa Valley? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican.)

4 respuestas




9. Usted cree que es difícil encontrar vivienda económica en renta en Jurupa Valley? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)

4 respuestas




10. Usted cree que es difícil encontrar viviendas de venta en Jurupa Valley? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican.)

4 responses




11. Usted cree que es difícil encontrar viviendas económicas de venta en Jurupa Valley? (Comprobar todos los que se aplican.)


4 responses



12. Por favor proeba rango para los grupos abajo por orden de necesidad de vivienda y servicios relacionados en la comunidad. (Comprobar todos los que se aplican)



13. Jurupa Valley continuara creciendo y evolucionando en la proxima decada. Que cree usted que son los problemas mas importantes/preoridades de ...a en Jurupa Valley? Escoga (4) opciones abajo. * 4 responses




14. A visto ejemplos de nuevas viviendas (en Jurupa Valley otra ciudad) que le guste y que pueda “ajustar” a Jurupa Valley? Porque? Cuales funciones le gusto? *

4 responses

1. No se
2. vecindarios con banquetas, luces y calles en buenas condiciones
3. Rentas de acuerdo al ingreso.
4. No

15. Que adecuadamente esta proporcionando los siguientes tipos de viviendas la Ciudad de Jurupa Valley? *Comprobar todos los que se aplican.




16. Tiene informacion adicional o observaciones que quisiera compartir sobre viviendas en Jurupa Valley?

4 responses

1. No
2. Que se exija mantenimiento y limpieza al propietario de la casa
3. Me gustaria que hubieran viviendas para personas mayores de 65 de bajos recursos.
4. Las rentas están subiendo.

7. Virtual Community Workshop Flyer (English and Spanish)



City of
JURUPA VALLEY
California

JOIN US!

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP ON HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

APRIL 5th & 6th, 2021 at 6:00 PM

Join fellow community members for a virtual workshop to discuss housing in Jurupa Valley as we prepare the 2021-2029 Housing Element. Your input is important to help us best meet our residents' needs and priorities when it comes to providing housing for all members of our community.

WORKSHOP INFORMATION


APRIL 5th (English session) from 6:00 to 7:30 PM
<https://zoom.us/j/98617263584?pwd=cGorcTRKeG5wT0JQMDRGd3p1d1RNQT09>
Meeting ID: 986 1726 3584
Passcode: 148394

APRIL 6th (Spanish session) from 6:00 to 7:30 PM
<https://zoom.us/j/91977825286?pwd=QU4vdHZkaFhTLzZjZk5jdWZESGVFUT09>
Meeting ID: 919 7782 5286
Passcode: 485948

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE

If you don't have access to internet, join us in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, where a limited amount of socially distanced laptops with zoom access and staff assistance will be available. Contact (951) 332-6464 Ext. 215 to reserve your seat.

Jurupa Valley City Hall:
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509



For more information, check www.jurupavalley.org.



City of
JURUPA VALLEY
California

ACOMPANENOS!

TALLER COMUNITARIO DE LA ACTUALIZACION DEL ELEMENTO RESIDENCIAL

ABRIL 5 Y 6, 2021 a las 6:00 PM

Unase a sus companeros de comunidad para un taller virtual para hablar sobre el elemento residencial en Jurupa Valley mientras preparamos el Elemento Residencial del 2021-2029. Su opinion es importante para saber como mejor satisfacer las necesidades y prioridades de los residentes cuando se trata de proveer residencias a miembros de la comunidad.

INFORMACION DEL TALLER

ABRIL 5 (Sesion en ingles) de 6:00 a 7:30 PM

<https://zoom.us/j/98617263584?pwd=cGorcTRKeG5wT0JQMDRGd3p1d1RNQT09>

ID de la junta: 986 1726 3584

Passcode: 148394

ABRIL 6 (Sesion en espanol) de 6:00 a 7:30 PM

<https://zoom.us/j/91977825286?pwd=QU4vdHZkaFhTLzZjZk5jdWZESGVFUT09>

ID de la junta: 919 7782 5286

Passcode: 485948

ASISTENCIA ADICIONAL

Si no tienen acceso al internet acompanenos en el ayuntamiento de la ciudad, donde ayara un numero limitado de computadoras con acceso a zoom y habra ayuda de personal. Contacto (951) 332-6464 Ext. 215 para reservar su asiento.

Jurupa Valley City Hall:
8930 Limonite Avenue
Jurupa Valley, CA 92509



Para mas informacion, revise www.jurupavalley.org.

8. Community Flyer – Revised Draft Housing Element Update

JURUPA VALLEY
REVISED DRAFT
HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

The City of Jurupa Valley is updating its General Plan Housing Element to outline its plan to provide housing for all income levels during the 2021- 2029 planning period.


The Draft Housing Element has been revised in response to comments from the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

Please go to the website below to review the revised Draft Housing Element Update and provide input.

WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

HOUSING ELEMENT WEBSITE:
www.jurupavalley.org/Housing-Element-Update

**Available starting
October 5, 2021!**



City of
JURUPA VALLEY
California

Appendix D – Evaluation of Previous Housing Element/ Past Accomplishments

Per *California Government Code* §65588, “Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate all of the following: (1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal; (2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community’s housing goals and objectives; and (3) The progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementation of the housing element.”

Jurupa Valley’s 5th Cycle Housing Element spanning the 2013-2021 planning period was initially adopted by the City Council on September 7, 2017 with the 2017 General Plan. The City subsequently worked with HCD on minor changes needed to fully comply with state law and HCD deemed the 5th Cycle Housing Element to be in full compliance with state law on June 4, 2019. This 6th Cycle includes updates and all achievements made by the City during the 2017 to 2021 time period.

From adoption (i.e., 2017) to the development of the 2021 Housing Element, the City has achieved the following:

- Implemented programs for housing rehabilitation and infrastructure updates
- Updated and adopted municipal code for affordable housing density per state law
- Up-designated and up-zoned 35 acres to allow for higher density residential development
- Implemented programs to fund transitional and homeless housing.
- Contracted with the Fair Housing Council of Riverside to keep data on discrimination, complaints and housing access for the City.
- Conducted an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice
- Updated and adopted municipal code for Emergency shelters per state law
- Updated and adopted municipal code to for Accessory Dwelling Units
- Continued progress of developing a more expedited housing developmental review process.

These notable changes to housing policy have bolstered the housing development choices in the City and aided in the approval of over 1,000 new dwelling units in the past four years.

From the previous Housing Element, there are still objectives and programs that are being worked on and in progress. However, with how recent the last cycle review was conducted, the City of Jurupa Valley has many objectives that will continue into the 6th cycle and beyond. As part of the annual review of the Housing Element as part of the General plan, each local government is required to complete an evaluation of the existing goals, objectives, programs, and policies to identify the effectiveness of the programs. The following table reviews the work accomplished during the 5th cycle, indicates changes and identifies programs being continued in the 6th cycle Housing Element for the planning period of 2021 to 2029.

Table D-1 Housing Action Plan Summary 2017-2021 (5th Cycle Status of Items)

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Goal HE 1: Encourage and where possible, assist in the development of quality housing to meet the City's share of the region's housing needs for all income levels and for special needs populations.		
Ensure that the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map designate sufficient land at appropriate densities and in appropriate locations to accommodate the City's fair share of regional housing needs.	HE 1.1.1. General Plan and Zoning Amendments. Amend General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Map to designate at least 16 acres for residential use at HHDR density (up to 25 du/acre) to help meet Lower Income RHNA needs. The Land Use Map will be amended concurrently with the 2017 General Plan. Zoning Ordinance amendments shall be initiated within 1 year of adopting the new General Plan.	Updated action to 6 th cycle Previously required rezones in 5 th cycle housing element were completed and now numbers will replace 16 acres with additional potential parcels to satisfy corrected need based on RHNA numbers.
Provide incentives to encourage development of Opportunity Sites and adaptive reuse of properties in all Residential Zones, with emphasis on Medium-High, High, Very High, and Highest Density Residential zones.	HE 1.1.2. Housing Authority Coordination. Coordinate with the Riverside County Housing Authority to pursue grant funding and other incentives to promote and assist the non-profit and/or private production of housing affordable to lower income households. Utilize public financing tools when available, including revenue bonds, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program funds.	Continued action to the 6 th cycle During the 5 th cycle the City worked with the Housing Authority to utilize grant funding to help homeowners and renters alike with improvements on housing stock of the community.
Encourage construction of multi-family housing affordable to moderate- and lower-income households.	HE 1.1.3. Tax Exempt Bonds. Consider using tax-exempt revenue bonds to help finance new multi-family construction.	Updated action in the 6 th Cycle Housing Element, through the combination of the objective and removal of action because funding is not an action.
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 1.1.4. Mobile Homeowner Assistance. As resources allow, use federal and state grant funds, when available, to assist seniors, veterans and other lower income households purchase and/or improve mobile homes.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle .
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.5. Affordable Housing Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for developers of new housing that is affordable to lower income households and special needs groups, such as: fast track/priority application and permit processing, density bonuses and/or fee waivers, assist affordable housing developers with right-of-way acquisition, off-site infrastructure improvements and other development costs, and assist in securing federal or state housing financing resources. Incentives should be considered for new housing developments of 100 or more units in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Maintain consistency with state law and encourage production of smaller, affordable housing where appropriate.	HE 1.1.6. Density Provisions. Update the Jurupa Valley Municipal Code and General Plan density provisions to ensure consistency with state law, including minimum density requirements and density bonuses, as required by state law, to encourage production of smaller, affordable housing, particularly in Town Centers and in higher density, mixed-use and other areas where appropriate and compatible with adjacent development.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.7. City Development Fees. Develop a sliding scale Fee Assistance program where the amount and type of City development fees may be waived by the City Council based on the number of affordable units proposed (i.e., as the number of affordable units increases, the amount of fee waiver increases).	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Utilize grant funding to assist in the development of affordable housing and to improve neighborhoods.	HE 1.1.8. CDBG and HOME Funds. When available, use CDBG; HOME and other grant or housing trust funds to write down costs of acquiring sites and to offset infrastructure and construction costs for residential developments in which at least 15% of total units are sold or rented at prices affordable to households with incomes below 80% of the Riverside County Area Median Income (AMI).	Updated action in the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of private development of affordable housing for lower income households and special needs groups.	HE 1.1.9. Site Identification. Work with public, private and non-profit housing entities to identify candidate sites for new construction of rental housing for seniors and other special housing needs and take all actions necessary to expedite processing and approval of such projects.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 1.1.10. Residential Incentive Zone (R-6). Update and continue to encourage development of affordable housing in the R-6 zone, and other multi-family residential zones, where appropriate. Utilize incentives for development as established in Ordinance 348, or in the 2017 General Plan and subsequent Zoning Ordinance amendments.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the City completed this action and adopted the R-6 zone into the municipal code.
Assist developers, decision makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.	HE 1.1.11. Updated Land Use Inventory and Map. Establish and maintain a Land Use Inventory and a map that provide a mechanism to monitor a) acreage and location by General Plan designation, b) vacant and underutilized land, and c) build-out of approved projects utilizing the City's GIS system and supported by mapping. Maintain the Land Use Inventory on a regular basis, as frequently as budget allows.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Assist developers, decision-makers and the public in identifying housing opportunities.	HE 1.1.12. Candidate Site Mapping. Encourage developers to identify vacant and underutilized properties as candidate sites for affordable or mixed market rate/affordable housing development and identify them in the Land Use Inventory.	Updated in the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action because it sounded too similar to the objective.
Establish a shelter to help meet local needs for safe housing for homeless adults and children.	HE 1.1.13. Homeless Shelter. In cooperation with non-profit organizations, adjacent cities, and with Riverside County, encourage the development of a homeless shelter to meet Jurupa Valley's and adjacent communities' homeless shelter needs. Consider tax incentives and other financial incentives to encourage homeless shelter development.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action without the financial incentive because they do not have financial incentives for homeless shelters.
Address the broad range of needs of homeless persons.	HE 1.1.14. Homelessness Strategy. Until a permanent shelter or shelters can be established, the City shall work with Riverside County and local housing agencies to help prepare a homelessness strategy to address immediate needs dealing with safety, health and sanitation, environmental health, temporary housing, and access to homeless services.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Provide government incentives to promote creative, private- and public sector housing products, particularly for lower income households.	HE 1.1.15. Creative Housing Solutions. Provide incentives to encourage development of a range of creative and affordable housing types to accommodate homeless persons, seniors, disabled persons, and other low and extremely low-income populations, such as single room occupancy dwellings (SROs), pre-fabricated housing, so-called “tiny houses,” and other emerging housing products. Potential incentives include priority permit processing, fee waivers or deferrals, flexible development standards, supporting or assisting with funding applications, and coordinating with housing developers.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Encourage and coordinate activities of non-profit housing providers in Jurupa Valley.	HE 1.1.16. Coordination with Non-Profit Housing Providers. Continue to work with non-profit organizations, such as National Community Renaissance, Mary Erickson Housing, and Habitat for Humanity, in the production of affordable and self-help housing for moderate and lower income households.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.	HE 1.1.17. Flexible Standards. Continue to provide for flexibility in the design of residential development through the processing of planned unit developments (PUDs), area and specific plans, and town center plans, and through the application of Zoning Ordinance provisions allowing flexible lot sizes and development standards.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Comply with new state law and to provide housing that meets the needs and budgets for small households, such as single parent families, adult children, seniors.	HE 1.1.18. Accessory or Second Dwelling Units. Update the Municipal Code to allow “Accessory Dwelling Units” in compliance with state law within 1 year of Housing Element adoption.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the City completed this action and adopted the Accessory Dwelling Units Ordinance into the municipal code.
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing, and allow for the construction or expansion of high-quality mobile home parks.	HE 1.1.19. Mobile and Manufactured Homes. Continue to allow mobile homes, modular and manufactured homes in single-family residential zones “by right,” and mobile home parks subject to a CUP, and encourage construction of new mobile home parks and manufactured housing to increase the supply of affordable dwelling units, where appropriate.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the into existing objective.
Encourage and assist the feasibility of developing high-quality housing that meets a wide range of housing needs, tenure and budgets.	HE 1.1.20. Mixed Housing Types and Densities. Encourage residential development proposals to provide a range of housing types and densities for all income levels, including market rate housing, using creative planning concepts such as traditional neighborhood design, planned unit developments, area and specific plans, and mixed-use development.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action because it sounded too similar to the objective.
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.21. Accessible Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage single- and multi-family housing developers to designate accessible and/or adaptable units already required by law to be affordable to persons with disabilities or persons with special needs.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is already part of Building Code
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.22. Universal Design. Encourage “universal design” features in new dwellings, such as level entries, wider paths of travel, larger bathrooms, and lower kitchen countertops to accommodate persons with disabilities.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is already part of Building Code

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Promote accessible housing that meets the needs of disabled persons and other persons with special needs.	HE 1.1.23. Affordable Housing for Disabled Persons. Encourage, and as budget allows, help support programs providing increased opportunities for disabled persons in affordable residential units rehabilitated or constructed through City or County programs.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action because it sounded too similar to the objective.
GOAL HE 2: Conserve and improve the housing stock, particularly housing affordable to lower income and special housing needs households.		
Maintain and improve the overall quality, safety and appearance of Jurupa Valley's housing stock.	HE 2.1.1. Infrastructure. Plan for adequate maintenance of public facilities such as streets, sidewalks, and drainage in the City's capital improvement program and encourage community services districts to do likewise.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is already part of City's responsibilities.
Conserve housing resources, particularly for historic resources and to provide cost- and resource-efficient, high quality affordable housing.	HE 2.1.2. Adaptive Housing Strategies. Support creative strategies for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial structures for housing, if appropriate.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action.
Protect public health, safety and neighborhood quality for all persons; administer codes in a fair, consistent and community-responsive manner.	HE 2.1.3. Code Enforcement. Ensure that housing is maintained through code enforcement activities. Continue to administer the Code Enforcement Program to eliminate unsafe, illegal, and substandard conditions in residential neighborhoods and residential properties.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Preserve mobile homes and encourage their maintenance and improvement as affordable housing for seniors, disabled persons and lower income households, and to maintain and enhance neighborhood quality and safety.	HE 2.1.4. Affordable Mobile Homes Conservation. Conserve affordable mobile home housing stock and help bring such housing up to code through mobile home loan and improvement grants funded by CDBG and other funds, as available.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Offer all persons and equal opportunity to participate in planning and housing decisions that affect them.	HE 2.1.5. Bilingual Outreach. As resources allow, provide bilingual outreach materials and activities to educate and inform the community about available housing rehabilitation programs and resources.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.	HE 2.1.6. Monitor Assisted Units. Help ensure that affordable housing assisted with public funds remains affordable for the required time through maintenance of an inventory of assisted units which is monitored for expiration of assisted housing.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Preserve publicly assisted affordable housing that is at risk of being converted to market-rate and losing its affordability provisions.	HE 2.1.7. Preserve At-Risk Housing Units. Preserve grant-assisted, bond-financed, density bonus or other types of affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate during the planning period by working with the Riverside County Housing Authority or other nonprofit housing entities to 1) purchase the units using state, federal or local financing and/or subsidies, 2) assist with low or no interest loans for rehabilitation, as budget allows, 3) support bond refinancing, and 4) refer the project sponsor to other federal or local sources of below-market financing. City shall also ensure compliance with state noticing and tenant education requirements.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Preserve affordable housing as required by the funding agency or source of funds providing assistance to the project.	HE 2.1.8 Affordability Covenants. As a condition of project approval, require new affordable housing projects to remain affordable for a specific time, consistent with and as required by the funding program(s) in which they participate, through covenants with the project proponent, Housing Authority or other housing agency.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Remove or mitigate governmental constraints to housing such as outmoded, unnecessary, conflicting and excessive requirements.	HE 2.1.9 Remove Government Constraints. Evaluate the zoning ordinance, subdivision requirements, and other City regulations to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing, where appropriate and legally possible. Evaluate and revise as appropriate the City's density requirements for the Highest Density Residential land use designation (HHDR) to address constraints for housing development including impacts on feasibility of proposals.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
GOAL HE 3: Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.		
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.1. Fair Housing Council. Utilize the services of the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County to implement a number of programs, including: 1) audits of lending institutions and rental establishments, 2) education and training of City staff, and 3) fair housing outreach and education regarding fair housing laws and resources.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Help ensure that all persons are treated fairly and have access to housing which meets their needs and budget.	HE 3.1.2. Education and Outreach. Continue to use the services of the Fair Housing Council to provide education and outreach services to the public in both Spanish and English (also see HE 3.1.1 above).	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Preserve existing public housing.	HE 3.1.3. Public Housing and Rental Assistance. Encourage Riverside County to continue to maintain 300+ public housing units and continue to assist very low-income recipients in Jurupa Valley with Section 8 rental assistance vouchers.	Updated to the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action because it sounded too similar to the objective.
Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers.	HE 3.1.4. First-Time Homebuyers Assistance. Explore the feasibility of developing a new First Time Home Buyer Down Payment Assistance Program, utilizing tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds to finance mortgages and down payment assistance for single-family homes for very low and low income first time homebuyers.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Explore innovative financing strategies to assist first time homebuyers.	HE 3.1.5. Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Program. Encourage the Housing Authority to continue the Lease/Purchase Home Ownership Assistance Program, which assists potential homeowners in leasing a property while moving towards ownership at the end of 3 years.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is program with the Housing Authority no longer exists.
Accommodate new market rate housing to diversify the housing stock, increase property values, increase median income and create the elements for prosperity for all households.	HE 3.1.6. Housing Variety. Facilitate new market rate residential projects that provide a variety of housing types and densities.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is not a housing program but an economic sustainability action and will be relocated and reevaluated as part of that Economic Sustainability Element.

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
Provide safe pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle linkages between neighborhoods; promote walkability.	HE 3.1.7. Neighborhood Connectivity. Require new residential neighborhoods to interconnect with existing neighborhoods to provide for social interaction, assure pedestrian-friendly connectivity, and minimize vehicle trips.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is not a housing program but a mobility element program and will be relocated and reevaluated as part of the Mobility Element.
Ensure new multi-family housing meets the same high quality standards for safety, quality and environmental health that other housing types must meet for all income levels.	HE 3.1.8. Multi-Family Dwellings Standards. Establish standards for multiple-family dwellings that will achieve comparable recreation and open space opportunities, protection from sources of noise and degraded air quality, adequate access to public services and facilities and parking that apply to single-family housing.	Updated in the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewritten because part of this was adopted in 2021 is an ongoing process.
Ensure fair treatment of all persons in securing safe housing and to promote equal housing opportunities.	HE 3.1.9. Amend the Zoning Ordinance. Amend the Zoning Ordinance to expand housing opportunities, as required by state and federal law, including but not limited to: amending the definition of "Family," removing the minimum distance requirement between emergency shelters, permitting multi-family development without discretionary land use approval, providing reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, and encouraging development of a variety of housing for all income levels, such as manufactured housing, rental housing, mobile homes, single-room occupancy housing, employee housing and transitional and supportive housing.	Updated in the 6 th cycle to clarify specifics and rewrite the action. This action's code update was completed and item replaced with a new other action. See HE 3.1.6
GOAL HE 4: Maintain and enhance residential neighborhoods and remove blight.		
Enhance the quality of life in all residential areas and promote residents' active involvement in and support for neighborhood pride and improvement activities.	HE 4.1.1. Neighborhood Participation. Implement varied strategies to ensure residents are aware of and able to participate in planning decisions affecting their neighborhoods early in the planning process, such as neighborhood meetings, City Council member visits, and town hall meetings.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 4.1.2. Neighborhood Needs. Identify specific neighborhood needs, problems, trends, and opportunities for improvements. Work directly with neighborhood groups and individuals to address concerns.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 4.1.3. Neighborhood Improvements. As budget allows, help fund neighborhood improvements, such as street paving or repairs, sidewalks, pedestrian and equestrian trails, crosswalks, parkways, street trees and other public facilities to improve aesthetics, safety, and accessibility.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Establish a pro-active code enforcement program to identify housing in need of repair and make owners aware of resources for financial assistance	HE 4.1.4. Neighborhood Pride. Working with Riverside County, CSDs and non-profit housing entities, develop and promote a Neighborhood Pride Program including cooperative projects with Code Enforcement staff, and Public Works projects in target areas, as funding allows.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.

Objective	Action	Current Status of Progress
GOAL HE 5: Reduce residential energy and water use.		
Conserve resources, reuse and recycle solid waste, and improve environmental sustainability.	HE 5.1.1. Incentives. Consider establishing incentives for energy conservation above and beyond the requirements of Title 24, such as priority permit processing or reduced permit fees on a sliding scale Fee Assistance Program, as budget allows.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
Conserve resources, reuse and recycle solid waste, and improve environmental sustainability.	HE 5.1.2. Energy Programs for Lower Income Households. Encourage and participate in Riverside County's and utility providers' programs to reduce maintenance and energy costs for households with low incomes, and increase efforts to inform the public about available cost-saving, energy conservation programs.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 5.1.3. Energy Conservation Grants. Pursue grant funds for energy rehab costs and consumer education.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 5.1.4. City Requests for Proposals. City RFPs, contracts, and bidding procedures capital projects and programs shall incorporate energy conservation and sustainability measures.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.
	HE 5.1.5. City Facilities. Utilize energy/water saving measures in City-owned buildings and facilities, including landscaping, to meet industry sustainable design standards.	Removed action for 6 th cycle because the action is not a housing program but a community safety, services and facilities action and will be relocated and reevaluated as part of that Community Safety, Services, and Facilities Element.
	HE 5.1.6. Sustainable Design. Adopt sustainable design policies, standards and codes that result in attractive, energy efficient, neighborhoods.	Continued action from 5 th cycle to the 6 th cycle.

Appendix E – Fair Housing Assessment

1. Introduction and Overview of AB 686

In 2018, California passed Assembly Bill (AB 686) as the statewide framework to affirmatively further fair housing; to promote inclusive communities, to further housing choice, and to address racial and economic disparities through government programs, policies, and operations. AB 686 defined “affirmatively furthering fair housing” to mean “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combat discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity” for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes. The bill added an assessment of fair housing to the housing element that includes the following components: a summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the City’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity; an analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities, an assessment of contributing factors, and an identification of fair housing goals and actions. The City of Jurupa Valley continues to assess the access to housing with the most recent Analysis of Impediments (AI) prepared in 2019 to comply with the requirements of the current code. With this Housing Element Update, the City is again analyzing future actions to promote fair housing for all in Jurupa Valley.

AB 686 also requires that preparation of the housing element land inventory and identification of sites occur through the lens of AFFH, and that the housing element include a program that promotes and affirmatively furthers fair housing opportunities throughout the community. The program should address the issues identified through the assessment. The program must include: 1) meaningful actions that address disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity; 2) a timeline of concrete actions and a timeline for implementation; and 3) no actions inconsistent with AFFH. In the Jurupa Valley Housing Element, the Housing Element Section I includes the required AFFH program, based on the recommendations of the AI and the additional analysis done for the 6th Cycle Housing Element update provided in this assessment.

2. Assessment of Fair Housing Issues

In 2019, the City of Jurupa Valley completed its first Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice as a City, pulling from regional and county-based data for the review. This analysis considered the current issues surrounding Jurupa Valley’s fair housing and resulting in an action plan for the planning period of 2019-2023. It included a community survey, local knowledge, and help from housing consultant, which all shaped the focus of that report. The report concluded that the following main changes to current fair housing practices in Jurupa Valley were needed:

- Additional outreach and education activities
- Increase enforcement activities from discrimination cases
- Monitoring of lending, housing providers, and local real estate practices
- Increase geographic choice in housing
- Adopting land use law to increase inclusionary housing access

Currently the City is contracted with the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County (FHCRC) and provides housing programs through Community Development Block Grants to provided additional options to the community of Jurupa Valley. The City, with the help of FHCRC, tracks issues of fair housing and also provide housing education, housing access, and housing counseling.

Now with the development of the 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City is performing an analysis to satisfy the requirements to meet the needs of current state housing law. In this analysis the City relied on the AFFH

Data and Mapping Resources provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD Data Viewer), the following sources of data:

- City of Jurupa Valley General Plan (adopted September 7, 2017)
- City of Jurupa Valley Draft Housing Element (under review by the State of California Housing and Community Development and adopted by the Jurupa Valley City Council on December 2, 2021)
- Consolidated Plan (2018-2022)
- California Department of Finance Population and Housing Estimates (2019)
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010
- California Employment Development Department (2007-2019)
- Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (2019)
- Comprehensive Performance Evaluation Report (2019-2020)
- Annual Action Plan for 2020-2021

Additional sources of information include the American Community Survey 2015-2019 five-year estimates (ACS), Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data, and the “Pre-Certified Local Housing Data” prepared for Jurupa Valley by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG Report), and additional local sources of information.

2.1. Fair Housing Enforcement and Outreach

The City has contracted the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County (FHCRC) to implement its Fair Housing Program, and the availability of these services are promoted on the City’s website and the Fair Housing Council website. The FHCRC provides free fair housing services including landlord/tenant counseling to answer questions about rights and responsibilities; investigation concerning allegations of housing discrimination and help for victims of discrimination; outreach and education about Fair Housing laws and issues; and publication of a monthly rental listing of affordable housing opportunities. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, FHCRC now provides additional resources for those who need rental assistance and education opportunities to stay informed of housing rights. Their website includes housing videos, workshops, and events to promote public awareness for housing education. FHCRC has physical offices in Riverside, Corona, Moreno Valley, and Palm Springs, which currently maintains a Housing Rights Hotline, and offers phone or online counseling.

According to the FHCRC Data collected for 2020, the county has seen a rise in complaints for overdue rent, lack of maintenance, and discrimination. The FHCRC profile of Jurupa Valley spells a similar story and can be attributed to the many closures and job losses due to the COVID-19 pandemic through 2020. In Jurupa Valley, FHCRC received 429 complaints and assisted 1,169 residents during the 2019-2020 fiscal year. The highest landlord-tenant complaints received concerned notices (25.5%), lease/rental terms (20.7%), and repairs (19.9%). This information is not tracked by address, so there is no way to tell if a concentration of complaints occurs in specific neighborhoods.

At the County level, the data collected by FHCRC has shown that discrimination happens most often when landlords and property managers enact rules and policies that are discriminatory due to lack of understanding or misunderstanding of the Fair Housing Act and what is considered discriminatory. Due to this lack of knowledge, the FHCRC investigates violations through its Fair Housing Initiative Program grants that fund the Private Enforcement Initiative and the Education and Outreach Initiative. The Private Enforcement Initiative utilizes investigational techniques to monitor and uncover when discriminatory practices are present for home seekers and current residents. The Education and Outreach Initiative focuses on educating the public, tenants, and property managers and public services of forms of housing and the different access needed for those who are overlooked, like individuals with disabilities. From the FHCRC countywide data, the three main reasons

that people are discriminated against in housing are based on physical disability (54%), race(13%), and mental disability (8%). The City of Jurupa Valley had reports of housing discrimination based on physical disability at 50% and a five-way split in discrimination due to sex, national origin, familial status, race, and marital status with 10% each.

According to HCD Data Viewer Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) complaints for Jurupa Valley in 2013-2021, the City received fewer than 0.25 inquiries for every 1,000 people in the total city population, which is similar to most cities adjacent to Jurupa Valley, except for the City of Riverside, which has received twice as many complaints (Figure E-1).

While the data from the Data Viewer does not include a breakdown for the different types of complaints at the City level, it does provide a breakdown at the County level from 2010 and 2020. In 2020, the County of Riverside as a whole saw a reduction of FHEO complaints in comparison to its 2010 data. However, of those complaints received, the proportions of AFFH cases that are based on disabilities bias and race bias have remained the same with 45% to 65% of all cases dealing with disabilities bias and 20% to 35% in race bias. This data reflects a very similar story as the FHCRRC data for discrimination in housing at the County level.

Figure E-1 also shows housing choice voucher (HCV) recipients by tract. Between 5% and 15% of renters in five Jurupa Valley tracts receive HCVs. To protect the confidentiality of those receiving Housing Choice Voucher Program assistance, tracts containing 10 or fewer voucher holders were omitted from this data set.


In Jurupa Valley, the majority of the housing programs for fair housing are handled through the contract with FHCRRC due to the lack of housing-dedicated city staff to operate these programs at the capacity that they need to be operated. However, the City still operates a handful of programs that are developed with funds from Community Development Block Grants. These programs are required to report annually to maintain funding through the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The City of Jurupa Valley completed its CAPER in November 2020 for the evaluation period of 2019-2020.

The CAPER report includes the breakdown of goals, and the outcomes of the City efforts. The report also reviews the different forms of assistance provided to the community and the demographics of the families assisted, along with methods of monitoring, special needs groups, and affordable housing. This report looked at the following goals for change:

- Homeless Services: The city expected to assist 90 persons and assisted 121 persons.
- Fair Housing Services: The city expected to assist 200 persons and assisted 429 persons.
- Housing Rehabilitation: The city expected to assist 5 households and assisted 1 household.
- Program Administration: The city expected to contract 1 entity for administration and contracted 1 entity.
- Public Facilities: The city expected to assist 0 persons and assisted 0 persons.
- Public Infrastructure Improvements: The city expected to assist 11,225 persons and assisted 11,225 persons.
- Services for Low- and Moderate-Income Households: The city expected to assist 275 persons and assisted 274 persons.

The CAPER helps the City understand which programs are working and which are not, while some programs like Public Facilities were not budgeted for in the 2019-2020 year. The number of people assisted includes all people who made a formal complaint to FHCRRC to have FHCRRC enforce the housing law and provide education for tenants and landlords/property managers.

Figure E-1 FHEO Inquiries (2013-2021) and HCVs (2020)



Source: HCD Data Viewer (2013-2021 HUD FHEO inquiry and HCV database), 2021

2.2. Integration and Segregation

The HCD Data Viewer, drawing from U.S. Census, ACS, and other data sources, provides a depth of resources to better understand patterns of affluence, poverty, segregation, and integration.

AB 686 requires that preparation of the housing element land inventory and identification of sites occur through the lens of AFFH. To meet this requirement, the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Sites Inventory has been mapped and overlaid onto the HCD Data Viewer opportunity and R/ECAP maps (Figure E-1), as further discussed below.

The Sites Inventory was developed with many attributes and requirements to ensure that parcels that were included could successfully meet the needs of the RHNA. These sites were selected due to their proximity to similar densities, similar developments, access to transportation, and access to amenities. Some sites are entitled as part of specific plans in which they will develop with the adjacent homes and commercial sites to better integrate the developments within each neighborhood. While these sites are based on opportunity, vacant, and underutilized sites, they are not concentrated in any given neighborhood but rather dispersed all over the city to provide opportunity for diverse living situations and geographies. With the help of the HCD Data Viewer, the City was able to determine sites that were suited in locations of development to best serve the community of Jurupa Valley.

Race and Ethnicity

The ethnic and racial composition of a region is useful in analyzing housing demand and any related fair housing concerns, because it tends to demonstrate a relationship with other characteristics such as household size, locational preferences, and mobility.

Local Trend

The breakdown of population by race can be found in Table E-1. From 2012 to 2019 the largest shifts in racial/ethnic composition in Jurupa Valley can be seen in a decrease of the Non-Hispanic White and the increase of the Hispanic or Latino demographics. Regionally Hispanic/Latino residents make up 48.9% of the total population compared to 71.4% in Jurupa Valley. Jurupa Valley has a smaller share of Whites, Black/African Americans, American Indian/Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, persons of a different race, and persons of two or more races compared to the County.

Table E-1 Race/Ethnicity Demographics (2012-2019)

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2019	
	Jurupa Valley	Riverside County	Jurupa Valley	Riverside County
White	23.8%	39.6%	20.6%	35.3%
Black/African American	3.5%	5.9%	3.0%	6.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%
Asian	2.9%	5.8%	3.5%	6.3%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%
Other	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%
Two or more races	1.1%	2.2%	1.0%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	68.1%	45.5%	71.4%	48.9%
Total	97,673	2,192,982	105,653	2,411,439

Source: 2008-2012 and 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Dissimilarity indices can be used to measure the evenness of distribution between two groups in an area. The distribution of racial/ethnic groups can be used as an indicator for segregation. HUD provides dissimilarity indices for CDBG jurisdictions, including Jurupa Valley and Riverside County. The following shows how HUD views various levels of the index:

- <40: Low Segregation
- 40-54: Moderate Segregation
- >55: High Segregation

Segregation between all non-White and White groups in Jurupa Valley is considered low. Dissimilarity indices in the City are lower than the County for all racial/ethnic groups. Since 1990, dissimilarity indices have increased in all racial/ethnic and White populations. Black and White communities are most segregated in the City, while Hispanic and White communities are the least segregated.

Table E-2 Dissimilarity Indices (1990-2020)


	1990	2000	2010	Current
Jurupa Valley				
Non-White/White	17.93	21.61	22.77	26.15
Black/White	32.98	30.34	31.53	37.56
Hispanic/White	16.56	23.82	24.58	27.76
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	15.36	20.81	23.88	31.04
Riverside County				
Non-White/White	32.16	38.18	36.71	39.53
Black/White	46.72	47.08	40.59	44.89
Hispanic/White	34.33	41.31	40.66	42.61
Asian or Pacific Islander/White	34.92	35.99	36.36	40.80

Source: HUD AFFH-T Data: Dissimilarity Indices, 2020.

As shown in Figure E-2, racial/ethnic minority groups make up more than 60% of most block groups in Jurupa Valley. Jurupa Valley has similar racial/ethnic minority concentrations compared to the region. There are slightly fewer racial/ethnic minorities in jurisdictions south of Jurupa Valley compared to the jurisdictions on the northern, western, and eastern sides.


According to ACS data used for the HCD Data Viewer, the city is dominated in almost all tracts by Hispanic populations. Predominant racial/ethnic populations are shown in Figure E-3. This map is important when looking at the Sites Inventory, because the ethnic majority can provide insight into the types of cultural habits and cohabitation habits seen throughout the City and can also provide insight into locations throughout the City that require a higher density of housing. The data of the community ethnic/racial demographics is necessary for the AFFH analysis, because the two largest discrimination issues in Jurupa Valley according to FHCRC data are racial discrimination and disabilities discrimination.

Figure E-2 Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration and Sites Inventory (2018)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure E-3 Predominant Racial/Ethnic Population (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021.

Regional Trend

Riverside County is predominantly non-White; nearly half the population is Hispanic/Latino, 6% is Asian, and 6.1% is Black/African American (Table E-1). As shown in Table E-2, dissimilarity indices are higher in the County compared to Jurupa Valley. Overall, segregation between all non-White and White communities is considered low, while Black/White communities, Hispanic/White communities, and Asian or Pacific Islander/White communities are considered moderately segregated. Table E-3 shows the racial/ethnic composition of Riverside County, Jurupa Valley, and neighboring jurisdictions. Jurupa Valley has the largest Hispanic/Latino population among the selected jurisdictions. Moreno Valley, Jurupa Valley, and Eastvale have smaller White populations, while Norco has the largest White population (55.6%). Jurupa Valley also has the smallest share of Black/African American residents, Asian residents, and residents of two or more races compared to nearby cities.

Table E-3 Race/Ethnicity Composition of Jurupa Valley and Neighboring Jurisdictions (2019)

Race/Ethnicity	Jurupa Valley	Corona	Eastvale	Moreno Valley	Norco	City of Riverside	Riverside County
White	20.6%	34.7%	21.2%	15.7%	55.6%	29.8%	35.3%
Black/African American	3.0%	5.2%	7.9%	17.1%	4.5%	5.8%	6.1%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
Asian	3.5%	11.1%	25.7%	6.0%	4.3%	7.4%	6.3%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Other	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%
Two or more races	1.0%	2.5%	5.2%	1.8%	2.3%	2.5%	2.4%
Hispanic/Latino	71.4%	45.7%	39.5%	58.7%	33.0%	53.7%	48.9%
Total	105,653	166,972	62,046	207,289	26,670	326,414	2,411,439

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

As shown in Figure E-4, most block groups in Riverside County in the Jurupa Valley region have racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 61%. San Bernardino County jurisdictions north and east of Jurupa Valley, and the areas surrounding Moreno Valley and Perris, have high concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities. Racial/ethnic minority groups make up a slightly lower proportion of block groups around Woodcrest and Sun City; however, in most block groups the non-White population outnumbers the White population.

Sites Inventory

The distribution of RHNA units, including vacant and underutilized sites, rezone sites, and specific plan sites, are shown below. As presented in Table E-4, most lower-income RHNA units are in block groups where racial/ethnic minorities make up more than 81% of the population. In comparison, only 34.6% of moderate income RHNA units and 32% of above-moderate income RHNA units are in block groups with the same racial/ethnic minority concentration. There are no lower or moderate income units in block groups with lower racial/ethnic minority populations of 60% or below. Approximately 49.4% of all RHNA units are in block groups where more than 81% of the population belongs to a racial/ethnic minority group. The RHNA sites strategy does concentrate lower income units in tracts with larger racial/ethnic minority populations. However, as shown above, the sites strategy does not concentrate sites suitable to accommodate lower income units in a single area of the City. The concentration of lower income units is a reflection of the composition of the City as a whole.

Table E-4 Distribution of RHNA Units by Racial/Ethnic Minority Population (2018)

Racial/Ethnic Minority Population (Block Group)	Very Low Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
41-60%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32	1.6%	32	0.6%
61-80%	679	30.0%	481	65.4%	1,358	66.4%	2,518	49.9%
>81%	1,585	70.0%	255	34.6%	654	32.0%	2,494	49.4%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Persons with Disabilities

Persons with disabilities have special housing needs because of their fixed income, the lack of accessible and affordable housing, and the higher health costs associated with their disability.

Local Trend

In Jurupa Valley, persons living with one or more disability make up about 10.8% of the total population with a variety of different disability types. Ambulatory and independent living disabilities are the most common; approximately 6.3% of the population experiences an ambulatory difficulty, and 6.1% experiences an independent living difficulty. Nearly 40% of elderly adults in Jurupa Valley experience a disability, as shown in Table E-5.

Table E-5 Disability by Age and Type – Jurupa Valley (2019)

Disability Type	Under 18	18-64	65+	Total
With a hearing difficulty	0.5%	1.7%	15.9%	2.8%
With a vision difficulty	1.1%	2.7%	6.7%	2.6%
With a cognitive difficulty	3.6%	3.2%	12.9%	4.3%
With an ambulatory difficulty	0.7%	4.5%	29.1%	6.3%
With a self-care difficulty	1.3%	1.8%	10.5%	2.6%
With an independent living difficulty	–	3.5%	22.2%	6.1%
Total with a disability	3.7%	9.3%	39.9%	10.8%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates)

Table E-6 shows disability status by race. Black or African American and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander residents have the highest rate of disability. Approximately 21.8% of the Black/African American population and 21.1% of the Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander population in Jurupa Valley experience a disability. White and American Indian/Alaska Native populations also experience disabilities at a higher rate than the average citywide.

Table E-6 Disability Status by Race – Jurupa Valley (2019)


Race/Ethnicity	Total Population	With a Disability
White alone	55,104	12.8%
Black or African American alone	3,374	21.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	835	12.3%
Asian alone	3,809	8.0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	142	21.1%
Some other race alone	37,955	7.1%
Two or more races	3,801	9.8%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	21,470	18.7%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	75,190	8.0%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates)

According to the data provided in FHCR data collected over the year of 2019-2020, most of the complaints of discrimination both at the City and County levels stem from racial disability discriminations. According to FHCR discrimination complaint records, 50% were related to physical disability.


The HCD Data Viewer maps show that that the percentage of the population with a disability is predominantly located in the highest concentration in the community in the northwest side of Jurupa Valley; this area is the same area that is under specific review of the Environmental Justice Element. More than 50% of the tracts have from 10% to 20% of the total population living there with one or more disabilities shown in Figure E-5. There is one tract in Jurupa Valley with a higher concentration of persons with disabilities compared to the region (Figure E-6). Most tracts in the Jurupa Valley region have concentrations of persons with disabilities up to 20%.

Figure E-5 Concentration of Persons with Disabilities and Sites Inventory (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure E-6 Regional Concentration of Persons with Disabilities (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Regional Trend

According to 2015-2019 ACS estimates, 11.6% of Riverside County residents experience a disability, more than in Jurupa Valley. As discussed previously, 10.8% of Jurupa Valley residents experience a disability, a larger proportion compared to the neighboring jurisdictions of Corona (7.9%), Eastvale (8.3%), and Moreno Valley (9.7%), but smaller than Norco (11.6%) and the City of Riverside (11.2%). Disabilities are more common among elderly adults countywide. Approximately 26.2% of the County population aged 64-74 and 49.5% of the population aged 75 and older experience a disability. Over half of discrimination complaints filed through FHCR were related to physical disability and 8% were related to mental disability.

As shown in Table E-7, less than 20% of the population experiences a disability in most tracts in Riverside County. Tracts around the cities of Sun City, Hemet, and Beaumont, and one tract in Jurupa Valley, have disabled populations exceeding 20%.

Sites Inventory

Approximately 69.6% of all RHNA units, including 46.6% lower income units, 100% of moderate income units, and 76.8% of above moderate income units, are in census tracts where 10 to 20% of the population has a disability. There are no units in the tract where more than 20% of the population experiences a disability. While there are more RHNA units in tracts where more than 10% of the population experiences a disability, the sites strategy does not disproportionately place lower income sites in these tracts compared to moderate and above moderate income units. As shown above, tracts with a population of persons with disabilities exceeding 10% make up more than half this City. The sites inventory generally follows this trend, specifically for lower income units.

Table E-7 Distribution of RHNA Units by Population of Persons with Disabilities (2019)

Disabled Population (Tract)	Lower Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
<10%	1,056	46.6%	0	0.0%	475	23.2%	1,531	30.4%
10-20%	1,208	53.4%	736	100.0%	1,569	76.8%	3,513	69.6%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Familial Status

Familial status refers to the presence of children under the age of 18, whether the child is biologically related to the head of household, and the marital status of the head of households. Families with children may face housing discrimination by landlords who fear that children will cause property damage. Some landlords may have cultural biases against children of the opposite sex sharing a bedroom. Differential treatments such as limiting the number of children in a complex or confining children to a specific location are also fair housing concerns. Single-parent households are protected by fair housing law. Female-headed households with children require special consideration and assistance because of their greater need for affordable housing and accessible day care, health care, and other supportive services.

Local Trend

As shown in Table E-8, 40.5% of Jurupa Valley households were households with children in 2012, a higher proportion than the County as a whole (37.2%). As of 2019, the proportion of households with children in Jurupa Valley had decreased from 40.5% to 39.8%. Approximately 30.4% of households are married couple households with children, and 9.4% are single-parent households, including 6.7% single-parent female-headed households.

Table E-8 Household Type Composition Trend (2012-2019)

Household Type	2012		2019	
	Jurupa Valley	Riverside County	Jurupa Valley	Riverside County
Households with Children	40.5%	37.2%	39.8%	32.6%
Married Couple with Children	30.8%	26.5%	30.4%	23.4%
Single-Parent	9.7%	10.7%	9.4%	9.2%
Male-Headed	3.1%	3.1%	2.7%	2.6%
Female-Headed	6.6%	7.6%	6.7%	6.6%
Total Households	25,043	676,618	24,907	724,893

Source: 2008-2012 & 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Housing element law requires analysis of specialized housing needs, including female-headed households, in an effort to ensure adequate childcare or job training services. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, approximately 2,331 single-parent households resided within Jurupa Valley, representing 9.4% of the City’s households. An estimated 1,657 households of the 2,331 single-parent households with children under age 18 are headed by females. Of particular concern are single-parent households with lower incomes.

As shown in Figure E-7, most Jurupa Valley tracts have more than 60% of children living in married couple households. There are two tracts along the northern border and five tracts in the southeastern areas of the City where fewer than 60% of children live in married couple households. Figure E-8 shows the percentage of children living in female-headed households by tract. There are six tracts in Jurupa Valley where more than 20% of children live in female-headed households; they are not generally concentrated in one area of the City.

Regional Trend

As discussed previously, Riverside County has a smaller proportion of families with children compared to Jurupa Valley; approximately 32.6% of households in Riverside County are households with children. Only 9.2% of Riverside County households are single-parent households, including 6.6% female-headed households, compared to 9.4% in Jurupa Valley. Jurupa Valley has a share of households with children comparable to the neighboring jurisdictions of Corona and Moreno Valley (Table E-9).


Table E-9 Households by Type with Children (2019)

Race/Ethnicity	Jurupa Valley	Corona	Eastvale	Moreno Valley	Norco	City of Riverside	Riverside County
Households with Children	39.8%	36.8%	50.0%	40.7%	29.4%	33.2%	32.6%
Married Couple with Children	30.4%	27.9%	41.3%	27.1%	24.2%	22.9%	23.4%
Single-Parent	9.4%	8.8%	8.7%	13.6%	5.2%	10.3%	9.2%
Male-Headed	2.7%	2.7%	2.9%	3.5%	1.3%	2.9%	2.6%
Female-Headed	6.7%	6.1%	5.7%	10.1%	4.0%	7.3%	6.6%
Total Households	24,907	48,899	14,749	50,886	7,119	90,722	724,893

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).


Table E-9 and Figure E-9 show the percentage of children in married couple households and female-headed households by tract in the Riverside County region. In most tracts, fewer than 40% of children live in female-headed households. There are a few tracts in the Woodcrest, City of Riverside, Sun City, and Hemet areas where more than 40% of children live in female-headed households. There are also concentrations of children living in female-headed households in the San Bernardino County areas of Colton and Redlands (Figure E-10).

Figure E-7 Percent of Children in Married Couple Households and Sites Inventory (2019)




Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021

Figure E-8 Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households and Sites Inventory (2019)




Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure E-9 Regional Percent of Children in Married Couple Households (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure E-10 Regional Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Sites Inventory

As presented in Table E-10, only 4.1% of lower income units, 14.9% of above moderate income units, and no moderate income units are in tracts where more than 80% of children live in married couple households. As shown above, there are only nine tracts in the City where more than 80% of children live in married couple households. Most RHNA units (60.8%) are in tracts where 60 to 80% of children live in married couple households. There is a higher proportion of lower income units (48.4%) in tracts where less than 60% of children live in married couple households compared to moderate income units (37.9%) and above moderate income units (10.1%). A higher percentage of lower income units are in tracts where more than 20% of children live in female-headed households compared to moderate and above moderate income units. Approximately 60% of all RHNA units are in tracts where less than 20% of children live in female-headed households (Table E-11). The City's sites inventory does concentrate lower income units in areas where more children live in single-parent female headed households. However, as shown above, sites that can accommodate lower income units are generally distributed throughout the City and are not concentrated in a single area. Further, there are no tracts in the City with a concentration of children living in female-headed households that exceeds the 20 to 40% range. Only 33% of children live in female-headed households in the tract with the highest concentration.

Table E-10 Distribution of RHNA Units by Children in Married Couple Households (2019)

Children in Married Couple Households (Tract)	Lower Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage
40-60%	1,095	48.4%	279	37.9%	207	10.1%	1,581	31.3%
60-80%	1,076	47.5%	457	62.1%	1,532	75.0%	3,065	60.8%
>80%	93	4.1%	0	0.0%	305	14.9%	398	7.9%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Table E-11 Distribution of RHNA Units by Children in Female-Headed Households (2019)

Children in Female-Headed Households (Tract)	Lower Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage	Units	Percentage
<20%	722	31.9%	498	67.7%	1,806	88.4%	3,026	60.0%
20-40%	1,542	68.1%	238	32.3%	238	11.6%	2,018	40.0%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Income Level

Identifying low or moderate income (LMI) geographies and individuals is important to overcome patterns of segregation. HUD defines a LMI area as a census tract or block group where over 51% of the population is LMI (based on HUD income definition of up to 80% of the AMI).

Local Trend

Only 38% of households in Jurupa Valley are considered lower income and approximately 20% are considered moderate income. According to the 2015-2019 ACS, the median income in Jurupa Valley is \$70,642. Table E-12 below shows that a majority of the tracts in the City are comprised of between 25-50% LMI households. There are concentrations of LMI households in the central eastern and central western areas of the City where more than 50% of households are low or moderate income.

Table E-12 Distribution of Households Income Category (2020)

Income Category	Jurupa Valley		Riverside County	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Very Low (0-50%)	5,765	22.9%	175,594	24.7%
Low (50-80%)	3,807	15.1%	114,480	16.1%
Moderate (80-120%)	5,007	19.9%	124,301	17.5%
Above Moderate (>120%)	10,591	42.1%	297,349	41.8%
Total	25,170	100%	711,724	100%

Source: SCAG Final RHNA Data Appendix, 2020.

Regional Trend

As shown in Table E-12 above, Riverside County has a larger proportion of low income households (40.8%) but a smaller proportion of moderate income households (17.5%) compared to Jurupa Valley. The median household income of \$67,005 countywide is lower than \$70,642 in Jurupa Valley. The median household income in Jurupa Valley is lower than the neighboring jurisdictions of Corona (\$83,752), Eastvale (\$119,213), and Norco (\$102,817), but higher than Moreno Valley (\$66,134) and the City of Riverside (\$69,045).

As shown in Figure E-12, there are concentrations of LMI households in San Bernardino County, north of Jurupa Valley, from Moreno Valley to the Lake Elsinore area, in the Jurupa Valley/City of Riverside areas, and around the cities of Hemet, Winchester, and Banning.

Sites Inventory


Parcels used to meet the 6th Cycle RHNA are included in Figure E-11. It is important to note that the distribution of units shown in Table E-13 are at the tract level. There are more LMI tracts compared to LMI block groups in the City (see Figure E-43). The largest share of RHNA units (53%) are in tracts where 50 to 75% of households are low or moderate income. More than half of all units (55.9%) are in LMI areas where more than 50% of households are low or moderate income, including 53.7% of lower income units, 94.4% of moderate income units, and 44.4% of above moderate income units.

Table E-13 Distribution of RHNA Units by Concentration of LMI Households (2020)

LMI Households (Tract)	Lower Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
<25%	250	11.0%	0	0.0%	587	28.7%	837	16.6%
25-50%	798	35.2%	41	5.6%	550	26.9%	1,389	27.5%
50-75%	1,072	47.3%	695	94.4%	907	44.4%	2,674	53.0%
75-100%	144	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	144	2.9%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%


Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure E-11 Concentration of LMI Households and Sites Inventory (2020)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD 2020, 2021.

Figure E-12 Regional Concentration of LMI Households (2020)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD 2020, 2021.

Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Jurupa Valley has a large racial/ethnic minority population, primarily comprising Hispanic/Latino residents. More than 60% of the population in most Jurupa Valley block groups have racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 61%. A larger proportion of lower income RHNA units are in block groups with very high racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 81% compared to moderate and above moderate units.

There is one tract where the population of persons with disabilities exceeds 20%. Within this tract, there are three block groups, one of which has a racial/ethnic minority population over 81%. However, there are no RHNA units located in this tract.

The tracts with higher concentrations of children living in female-headed households in the northern, central, and eastern areas of the City also have racial/ethnic minority populations of 81% or higher. The tracts along the southern City boundary where a larger percent of children live in female-headed households have smaller racial/ethnic minority populations between 60% and 80%. Overall, Jurupa Valley has a smaller share of households with children, but a larger share of single-parent households compared to Riverside County. A larger share of lower income RHNA units are in tracts where 20-40% of children live in female-headed households compared to moderate and above moderate income units.

Jurupa Valley has a smaller proportion of lower income households but a larger proportion of moderate income households than the County. More than 50% of households are LMI in several block groups in the central western and central eastern areas of the City. Nearly all LMI concentrated areas have racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 81%. The tract along the northeastern City boundary with a concentration of persons with disabilities exceeding 20% also contains a block group where 79% of the population is LMI. The tract along the northern City boundary and tracts on the eastern side of the City with larger concentrations of children in female-headed households also have LMI populations exceeding 50%.

2.3. Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas

Racially/Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty

To identify racially/ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAPs), HUD has identified census tracts with a majority non-white population (greater than 50%) and has a poverty rate that exceeds 40% or is three times the average tract poverty rate for the metro/micro area, whichever threshold is lower.

In the Jurupa Valley regional area, there are few tracts surrounding the City that meet the requirements to be classified as a R/ECAPs area. A few tracts designated as R/ECAP are located near Loma Linda, Fontana, and Ontario to the north and Riverside and Moreno Valley to the south. As shown on Figure E-15, there are no R/ECAPs in Jurupa Valley, but there is a TCAC designated area of High Segregation and Poverty provided by HCD on the AFFH Data Viewer (tract 402.03). TCAC Opportunity Maps are further described in Section 2.4, Access to Opportunities. This is important to the Housing Element due to the context of this type of metric to measure the different disparities based on race or ethnicity in certain tracts. Tracts that meet the R/ECAP metrics would consider the different methods of development that would build up the value to better serve the community. Within the TCAC-designated area of high segregation of poverty are several RHNA sites the City has identified as appropriate for lower income units. While only lower income units are located within this tract, sites used for lower and moderate income RHNA units are generally dispersed throughout the City and are not concentrated within the high segregation and poverty tract. As described in Section 2.4, Access to Opportunities below, most lower income RHNA units are in moderate resource tracts. Further, more lower income RHNA units are located in highest resource tracts compared to moderate and above moderate units. As described in Section 2.6, Other Relevant Factors below, the TCAC-identified area of high segregation and

poverty likely exists, in part, due to the high concentration of mobile home parks and subsidized housing in this area.

As shown in Figure E-16, tract 402.03 is the only tract in the City with a poverty rate exceeding 30%. This tract has a non-White population of 90%, a population of persons with disabilities of 13.9%, population of children living in female-headed households of 29%, and LMI population of 76.5%, exceeding the Citywide average for all groups. The UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project created neighborhood segregation typologies which identify which groups have more than 10% representation within a tract (Figure E-13). Tract 402.03 and the northern adjacent tract are the only areas in the City that have been identified as mostly Latinx. The remainder of the City is Latinx-White, a mix of three groups, or a mix of four groups.

Zoning designations in this tract are primarily R-2 (Multiple Family Dwellings) and R-3 (General Residential), with smaller areas designated for R-4 (Planned Residential), R-6 (Residential Incentive), and General Commercial. The tract is located adjacent to the Flabob Airport along the southern tract boundary. Non-White and lower-socioeconomic populations are generally exposed to noise pollution, including noise generated by airports, at a higher rate than White and high-income communities.¹ As shown below, 15.6% of the Hispanic/Latino population in Jurupa Valley is below the poverty level, higher than the Citywide average of 13.9%.

The median home value for owner-occupied units with a mortgage by tract based on 2015-2019 ACS estimates is presented in Figure E-14. Consistent with the findings discussed previously, tracts surrounding the Flabob Airport, including tract 402.03, the area of high segregation and poverty, have the lowest home values in the City. The median home value in tract 402.03 is \$263,600, significantly more affordable than other areas of the City. While for-sale housing is generally more affordable here, it is relevant to note that this tract is characterized by a renter household majority of 63.5%, more than half of which are cost burdened (57.4%). An assessment of median rental prices revealed that rental prices in this area are also the lowest in the City. The affordability of housing in this tract contributes to the concentration of lower income households.

The proximity of Flabob Airport is likely a driving factor for the concentration of racial/ethnic minority populations and lower income households in this area as there are a plethora of facilities and resources, including community centers, food outlet facilities, hospitals/clinics, parkland, and schools, accessible to persons residing in this tract. Amenities, facilities, and resources are further described in Section 2.7, *Sites Inventory*, of this Appendix.

¹ Joan A. Casey, Rachel Morello-Frosch, Daniel J. Mennitt, Kurt Fristrup, Elizabeth L. Ogburn, and Peter James. 2017. Race/Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, Residential Segregation, and Spatial Variation in Noise Exposure in the Contiguous United States. <https://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/doi/10.1289/EHP898>.

Housing

Figure E-16 shows poverty status by tract in Jurupa Valley. When compared to the areas of high segregation and poverty in Figure E-15, the higher concentration of need comes from the neighborhoods that are most adversely impacted by the industrial uses that are located adjacent to or in their tract. As seen in Figure E-16 below, the west portions adjacent to the Mira Loma Overlay, the east portions next to the Agua Mansa Specific Plan, and the southern portions next to the industrial complex/business parks show the higher concentration of poverty with 20% to 30% of the population living under the poverty line in these tracts. The highest concentration of poverty is shown in the purple area located adjacent to the Flabob Airport. This tract is sandwiched between industrial uses to the north and the airport to the south. Due to regulations for airports, the housing density located around an airport is required to be higher density rather than low density with 30% to 40% of the population in that tract living in poverty.


Table E-14 shows poverty status by race/ethnicity and disability status in Jurupa Valley and Riverside County. Nearly 14% of the Jurupa Valley population is below the poverty level compared to 13.7% countywide. Residents of a race not listed, Hispanic/Latino residents, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and residents with a disability have the highest rate of poverty in the City.

Table E-14 Poverty Status by Race/Ethnicity and Disability Status (2019)

	Jurupa Valley		Riverside County	
	Total Population	Below Poverty Level	Total Population	Below Poverty Level
White	55,001	12.4%	1,425,172	12.0%
Black or African American	3,373	9.3%	152,447	17.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native	835	3.2%	19,429	20.8%
Asian	3,799	8.0%	153,018	11.3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	142	14.1%	7,246	13.0%
Some other race	37,852	17.8%	512,339	18.2%
Two or more races	3,768	9.9%	104,055	11.4%
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	74,972	15.6%	1,162,009	16.7%
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	21,451	9.9%	841,304	9.3%
With a Disability	10,497	15.7%	256,561	16.3%
Total	104,770	13.9%	2,373,706	13.7%


Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure E-15 R/ECAPs and TCAC Areas of High Segregation and Poverty (2020, 2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD 2020 (based on 2009-2013 ACS) and 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Figure E-16 Poverty Status by Census Tract (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence


While R/ECAPs have long been the focus of fair housing policies, racially concentrated areas of affluence (RCAAs) must also be analyzed to ensure housing is integrated, a key to fair housing choice. According to a policy paper published by HUD, RCAA is defined as affluent white communities.² According to HUD's policy paper, whites are the most racially segregated group in the United States and in the same way neighborhood disadvantage is associated with concentrated poverty and high concentrations of people of color, conversely, distinct advantages are associated with residence in affluent White communities.

The AFFH Guidance Memo issued by HCD discusses research from the University of Minnesota as follows: "RCAAs are defined as census tracts where 1) 80% or more of the population is white, and 2) the median household income is \$125,000 or greater (slightly more than double the national median household income in 2016). While this is a useful measure nationwide, HCD has adjusted the RCAA methodology to better reflect California's relative diversity." The AFFH Guidance Memo then encourages jurisdictions to refer to the HCD Data Viewer for HCD's adjusted definition of RCAAs, along with RCAA maps and accompanying data. However, the RCAA data layer is not currently available and the HCD definition is not provided. Using data that is available on the Data Viewer, this fair housing assessment uses the percent white population and median household income to identify potential areas of affluence. The City has one identified area of affluence that is considered marginally slim in population difference and also has a median income level of over \$125,000.

Figure E-17 provides a view of median household income by block group and racial/ethnic minority by tract in Jurupa Valley. More than 50% of the City's households earn less than the State Median Income of \$87,100. There is only one block group in Jurupa Valley with a median income exceeding \$125,000 located along the eastern City boundary. Between 80% and 100% of the population in this area belongs to a racial/ethnic minority group. There are no areas in the City that are considered RCAAs.

2 Goetz, Edward G., Damiano, A., & Williams, R. A. (2019) Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence: A Preliminary Investigation. Published by the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in *Cityscape: A Journal Policy Development and Research* (21,1, 99-123).

Figure E-17 Median Income by Block Group and Racial/Ethnic Minority by Tract (2018, 2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Summary of Fair Housing Issues

There are no HUD R/ECAPs in Jurupa Valley. However, one TCAC-designated area of high segregation and poverty is located in southeastern Jurupa Valley. This tract also has racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 81%, between 20% and 40% of children living in female-headed households, and LMI populations between 50% and 75% (see Figure E-2 (Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration and Sites Inventory (2018)), Figure E-8 (Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households and Sites Inventory (2019)), and Figure E-11 (Concentration of LMI Households and Sites Inventory (2020))). Hispanic/Latinos, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, persons of a race not listed, and persons with disabilities experience poverty at a rate exceeding the citywide average of 3.9%. There are no RCAAs in Jurupa Valley.

2.4. Access to Opportunities

HUD developed an index for assessing fair housing by informing communities about disparities in access to opportunity. Table E-15 shows index scores for the following opportunity indicator indices in Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County region (values range from 0 to 100):

- **Low Poverty Index:** The higher the score, the less exposure to poverty in a neighborhood.
- **School Proficiency Index:** The higher the score, the higher the school system quality in a neighborhood.
- **Labor Market Engagement Index:** The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood.
- **Transit Trips Index:** The higher the transit trips index, the more likely residents in that neighborhood utilize public transit.
- **Low Transportation Cost Index:** The higher the index, the lower the cost of transportation in that neighborhood.
- **Jobs Proximity Index:** The higher the index value, the better access to employment opportunities for residents in a neighborhood.
- **Environmental Health Index:** The higher the value, the better environmental quality of a neighborhood.

HUD opportunity indicator scores a further discussed below.

Table E-15 HUD Opportunity Indicators by Race/Ethnicity (2020)

	Low Poverty	School Prof.	Labor Market	Transit	Low Trans. Cost	Jobs Proximity	Env. Health
Jurupa Valley							
Total Population							
White, non-Hispanic	47.69	34.88	19.59	56.78	40.84	59.89	15.68
Black, non-Hispanic	42.76	31.14	23.83	58.82	43.10	61.98	14.84
Hispanic	37.31	27.07	16.85	57.06	42.26	60.67	15.38
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	53.03	36.21	25.68	57.01	40.00	56.41	15.54
Native American, non-Hispanic	43.05	34.89	17.97	57.79	41.47	59.82	15.73
Population below federal poverty line							
White, non-Hispanic	39.88	30.47	17.94	56.32	42.53	59.75	15.69
Black, non-Hispanic	36.26	23.88	19.12	62.91	43.24	58.51	15.13
Hispanic	29.39	21.58	15.52	59.02	44.38	61.15	14.78
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	53.33	34.89	24.19	51.49	40.62	58.03	15.73
Native American, non-Hispanic	18.95	24.54	7.87	60.50	50.40	48.87	16.04

	Low Poverty	School Prof.	Labor Market	Transit	Low Trans. Cost	Jobs Proximity	Env. Health
Riverside County							
Total Population							
White, non-Hispanic	54.34	49.82	34.92	49.30	41.48	46.74	46.55
Black, non-Hispanic	46.10	40.18	28.30	50.49	42.47	42.48	38.59
Hispanic	37.64	36.90	24.85	52.08	44.34	42.73	41.59
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	59.61	53.22	39.33	52.51	39.60	47.47	38.35
Native American, non-Hispanic	43.23	39.36	26.49	47.63	42.19	41.41	50.18
Population below federal poverty line							
White, non-Hispanic	42.88	41.70	28.16	51.75	46.30	47.26	47.46
Black, non-Hispanic	33.36	31.09	20.88	51.61	46.61	39.29	40.19
Hispanic	25.67	30.29	18.00	54.41	47.97	41.79	42.72
Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	46.61	37.78	29.23	56.57	47.40	55.01	34.96
Native American, non-Hispanic	36.00	36.90	21.34	46.71	44.73	43.74	46.02

Source: HUD AFFH-T Data: Dissimilarity Indices, 2020.

To assist in this analysis, HCD and the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) convened in the California Fair Housing Task force to “provide research, evidence-based policy recommendations, and other strategic recommendations to HCD and other related state agencies/departments to further the fair housing goals (as defined by HCD).” The Task Force has created Opportunity Maps to identify resource levels across the state “to accompany new policies aimed at increasing access to high opportunity areas for families with children in housing financed with 9% Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs).” These opportunity maps are made from composite scores of three different domains made up of a set of indicators.

Table E-16 shows the full list of indicators. The opportunity maps include a measure or “filter” to identify areas with poverty and racial segregation. To identify these areas, census tracts were first filtered by poverty and then by a measure of racial segregation. The criteria for these filters were:

Table E-16 List of Domains and Indicators for Opportunity Maps

Domain	Indicator
Economic	Poverty Adult education Employment Job proximity Median home value
Environmental	CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution Indicators and values
Education	Math proficiency Reading proficiency High School graduation rates Student poverty rates
Poverty and Racial Segregation	Poverty: Tracts with at least 30% of population under federal poverty line Racial Segregation: Tracts with location quotient higher than 1.25 for Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, or all people of color in comparison to the County

Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, Methodology for the 2020 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020

Local Trend

HUD opportunity indicator scores for Jurupa Valley are shown in Table E-15. In the City, the Hispanic population has the lowest low poverty, school proficiency, and labor market index scores; the Asian/Pacific Islander population has the lowest jobs proximity index score; and the Black population has the lowest environmental health index score. Asian/Pacific Islander communities in Jurupa Valley received the highest index scores for low poverty, school proficiency, and labor market participation. The Black

population was most likely to use transit, have low transportation costs, and have the best access to employment opportunities. The Native American population scored the highest for environmental health.


The TCAC Opportunity area maps are available in the HCD AFFH Data and Mapping Resources Data Viewer (Data Viewer) and were used for this analysis. Higher composite scores mean higher resources. As shown in Figure E-18, the western side of the City has the highest and high resource tracts, while the eastern side is composed of mostly low resource tracts and one tract with high segregation and poverty. Table E-17 shows the opportunity map scores for all the tracts in Jurupa Valley. Approximately 41.7% of tracts are moderate resource, 20.8% are low resource, 16.7% are high resource, and 12.5% are highest resource. One tract is moderate resource (rapidly changing), and one tract is an area of high segregation and poverty. Tracts along the western City boundary are highest resource, while the eastern side of the City is largely low resource with one area of high segregation and poverty.

Table E-17 TCAC Opportunity Map Scores by Census Tract (2021)

Tract	Economic Score	Environmental Score	Education Score	Composite Score	Final Category
06065040101	0.451	0.017	0.136	-0.63	Low Resource
06065040102	0.494	0.055	0.508	-0.302	Low Resource
06065040201	0.616	0.107	0.166	-0.359	Low Resource
06065040202	0.348	0.368	0.383	-0.245	Moderate Resource
06065040203	0.288	0.419	0.08	#N/A	High Segregation & Poverty
06065040204	0.254	0.168	0.08	-0.599	Low Resource
06065040301	0.189	0.275	0.279	-0.479	Low Resource
06065040302	0.809	0.444	0.61	0.217	High Resource
06065040303	0.627	0.29	0.531	-0.015	Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)
06065040402	0.519	0.279	0.287	-0.225	Moderate Resource
06065040403	0.685	0.293	0.18	-0.197	Moderate Resource
06065040404	0.663	0.35	0.304	-0.105	Moderate Resource
06065040405	0.806	0.372	0.406	0.075	High Resource
06065040501	0.573	0.25	0.404	-0.128	Moderate Resource
06065040502	0.563	0.119	0.533	-0.147	Moderate Resource
06065040503	0.533	0.14	0.497	-0.182	Moderate Resource
06065040603	0.736	0.405	0.649	0.192	High Resource
06065040604	0.718	0.381	0.526	0.075	High Resource
06065040605	0.666	0.467	0.251	-0.11	Moderate Resource
06065040606	0.631	0.388	0.295	-0.118	Moderate Resource
06065040607	0.871	0.051	0.913	0.458	Highest Resource
06065040615	0.981	0.169	0.922	0.818	Highest Resource
06065040616	0.968	0.108	0.986	0.876	Highest Resource
06065041004	0.599	0.191	0.387	-0.167	Moderate Resource

Source: California Fair Housing Task Force, 2021 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Maps, December 2020

Figure E-18 TCAC Opportunity Map and Sites Inventory (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Regional Trend

HUD opportunity indicator scores for Riverside County are shown in Table E-15 above. Like Jurupa Valley, the Hispanic population countywide received the lowest index scores for low poverty, school proficiency, and labor market participation. Asian/Pacific Islander communities in the County had the highest scores for low poverty, school proficiency, labor market participation, transit, and jobs proximity. In general, Jurupa Valley populations scored lower in low poverty, school proficiency, labor market participation, low transportation cost, and environmental health than populations countywide. Jurupa Valley residents are more likely to use transit and have better access to employment opportunities than residents throughout the County.

Figure E-19 shows the TCAC Opportunity Map for the Riverside County region. Low resource areas are concentrated in San Bernardino County, north of Jurupa Valley, from Moreno Valley to the Lake Elsinore area, and in jurisdictions west of Mount San Jacinto including the Morongo Reservation, Banning, and Hemet areas. Woodcrest, and the areas south of Highway 91 are mostly highest resource areas. Riverside County tracts around Menifee and between Moreno Valley and Beaumont are also mostly highest and high resource areas.

Sites Inventory

As presented in Table E-18, the largest proportion of lower income units (57.5%) are in moderate resource tracts, while the largest proportion of moderate income units (94.4%) and above moderate income units (54.7%) are in low resource tracts. However, there are 144 lower income units in the area of high segregation and poverty. While there are some lower income units (6.4%) in the high segregation and poverty tract, there are far fewer lower income units in low resource tracts compared to moderate and above moderate income units. Further, 250 lower income units (11%) are in highest resource tracts. The distribution of RHNA units generally follows the trend Citywide, where moderate resource tracts are the most common, followed closely by low resource tracts.

Table E-18 Distribution of RHNA Units by TCAC Opportunity Map Score (2021)


TCAC Opportunity Map Category	Very Low Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%	Units	%
Highest Resource	250	11.0%	0	0.0%	509	24.9%	759	15.0%
High Resource	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	164	8.0%	164	3.3%
Moderate Resource	1,302	57.5%	41	5.6%	220	10.8%	1,563	31.0%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	276	12.2%	0	0.0%	33	1.6%	309	6.1%
Low Resource	292	12.9%	695	94.4%	1,118	54.7%	2,105	41.7%
High Segregation and Poverty	144	6.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	144	2.9%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Economic


As discussed previously, economic scores are calculated based on poverty, adult education, employment, job proximity, and median home value. Refer to Table E-16 for the complete list of TCAC Opportunity Map domains and indicators. Figure E-20 shows the TCAC economic scores for Jurupa Valley census tracts. The northeastern areas of the City have the lowest economic scores in the City. One tract in Jurupa Valley has an economic score in the lowest percentile. This area contains block groups with higher concentrations of LMI households and is characterized as a low resource area.

Figure E-19 Regional TCAC Opportunity Map (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Figure E-20 TCAC Opportunity Map - Economic Score (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Education

As discussed previously, education scores are based on math and reading proficiency, high school graduation rates, and student poverty rates. Refer to Table E-16 for the complete list of TCAC Opportunity Map domains and indicators. Figure E-21 shows the TCAC education scores for Jurupa Valley tracts. Tracts with the highest education scores are located along the western City boundary. These areas are also considered high resource areas. Tracts along the eastern City boundary and one tract in the central western area of the City have education scores in the lowest percentile. As discussed previously, the eastern side is mostly considered low resource.

Environmental

As described previously, environmental TCAC map scores are calculated using CalEnviroScreen 3.0 pollution indicators and values. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) compiles these scores to help identify California communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution. In addition to environmental factors (pollutant exposure, groundwater threats, toxic sites, and hazardous materials exposure) and sensitive receptors (seniors, children, persons with asthma, and low birth weight infants), CalEnviroScreen also takes into consideration socioeconomic factors. These factors include educational attainment, linguistic isolation, poverty, and unemployment. Refer to Table E-16 for the complete list of TCAC Opportunity Map domains and indicators.

As presented in Figure E-22, the entire City has lower environmental scores under 0.50. The northern section of the City and the tracts along the southern, western, and eastern City boundaries have environmental scores in the lowest quartile. The eastern side is considered low resource, but the tract categorized as an area of high segregation and poverty has a slightly higher environmental score exceeding 0.25.


CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores are shown in Figure E-23. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 is the OEHHA’s most updated California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool used to identify communities that are disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution. CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores are based on percentiles (the percentage of all ordered CalEnviroScreen scores that fall below the score for that area). Lower percentile scores indicate better environmental conditions. All tracts in Jurupa Valley scored within the 40th percentile, with most of the City scoring within the 70th percentile or above. The northeastern corner of the City has the largest concentration of tracts with CalEnviroScreen 4.0 scores in the highest percentile. Table E-19 shows the distribution of RHNA units by CalEnviroScreen 4.0 percentile. Most lower income units are in tracts in the 81st to 90th percentile, while most moderate income units are in tracts in the 91st to 10th percentile. Approximately 40.6% of above moderate income units fall into the 71st to 80th percentile range, and 41.2% fall into the 91st to 100th percentile range. There are far fewer lower income units in tracts in the 91st percentile or above (worst environmental conditions) compared to moderate and above moderate income units.

Table E-19 Distribution of RHNA Units by CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile

CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Score (Tract)	Very Low Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
51-60%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	78	3.8%	78	1.5%
61-70%	129	5.7%	41	5.6%	116	5.7%	286	5.7%
71-80%	250	11.0%	0	0.0%	830	40.6%	1,080	21.4%
81-90%	1,500	66.3%	17	2.3%	177	8.7%	1,694	33.6%
91-100%	385	17.0%	678	92.1%	843	41.2%	1,906	37.8%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%


Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure E-21 TCAC Opportunity Map - Education Score (2021)




Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Figure E-22 TCAC Opportunity Map - Environmental Score (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 TCAC Opportunity Map, 2021.

Figure E-23 CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Percentile Scores by Tract and Sites Inventory (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2021 OEHHHA CalEnviroScreen 4.0, 2021.


Transportation

AllTransit explores metrics that reveal the social and economic impact of transit, specifically looking at connectivity, access to jobs, and frequency of service. According to the most recent data posted (2019), Jurupa Valley has an AllTransit Performance Score of 3.6 (out of 10), indicating a low combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible by transit (Figure E-24). According to AllTransit, 44,758 jobs are accessible within a 30-minute transit commute on average for households and 33,103 workers accessible within a 30-minute transit commute of an employer in Jurupa Valley. In comparison, Riverside County has an AllTransit Performance Score of 3.3 (Figure E-25), indicating an even lower combination of trips per week and number of employment opportunities accessible to transit.

Figure E-26 below shows the job proximity index by block group for Jurupa Valley and the surrounding areas. HUD's Jobs Proximity Index can be used to show transportation need geographically. The Jobs Proximity Index quantifies the accessibility of a given residential neighborhood as a function of its distance to all job locations within a Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA), with larger employment centers weighted more heavily. Block groups with lower Jobs Proximity Indices are located farther from employment opportunities and have a higher need for transportation. The northeastern and northwestern corners of the City received the highest Jobs Proximity Indices. Most of the central areas of the City received Jobs Proximity Indices between 40 and 60. There are two block groups in Jurupa Valley with particularly low Jobs Proximity Indices located in the central eastern side of the City. These areas are considered low resource and have higher LMI concentrations.


Availability of efficient, affordable transportation can be used to measure fair housing and access to opportunities. SCAG developed a mapping tool for High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs) as part of the Connect SoCal 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). SCAG defines HQTAs as areas within one-half mile from a major transit stop and a high-quality transit corridor. Areas around U.S. Route 91, Interstate 215, and part of U.S. Route 60 are considered HQTAs. One small HQTA in Jurupa Valley is currently located along the southern City boundary (Figure E-27).

Figure E-24 AllTransit Performance Score – Jurupa Valley




Source: AllTransit Metrics: Jurupa Valley, 2019.

Figure E-25 AllTransit Performance Score – Riverside County



Source: AllTransit Metrics: Jurupa Valley, 2019.


Figure E-26 Jobs Proximity Index by Block Group (2014-2017)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD 2014-2017, 2021.

City of Jurupa Valley

Figure E-27 HQTAs (2021)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, HUD 2014-2017, 2021.

2.5. Disproportionate Housing Needs

The AFFH Rule Guidebook (24 C.F.R. § 5.152) defines “disproportionate housing needs” as “a condition in which there are significant disparities in the proportion of members of a protected class experiencing a category of housing needs when compared to the proportion of a member of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing the category of housing need in the applicable geographic area.” The analysis is completed by assessing cost burden, severe cost burden, overcrowding, and substandard housing.

Cost Burden

A household is considered cost burdened if it spends more than 30% of its income in housing costs, including utilities. Reducing housing cost burden can also help foster more inclusive communities and increase access to opportunities for persons of color, persons with disabilities, and other protected classes.

Local Trend

Table E-20 shows HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data for housing problems in Jurupa Valley. HUD considers the following issues are housing problems:

- incomplete kitchen facilities,
- incomplete plumbing facilities,
- more than 1 person per room (overcrowding), and
- cost burden greater than 30%.

Nearly half of all households in Jurupa Valley experience a housing problem, including 40.4% of owner-occupied households and 67.6% of renter-occupied households. Pacific Islander, Black, and Hispanic households have housing problems at the highest rate. Regardless of race, renters are experiencing housing problems at a higher rate than owners.

Table E-20 Housing Problem by Race/Ethnicity and Tenure (2020)

Race/Ethnicity	With Housing Problem		
	Owners	Renters	Total
White	31.1%	60.6%	38.5%
Black	27.6%	75.2%	55.1%
Asian	56.8%	30.8%	52.3%
American Indian	0.0%	69.2%	52.9%
Pacific Islander	75.0%	100.0%	85.7%
Hispanic	47.0%	71.1%	56.0%
Other	9.1%	41.6%	26.5%
Total	40.4%	67.6%	49.7%

Source: HUD CHAS Data, based on 2013-2017 ACS, 2020.

HUD considers households paying more than 30% of their gross income in housing costs to be cost burdened, and households paying more than 50% of their gross income in housing costs to be severely cost burdened. According to 2020 HUD CHAS data shown in Table E-21, an estimated 40% of households within the City are cost burdened. Approximately 57.2% of renters are cost burdened and 31% of owners are cost burdened in Jurupa Valley. There is a slightly larger proportion of cost burdened households in Jurupa Valley than countywide.

Table E-21 Cost Burden by Tenure (2020)

	Cost Burdened (>30%)	Severely Cost Burdened (>50%)	Total Households
Jurupa Valley			
Renter-Occupied Households	57.2%	31.6%	8,605
Owner-Occupied Households	31.0%	13.0%	16,565
All Households	40.0%	19.3%	25,170
Riverside County			
Renter-Occupied Households	54.5%	28.6%	248,935
Owner-Occupied Households	32.8%	14.2%	462,790
All Households	40.4%	19.2%	711,725

Source: HUD CHAS Data, based on 2013-2017 ACS, 2020.

In Jurupa Valley housing cost burden, and in particular housing the extremely-low income population (below 30% of area median income), can be especially challenging. Housing Cost Burden adversely affects the low income, very low income, and extremely low-income residents the most, and with the 2020-2021 COVID-19 pandemic, these income groups have been hit even harder with cost burdens. To track information related to cost burdens and issues surrounding fair housing, the City of Jurupa Valley is contracted with the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County. The agency helps track housing trends that can be considered an impediment to accessing housing. According to the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County 2019-2020 Fiscal Year Report, most landlord/tenant complaints (23.45%) were related to housing lease/rental terms, followed closely (22.61%) by complaints related to notices (e.g., eviction notices, late rent notices, and other notices from landlords), and then by complaints related to speed and lack of repair to rental facilities. According to the Fair Housing Council, recent increases in complaints related to these categories are likely linked to the loss of work due to the pandemic closures and safety regulations implemented by the State of California for a staggered reopening of businesses. The increasing cost burdens and global pandemic have exacerbated the issue and resulted in associated issues such as overcrowding and the need to assist those in the special needs groups identified in the Community Profile.

The HCD Data Viewer provides a visual assessment of overpayment by homeowners and renters by census tracts. Figure E-28 below shows that in most of the City, 20% to 40% of owner households have monthly costs that are 30% or more of their gross household income. There is only one tract along the northern City boundary where less than 20% of owners are cost burdened. Cost burden for owners has decreased in many tracts since the 2010-2014 ACS.

Figure E-29 shows that renters are cost burdened at a higher rate than owners during the same period. Nearly all census tracts show that 40% to 60% of renter households have monthly costs that are 30% or more of household income. There are five tracts where only 20% to 40% of renters are cost burdened, but eight tracts where more than 60% of renters experience cost burden. The proportion of cost burdened renters has decreased in some Jurupa Valley tracts but increased in others. There are more cost burdened renters in the southeastern areas of the City currently than in 2014.

HACR administers the federally funded Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) for Jurupa Valley residents. This housing voucher program (also known as Section 8 housing) provides rental subsidies to low-income families that spend more than 30% of their gross income on housing cost and currently 344 Jurupa Valley households are receiving Housing Choice Vouchers. For the distribution of Voucher assistance within the City, HACR has established local preferences such as families who have lost HCVs due to funding cuts, working families, elderly or disabled, and veterans. As of February 2018, 1,742 households were on the waiting list for the HCV program. Of these households, 292 are seniors, 409 are disabled and 282 are self-identified as homeless without permanent housing.

Figure E-28 (A) Overpaying Homeowners by Tract (2014)




Figure E-28. (B) Overpaying Homeowners by Tract (2019)




Figure E-29 (A) Overpaying Renters by Tract (2014)





Figure E-29. (B) Overpaying Renters by Tract (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2010-2014 & 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

As an extension of the HCV program, HACR assists eligible families who purchase a home by applying their existing HCV towards a monthly mortgage payment. Eligible families may qualify for a maximum period of 10 or 15 years (depending on the mortgage terms).

Regional Trend

As discussed above, approximately 40% of Riverside County households are cost burdened, including 54.5% of renter households and 32.8% of owner households. Compared to Jurupa Valley, a larger proportion of Riverside County owners are severely cost burdened (14.2%), but a smaller proportion of renters are severely cost burdened (28.6%).

Figure E-30 and Figure E-31 show cost burden by tenure and tract in the Riverside County region. In most tracts, between 20% and 60% of owners overpay for housing. There are a handful of tracts where the proportion of overpaying owners exceeds 60%, located around the City of Riverside, Sun City, and Hemet. Significantly more renters overpay for housing in Riverside tracts. Between 40% and 80% of renters in most tracts are cost burdened.

Sites Inventory


Figure E-28 and Figure E-29 above show the sites inventory used to meet the City’s 2021 RHNA. As shown in Table E-22, most lower income (55.1%), moderate income (94.4%), and above moderate income (52.8%) RHNA units are in tracts where 20% to 40% of owners are cost burdened. This follows the trend Citywide, where a majority of tracts have proportions of cost burdened owners in this range. The largest proportion of lower income units (58.1%) are in tracts where 40% to 60% of renters are cost burdened, whereas the largest proportion of moderate income units are in tracts where only 20% to 40% of renters overpay for housing. Most above moderate income units are in tracts where 20% to 60% of renters are cost burdened. Most tracts in the City (11 tracts) have concentrations of cost burdened renters between 40% and 60%. There are only 8 tracts where 60% to 80% of renters overpay and 5 tracts where 20% to 40% of renters overpay. Despite tracts with cost burdened renters exceeding 60% being the second most common in the City, only 10.7% of RHNA units are located in these tracts.

Table E-22 Distribution of RHNA Units by Cost Burdened Households

Cost Burdened Households (Tract)	Very Low Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
Owner								
<20%	494	21.8%	41	5.6%	455	22.3%	990	19.6%
20-40%	1,247	55.1%	695	94.4%	1,080	52.8%	3,022	59.9%
40-60%	523	23.1%	0	0.0%	509	24.9%	1,032	20.5%
Renter								
<20%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	81	4.0%	81	1.6%
20-40%	777	34.3%	440	59.8%	948	46.4%	2,165	42.9%
40-60%	1,316	58.1%	58	7.9%	886	43.3%	2,260	44.8%
60-80%	171	7.6%	238	32.3%	129	6.3%	538	10.7%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%


Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Figure E-30 Regional Overpaying Homeowners by Tract (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Figure E-31 Regional Overpaying Renters by Tract (2019)



Source: HCD Data Viewer, 2015-2019 ACS, 2021.

Overcrowding

The California Department of Housing and Community Development defines overcrowding as housing units occupied by more than one person per room in a dwelling unit, excluding kitchen and bathrooms, and severe overcrowding as more than 1.5 occupants per room.

The average household size in Jurupa Valley is 4.21 people. The county has an average household size of 3.28 people per household, which is lower than Jurupa Valley. Large households often live in overcrowded conditions, due to both the lack of units of appropriate size, and insufficient income to afford available units of adequate size. Overcrowding increases health and safety concerns and stresses the condition of the housing stock and infrastructure. Overcrowding is strongly related to household size, particularly for large households, and the availability of suitably sized housing. Overcrowding impacts owners and renters; however, renters are generally more significantly impacted. Some households may not be financially able to purchase adequately sized housing and may instead accept smaller housing or reside with other individuals or families in the same home to lower costs. With the current 2020-2021 COVID-19 pandemic, the stress on housing availability and affordability is even higher, causing additional overcrowding.

Household overcrowding reflects various living situations: 1) a family lives in a home that is too small; 2) a family chooses to house extended family members; or 3) unrelated individuals or families are “doubling up” to afford housing. However, cultural differences also contribute to the overcrowded conditions. Some cultures tend to have larger household sizes than others due to the preference of sharing living quarters with extended family members as a way of sharing living costs among family members. Overcrowding can strain physical facilities and the delivery of public services, reduce the quality of the physical environment, contribute to a shortage of parking, and accelerate the deterioration of homes and neighborhoods.

Local Trend

Approximately 15.5% of all households in Jurupa Valley were overcrowded, and 4% are severely overcrowded, according to the 2015-2019 ACS. As shown in Table E-23, overcrowding is significantly more common among the City’s renter-households than owner-households. By comparison, the incidence of overcrowding in Riverside County is much lower at almost half as many households dealing with this issue.


Figure E-32 shows the proportion of overcrowded households in Jurupa Valley census tracts. Overcrowding is most common on the eastern side of the City. More than 20% of households in these tracts are overcrowded. There are no concentrations of severely overcrowded households in the City.

Table E-23 Overcrowding by Tenure (2019)

	Overcrowded (1+ occupants per room)			Severely Overcrowded (1.5+ occupants per room)		
	Renter	Owner	Total	Renter	Owner	Total
Jurupa Valley	23.1%	11.8%	15.5%	5.7%	3.1%	3.9%
Riverside County	12.1%	4.3%	6.9%	3.2%	1.6%	1.8%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure E-32 Overcrowded Households by Tract and Sites Inventory (2020)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 HUD CHAS Data, 2021.

Regional Trend

As discussed previously, overcrowding is less common countywide than in Jurupa Valley. Only 6.9% of households in Riverside County are overcrowded, including 12.1% of renter households and 4.3% of owner households. Less than 2% of households in the County are severely overcrowded.

Figure E-33 shows overcrowding by census tract for the region. Tracts with more overcrowded households are most concentrated in the Jurupa Valley and City of Riverside areas, San Bernadino County north of Jurupa Valley, and along Interstate 215 from Moreno Valley to Perris.

Sites Inventory

A large proportion of lower income RHNA units are located in tracts where more than 20% of households are overcrowded (Table E-24). Nearly 76% of lower income units are in tracts with more than 20% overcrowded households. This is comparable to the distribution of moderate income units (100%) and above moderate income units (75.1%). A larger proportion of lower income units are in tracts where less than 20% of households are overcrowded. The City's RHNA strategy does not disproportionately place lower income units in tracts where overcrowding is more prevalent in comparison to moderate income and above moderate income units. Tracts with concentrations of overcrowded households exceed 20% contain the Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan (598 anticipated units) and the Rio Vista Specific Plan (1,018 anticipated units)

Table E-24 *Distribution of RHNA Units by Overcrowded Households (2020)*

Overcrowded Households (Tract)	Very Low Income Units		Moderate Income Units		Above Moderate Income Units		All Units	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
<8.2%	379	16.7%	0	0.0%	509	24.9%	888	17.6%
8.3-12%	93	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	93	1.8%
12.01-15%	82	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	92	1.8%
15.01-20%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
>20%	1,710	75.5%	736	100.0%	1,535	75.1%	3,981	78.9%
Total	2,264	100.0%	736	100.0%	2,044	100.0%	5,044	100.0%

Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021.

Substandard Conditions

Households living in substandard conditions are considered to be in need of housing assistance, even if they are not seeking alternative housing arrangements, due to the threat to residents' health and safety that substandard housing poses. Incomplete plumbing or kitchen facilities and housing stock age can be used to measure substandard housing conditions. The age of a housing unit is often an indicator of housing conditions. In general, housing that is 30 years or older may exhibit a need for repairs based on the useful life of materials. Housing more than 50 years old is considered aged and is more likely to exhibit a need for major repairs.

Local Trend


As presented in Table E-25, approximately 0.3% of Jurupa Valley households lack complete plumbing facilities, and 0.9% lack complete kitchen facilities. A larger share of renter-occupied households lacks complete facilities. Only 0.2% of owner households lack complete facilities, whereas 0.6% of renter households lack complete plumbing facilities and 2.5% lack complete kitchen facilities.

Table E-25 *Incomplete Plumbing or Kitchen Facilities (2019)*

	Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities			Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities		
	Owner	Renter	Total	Owner	Renter	Total
Jurupa Valley	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	2.5%	0.9%
Riverside County	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	1.6%	0.7%

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure E-33 Regional Overcrowded Households by Tract (2020)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2020 HUD CHAS Data, 2021.

Jurupa Valley’s housing stock is older. Approximately 32.8% of the City’s housing stock was built prior to 1969 and 40.3% was built between 1970 and 1989. Table E-26 shows the housing stock age by Jurupa Valley census tracts. Over 90% of the housing stock in tracts 404.02, 405.03, and 406.04 are 30 years or older. Figure E-34 shows the median age of the housing stock by census tract. Tracts along the western City boundary have the most new housing, where the median year built ranges from 1989 to 2007. Tracts in the central western areas of the City and the northwestern City boundary have the oldest housing, where the median year built ranges from 1964 to 1967. Based on housing age alone, a significant portion of Jurupa Valley’s housing stock could require rehabilitation in the upcoming decade.

Table E-26 Age of Housing Stock by Tract and Jurisdiction (2019)


Tract/Jurisdiction	Year Built			Total Units
	1969 or earlier (50+ years)	1970-1989 (30-40 years)	1990 or earlier (<30 years)	
Census Tract 401.01	55.4%	29.8%	14.8%	1,011
Census Tract 401.02	34.9%	43.7%	21.4%	1,062
Census Tract 402.01	18.2%	40.2%	41.6%	1,666
Census Tract 402.02	23.4%	56.4%	20.2%	817
Census Tract 402.03	56.3%	31.3%	12.4%	946
Census Tract 402.04	60.8%	28.9%	10.3%	851
Census Tract 403.01	43.3%	30.5%	26.3%	2,059
Census Tract 403.02	9.9%	48.2%	42.0%	1,957
Census Tract 403.03	38.1%	34.5%	27.4%	901
Census Tract 404.02	56.2%	41.6%	2.3%	1,020
Census Tract 404.03	46.2%	40.3%	13.5%	1,378
Census Tract 404.04	3.6%	57.8%	38.6%	862
Census Tract 404.05	8.7%	62.6%	28.7%	1,618
Census Tract 405.01	27.2%	46.3%	26.5%	1,768
Census Tract 405.02	34.3%	23.7%	42.0%	1,688
Census Tract 405.03	60.8%	32.2%	7.0%	1,732
Census Tract 406.03	50.1%	21.1%	28.9%	741
Census Tract 406.04	1.4%	93.5%	5.1%	1,351
Census Tract 406.05	60.3%	27.6%	12.1%	717
Census Tract 406.06	42.9%	38.3%	18.9%	763
Census Tract 406.07	0.5%	9.4%	90.1%	3,503
Census Tract 406.15	1.5%	1.6%	96.9%	2,388
Census Tract 406.16	2.2%	0.7%	97.0%	2,052
Census Tract 410.04	9.0%	75.7%	15.3%	1,383
Jurupa Valley	32.8%	40.3%	26.8%	26,021
Riverside County	17.5%	35.8%	46.7%	840,501

Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

One possible reason for the common use of substandard dwellings in the City is the relatively high number of lower income/large households and overcrowding in some residential areas. It should be noted that there might be some overlap in the number of substandard housing units, as some units may lack both complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. Similar to the county and the state, housing units lacking appropriate infrastructure and utilities comprise a very small proportion of the City’s housing stock.

To maintain adequate housing conditions, the City’s Code Enforcement Division works to ensure safe living standards for all residents in the community. The City’s 2018-2022 Consolidated Plan has the City of Jurupa Valley in 2019 to 2020 implementing a grant program for housing rehabilitation available to any resident who applied and qualified on an income basis. It was advertised on the City website, email lists, and social media pages. This program saw some success and was offered for a second group of grants when the first group of grants was distributed. This program was funded through the CDBG provided to Jurupa Valley and administered by the City as well.

Figure E-34 Median Housing Unit Age by Jurupa Valley Tract (2019)



Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Regional Trend

As show in Table E-25 above, a larger proportion of owner-occupied households but fewer renter-occupied households in Riverside County lack complete facilities. Approximately 0.3% of households lack complete kitchen facilities, and 0.7% lack complete plumbing facilities. The housing stock in Jurupa Valley is older than the County. Only 17.5% of the Riverside County housing stock was built prior to 1969, and 35.8% was built between 1970 and 1989. Figure E-34 shows the median year built for the housing stock in jurisdictions surrounding Jurupa Valley. The cities of Riverside, Norco, Jurupa Valley, and Ontario have older housing stocks, while Beaumont, Lake Elsinore, Menifee, and Perris have significantly younger housing stocks.

Displacement Risk


The HCD Data Viewer (see Figure E-36) citing the UC Berkeley Urban Displacement Project shows that much of the City contains “Sensitive Communities” identified as “vulnerable.” Communities were designated sensitive if they met the following criteria.

- They currently have populations vulnerable to displacement in the event of increased redevelopment and drastic shifts in housing cost.
- Vulnerability is defined as:
 - Share of very low income residents is above 20%, 2017 and
 - The tract meets two of the following criteria:
 - Share of renters is above 40%, 2017
 - Share of people of color is above 50%, 2017
 - Share of very low-income households (50% AMI or below) that are severely rent burdened households is above the county median, 2017
 - They or areas in close proximity have been experiencing displacement pressures

Local Trend


Figure E-36 shows the sensitive communities identified by HCD that may be at risk of displacement in the event of increased redevelopment and drastic shifts in housing cost. Sensitive communities are generally located in the central and eastern areas of the City. Most of these areas have racial/ethnic minority populations exceeding 81%, higher concentrations of children in female-headed households, and higher concentrations of LMI households. One sensitive community along the northern City boundary has a concentration of persons with disabilities exceeding 20% (see Figure E-2, Racial/Ethnic Minority Concentration and Sites Inventory (2018); Figure E-5, Concentration of Persons with Disabilities and Sites Inventory (2019); Figure E-8, Percent of Children in Female-Headed Households and Sites Inventory (2019); and Figure E-11, Concentration of LMI Households and Sites Inventory (2020)). The sensitive communities on the western side are moderate resource areas, while tracts on the eastern side are low resource areas and areas of high segregation and poverty (see Figure E-18, TCAC Opportunity Map and Sites Inventory (2021)). These areas have larger proportions of overcrowded households and overpaying renters (see Figure E-29 and Figure E-32).

Figure E-35 Median Housing Unit Age by Jurisdiction (2019)



Source: 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Figure E-36 Sensitive Communities At Risk of Displacement (2020)



Source: HCD AFFH Data Viewer, 2021 UC Berkley Urban Displacement Project, 2021.

Regional Trend

Sensitive communities at risk of displacement are identified for the region in Figure E-36. There are sensitive communities throughout the County; however, vulnerable communities are most concentrated around Moreno Valley, Perris, Hemet, Banning, and the City of Riverside. There is also a concentration of vulnerable communities in San Bernardino County, north of Jurupa Valley.

Housing tenure is, in turn, related to household income, composition (household size and relationships), and age of the householder. Communities need to have an adequate supply of units available both for rent and for sale to accommodate a range of households with varying incomes, family sizes, composition (individuals living together and their relationships to one another), and lifestyles. Approximately 62% of Jurupa Valley households owned their homes, and 38% of households rented their homes in 2019. As shown in Table E-27, the homeownership rate in Jurupa Valley was only slightly lower than in Riverside County but noticeably higher than in the State of California as a whole.

Table E-27 Occupied Units by Tenure (2019)

	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Jurupa Valley	15,293	62.3%	9,254	37.7%	24,548	100%
Riverside County	493,150	67.1%	241,797	32.9%	734,948	100%
California	7,223,672	54.9%	5,934,200	45.1%	13,157,873	100%

Source: Bureau of the Census 2010 (H16 -SF1) ACS 2019

Mortgage interest rates have a large influence over the affordability of housing. Higher interest rates increase a homebuyer's monthly payment and decrease the range of housing that a household can afford. Lower interest rates result in lower monthly payments for the homebuyer and can increase the buyer's purchasing ability. The availability of financing affects a person's ability to purchase or improve a home. Under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), lending institutions are required to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of the applicants. This applies to all loan applications for home purchases, improvements, and refinancing, whether financed at market rate or with government assistance. The difficulty to obtain a loan to own and to continue to live in Jurupa Valley can result in displacement of the households that are paying more and more for housing.

Figure E-37 Regional Sensitive Communities At Risk of Displacement (2020)




Table E-28 below summarizes the disposition of loan applications submitted to financial institutions in 2017 for home purchase, refinance, and home improvement loans in Jurupa Valley and the County of Riverside. Included is information on loan outcomes (i.e., the number of applications that were approved and originated, denied, withdrawn by the applicant, and incomplete).

Table E-28 Disposition of Home Loans (2019)

Loan Type	Total Applicants	Percent Approved	Percent Denied
Jurupa Valley			
Government-backed	460	91.1%	8.9%
Conventional	1,637	82.6%	17.4%
Refinance	2,277	73.2%	26.8%
Home improvement	401	63.6%	36.4%
Total	4,775	77.3%	22.7%
Riverside County (Unincorporated)			
Government-backed	995	21.6%	78.4%
Conventional	1,143	72.4%	27.6%
Refinance	2,590	56.3%	43.7%
Home improvement	512	42.0%	58.0%
Total	5,420	62.7%	37.4%

Source: www.LendingPatterns.com™, July 2019

In 2019, 1,637 Jurupa Valley households applied for conventional loans to purchase homes, as shown in Table E-29. Approximately 83% of these applications were approved and 17% were denied. The City’s approval rate was moderately higher than the approval rate for Riverside County. By comparison, 72% of conventional home loan applications countywide were approved while 28% were denied.

460 applications were submitted for the purchase of homes in Jurupa Valley through government-backed loans (e.g., FHA, VA) in 2019. Among applications for government-backed home purchase loans in the City, 91% were approved and 9% were denied. Again, the City’s approval rate for this loan type was much lower than that of Riverside County, where the approval rate for government-backed home purchase loans was 22%.

The vast majority of loan applications filed by Jurupa Valley residents in 2019 were for home refinance loans (2,277 applications). About 73% of these applications were approved, while 27% were denied. For the County, 56% of refinancing applications were approved. Approximately 36% of home-improvement loan applications were denied and 64% were approved by lending institutions in 2019. The high proportion of denials may be explained by the nature of these loans. Most home improvement loans are second loans and therefore more difficult to qualify for due to high income-to-debt ratio requirements.


Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, more people are moving out of state due to the lack of ability to afford to continue living in California. The state overall has seen almost 70,000 people relocate to other parts of the U.S.

Homelessness

Local Trend

Population estimates for persons experiencing homelessness in Jurupa Valley are based on the 2020 Riverside County Homeless Point-in-Time (PIT) Count and Survey, conducted on January 29, 2020. According to the 2020 PIT count, there were 103 unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness in Jurupa Valley. Figure E-38 shows the unsheltered homeless population in Jurupa Valley from 2015 to 2020. Since 2015, the unsheltered population in the City has decreased by nearly 40%.

Figure E-38 Unsheltered Homeless Trend – Jurupa Valley (2015-2020)



Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2015-2020.

Table E-29 shows the unsheltered homeless population in Jurupa Valley by race and ethnicity in 2019 and 2020. This table also shows the racial/ethnic composition citywide based on the most recent ACS estimates. Overall, the unsheltered homeless population in the City has decreased since 2019. The share of unsheltered American Indian, White, and Hispanic residents has increased while the share of unsheltered Black residents has decreased. The American Indian, Black, and White populations are overrepresented in the unsheltered homeless population compared to the population citywide.

Table E-29 Unsheltered Homeless Population by Race/Ethnicity (2019-2020)

Race/Ethnicity	2019		2020		Total Population
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent	
Asian	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	3.6%
American Indian	5	3.6%	4	3.9%	0.8%
Black	13	9.4%	9	8.7%	3.2%
White	75	54.0%	60	58.3%	52.6%
Multiple Races	18	12.9%	2	1.9%	3.6%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0.1%
Unknown Race	27	19.4%	27	26.2%	--
Hispanic	48	34.5%	45	43.7%	71.4%
Total	139	--	103	--	--

Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2019-2020; 2015-2019 ACS (5-Year Estimates).

Of the 103 unsheltered individuals counted in Jurupa Valley, 84 people were interviewed. Table E-30, below, shows subpopulation statistics of the 84 interviewed individuals in the City. A quarter of the interviewed homeless population experience a physical disability and 10.7% experience a developmental disability. Most of the unsheltered population are adults, 38.1% are chronically homeless, and 38.1% are newly homeless.

Table E-30 Unsheltered Homeless Subpopulation Statistics (2020)


Subpopulation	Persons	Percent
Substance Abuse	25	29.8%
PTSD	11	13.1%
Mental Health Conditions	12	14.3%
Physical Disability	21	25.0%
Developmental Disability	9	10.7%
Brain Injury	17	20.2%
Victim of Domestic Violence	5	6.0%
AIDS or HIV	0	0.0%
Veterans	1	1.2%
Chronically Homeless	32	38.1%
Adults Only	71	84.5%
Children Only	0	0.0%
Families with Children	0	0.0%
Pet Owners	33	39.3%
Newly Homeless	32	38.1%
Seniors (≥60)	9	10.7%

Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2020.

Regional Trend

Figure E-39 shows the homeless population trend from 2016 to 2020 in Riverside County. The unsheltered homeless population has increased by approximately 60% since 2016, while the sheltered population has remained relatively constant. Of the 2,155 unsheltered homeless persons, 41% were on the street, 20% were in encampments, and 15% were in vehicles. Overall, the homeless population has increased approximately 3% since 2019.


Figure E-39 Homeless Population Trend – Riverside County (2016-2020)



Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2020.

White residents make up the largest proportion of the homeless population followed by Black residents and American Indian residents. American Indian and Black populations are overrepresented in the homeless population. Approximately 2.5% of the homeless population is American Indian compared to 0.8% countywide, and 18.3% of the homeless population is Black compared to 6.5% countywide. Nearly 50% of the Riverside County population is Hispanic or Latino, compared to only 31.2% of the homeless population. A majority of the homeless population is male (63.3%).

Figure E-40 Homeless Population by Race, Gender, and Ethnicity – Riverside County (2020)



Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2020.

Table E-31 shows persons experiencing homelessness in Riverside County by subpopulation and shelter status. Approximately 25% of homeless individuals are sheltered and 75% are unsheltered. A majority of children (84.5%) and families with children (91.4%) are sheltered. Less than 20% of chronically homeless individuals and individuals experiencing substance abuse are sheltered. Only a third of homeless persons with mental health conditions and 30.9% of veterans are sheltered.

Table E-31 Homeless Subpopulations by Shelter Status – Riverside County (2020)

Subpopulation	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
Individuals	25.3%	74.7%	2884
Adults (≥25)	23.1%	76.9%	2216
Youth (18-24)	21.5%	78.5%	326
Children (≤17)	85.4%	14.6%	171
Unknown Ages	0.0%	100.0%	171
Households (Interview)	32.0%	68.0%	1718
Families w/ Children (Interview)	91.4%	8.6%	70
Chronically Homeless	19.9%	80.1%	648
Substance Abuse	15.2%	84.8%	534
Mental Health Conditions	33.0%	67.0%	557
Veterans	30.9%	69.1%	162
Pet Owners	--	100.0%	280

Source: Riverside County PIT Count, 2020.

2.6. Other Relevant Factors

SB 535

Disadvantaged communities in California are specifically targeted for investment of proceeds from the state's cap-and-trade program. Known as California Climate Investments (CCI), these funds are aimed at improving public health, quality of life, and economic opportunity in California's most burdened communities while reducing pollution that causes climate change.

Any jurisdiction can choose to include policies focused on environmental justice in their General Plan, but an Environmental Justice Element or the incorporation of environmental justice policies throughout the General Plan is required under state law for any city or county that includes disadvantaged communities. For the purposes of environmental justice, a disadvantaged community is defined as, "An area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) pursuant to §39711 of the California Health and Safety Code or an area that is a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation."

Senate Bill 535 defines disadvantaged communities as the top 25 percent scoring areas from CalEnviroScreen. Assembly Bill 1550 defines low-income communities using census data, statewide median income data, and state Department of Housing and Community Development income limits. As shown below (Figure E-41), all census tracts meet one or both of the definitions.

Based on the pollution data for Jurupa Valley, most of the City, specifically the northern and eastern sides, is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution.

Mobile Home Parks and Subsidized Housing

Mobile homes and subsidized housing typically house lower income persons and can be used to show concentrations of lower income households. As shown in Figure E-42, mobile homes and subsidized housing units are most concentrated on the eastern side of the City south of the Pomona Freeway. As described above, this area is also considered an area of high segregation and poverty according to TCAC opportunity maps, indicating that this area of the City has a high concentration of lower income households and racial/ethnic minority groups. This tract was also identified in the SB 535 map and as a community at risk of displacement.

There are several sites located within this tract used to meet the City's RHNA. These sites were found to be suitable for lower income housing. While there are only lower income RHNA sites in this tract, sites used to meet the lower and moderate income RHNA are generally distributed throughout the City and are not concentrated in the area referenced. Most lower income units are in moderate resource tracts, which make up a majority of the City. Further, approximately 14% of lower income units are in highest resource tracts despite the low presence of highest resource tracts Citywide.

Historical Land Use

Jurupa Valley was part of the unincorporated area of Riverside County prior to its incorporation in 2011. In the mid-20th century, the area consisted of farms, dairies, vineyards, rural large lot development and vacant land and had a large Hispanic population. Slow and measured low density rural development continued over the next few decades under the Riverside County General Plan which predominately allowed low density single family residential development and did not promote redlining or other

exclusionary land use practices. This era also saw the implementation of new public improvements such as the I-15 and SR-60 freeways and initial water and sewer infrastructure projects.

The late 1990s and early 2000s saw a significant increase in development activity in Jurupa Valley and surrounding areas as numerous single-family subdivisions were developed to provide more affordable housing options for persons working in Los Angeles and Orange counties. The area offered the dream of single-family home ownership at prices \$100,000 to \$200,000 less than the other counties to folks willing to take on a daily commute. This resulted in a significant population increase between 1995 and 2005 as the area became a bedroom community to the more affluent western counties and developed a significant jobs/housing imbalance.

After a prior failed incorporation attempt, Jurupa Valley residents successfully voted to incorporate in 2011 to enhance police services and gain more local control over land use and zoning. Without cityhood, residents feared they would lose their rural and equestrian character and be consumed by surrounding municipalities that were being developed with homogeneous “cookie cutter” housing. However, concurrently with initial incorporation, the State modified the municipal tax structure which shifted millions of dollars of vehicle license fees away from the City. This resulted in the City teetering on the brink of disincorporation for the first several years and unable to focus on improvements for the community.

In 2015, the state remediated many of the City’s outstanding debts, and the City was finally on stable financial ground and able to shift its focus inward. A major priority of the City became attracting new employment and jobs which would enable local residents to live and work in the City, reduce their commuting time and cost and improve their quality of life. The City also adopted its first General Plan and Housing Element in 2017 which focused on providing livable neighborhoods for all income levels while preserving the equestrian character of the City. The plan maintains the predominately single-family character of the area with opportunities for medium and higher density residential development near major transportation routes and community centers that can accommodate lower and moderate income households.

The goal of the City’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is to enhance the safety and quality of life for all citizens of Jurupa Valley and focuses on needed transportation and drainage improvements throughout the City’s nine communities. In addition, the City works with, and contracts with, other agencies to provide services and facilities, including the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA), the Housing Authority of Riverside County (HACR), the Jurupa Unified School District, CalFire, and the Riverside County Sheriff’s Department. In addition, three community service districts provide water and sewer service in the area. As of 2022, most of the City is equipped with wastewater infrastructure, with a portion of Mira Loma remaining on septic systems.

Figure E-41 SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities





Figure E-42 Mobile Home Parks and Subsidized Housing




2.7. Sites Inventory

The City’s sites inventory is generally distributed evenly throughout the City. Most of the sites used to meet the lower income RHNA are located along the Pomona Freeway (Highway 60), one of the major highways in Jurupa Valley and transportation corridors.

Jurupa Valley is composed of mostly block groups where more than 80% of the population belongs to a racial or ethnic minority group. Nearly all RHNA units are in block groups where 61% to 80% of the population belongs to a racial/ethnic minority (49.9%) or where more than 81% of the population belongs to a racial/ethnic minority group (49.4%). A larger percentage of lower income units are in areas with large proportions of non-White residents compared to moderate and above moderate income units.

Most block groups in the City have fewer than 50% LMI households. The distribution of RHNA units is shown at the tract level, which shows more LMI areas compared to the block group level map (see Figure E-43, below). A handful of LMI areas are located in the center of the City, specifically along Highway 60. More than half of RHNA units (55.9%) are in tracts that are considered LMI areas, including 53.7% of lower income units, 94.4% of moderate income units, and 44.4% of above moderate income units.

Figure E-43 Concentrations of LMI Households by Tract



While some lower income RHNA sites are located in areas with higher concentrations of racial/ethnic minorities and LMI households, as stated previously, most of these areas are moderate resource areas with fair economic opportunity scores and better access to transportation opportunities. The City’s RHNA strategy does not expose lower income households to adverse conditions at a higher rate than moderate

or above moderate income units. In general, all sites used to meet the RHNA, including lower income sites, follow the trends and patterns of the City overall.

Jurupa Valley's sites inventory shown by neighborhood and income level in Figure E-44. Table E-32 also shows the RHNA strategy by neighborhood and AFFH variable. The sites inventory is also shown in relation to community centers, food outlets and walkshed, medical centers, parks and walkshed, school facilities and walkshed, and bus stops and walkshed to ensure RHNA units have sufficient access to amenities. Amenity data for the City was provided by Houseal Lavigne and Associates. Jurupa Valley neighborhoods are referred to as Areas 1 through 10 for the purposes of this analysis. There are no RHNA units allocated in Area 8. Jurupa Valley neighborhoods are described below:

- Area 1 includes residential, industrial, commercial and agricultural uses in the northwestern portion of Jurupa Valley including a portion of the Mira Loma community and the I-15 Specific Plan area. Overall, housing in the northern and central portions of the area include low-density, lower income single-family residential neighborhoods, while the southwestern area along the I-15 corridor includes vacant land and newer market rate single-family development.
- Area 2 is located in the southeastern quadrant of the City along the Santa Ana River and includes primarily residential land uses with retail development along Limonite Avenue and a golf course and open space along the river corridor. Residential uses include older single-family neighborhoods as well as newer market rate single- and multi-family development along the I-15 corridor.
- Area 3 includes older, lower-income single-family neighborhoods in the Mira Loma community interspersed with small commercial establishments and ample equestrian activity. Approximately 20-30% of the census tracts in this area fall below the poverty line.
- Area 4 is located the north-central portion of the City straddling SR-60 with a portion located in the Jurupa Hills. Development includes older single-family rural residential development along Granite Hill Drive and mixed commercial and single- and multi-family residential development surrounding Mission Boulevard.
- Area 5 includes much of the community of Glen Avon and is located in the central portion of the City surrounding Mission Boulevard and Pedley Road. The area is historic in character and is characterized by small commercial establishments and traditional single-family neighborhoods.
- Area 6 encompasses a large area in the central portion of the city generally south of Jurupa Road and north of Limonite Avenue. Predominantly low density residential in nature with low levels of poverty, the area includes portions of the Mira Loma, Glen Avon, Indian Hills and Pedley communities with a strong equestrian presence.
- Area 7 is located in the south-central portion of the community along Limonite Avenue and the Santa Ana River in the Pedley community. The area includes older and newer single-family neighborhoods intermixed with commercial development and the Jurupa Valley City Hall along Limonite Avenue.
- Area 8 is similar in character to Area 7 with commercial development along Limonite Avenue and traditional single-family residential neighborhoods to the south. Approximately 20-30% of the census tracts in this area fall below the poverty level.

- Area 9 is located the north-central portion of the City straddling SR-60 and Mission Boulevard and includes the Sunnyslope community and a portion of Glen Avon. Development in the area includes older single-family rural residential development along Granite Hill Drive and mixed commercial and single- and multi-family residential development surrounding Mission Boulevard.
- Area 10 is located in the Pedley Hills area and includes portions of the Rubidoux, Indian Hills and Jurupa Hills communities. The area consists of traditional single-family residential development with vast open space areas.
- Area 11 includes the core of the Rubidoux community along both sides of Mission Boulevard. Land uses include commercial development along Mission Boulevard and older residential neighborhoods as well as the Emerald Meadows Specific Plan which is approved for mixed commercial and residential development.
- Area 12 includes a portion of the Rubidoux community near Flabob airport. The area includes commercial development along Mission Boulevard with older traditional single-family neighborhoods. 30-40% of the census tracts in the area fall below the poverty level.
- Area 13 includes Flabob Airport, Rancho Jurupa Regional Park and a portion of the Santa Ana River in the southeastern quadrant of the City. Residential development in this area includes stable single-family neighborhoods and a mobile home park.
- Area 14 includes the Crestmore community in the northeastern quadrant of the City with mixed residential, commercial and industrial development. The area also includes vacant hillside areas within the Rio Vista Specific Plan which are approved for residential and commercial development.

As shown below, above moderate income units are generally distributed throughout the City. Above moderate income units are located in all neighborhoods except Area 8 (no sites) and Area 12. Sites identified in Areas 2, 3, 6, 10, and 13 are allocated towards the above moderate income RHNA alone. These neighborhoods are spread throughout the City. Areas 1, 11, 13, and 14 have the highest concentrations of above moderate income units. The I-15 Corridor Specific Plan, located in Area 1, contributes most of the above moderate income units in this neighborhood. Similarly, the Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan is located in both Area 11 and 13 and the Rio Vista Specific Plan is located in Area 14. The Specific Plans identified contribute largely to the City's overall above moderate income RHNA. Areas 11, 13, and 14 are all located in the northeastern corner of the City. While Jurupa Valley's RHNA strategy does concentrate above moderate income units in this section of the City, the City has also identified many sites in this area that are suitable to accommodate both moderate and lower income units.

Moderate income units are located exclusively in Area 11 and 14. The Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan and Rio Vista Specific Plan are the greatest contributors to the moderate income RHNA, both located in the northeastern corner of the City. As discussed above, Area 11 and 14 are characterized by older residential neighborhoods and vacant hillsides, respectively, allowing for more housing opportunities in this section of the City. While moderate income units are concentrated in this area, this is due to the availability of sites suitable for housing development. Further, the City's RHNA strategy allocates a variety of units (lower, moderate, and above moderate) in this area and it is not exclusive to above moderate or moderate units alone. Area 11 and 14 are comprised of low to moderate resource tracts with LMI tracts and higher rates of cost burden and overcrowding. Moderate and above moderate income units in this

area will increase the potential for mixed-income communities further diversity housing types in the area. Further, amenities are very accessible in this corner of the City, specifically to Areas 11 and 12 and the southern section of Area 14. Amenities include two of the three community centers in the City are located in this area (Eddie Dee Smith Senior Center, Louis Rubidoux Library), food outlets, Rubidoux Family Care Center, and school facilities (Figure E-45, Figure E-46, Figure E-47, and Figure E-49).

There is only one neighborhood (Area 12) that contains sites exclusively allocated towards the lower income RHNA. All other lower income units are located in neighborhoods where a variety of units (lower, moderate, above moderate) have been allocated. Lower income units are located in the following neighborhoods:

- Area 1: 150 units (22.3% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 4: 780 units (94.8% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 5: 93 units (72.1% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 7: 300 units (91.5% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 9: 276 units (70.8% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 11: 171 units (24.3% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 12: 144 units (100% of units in this neighborhood)
- Area 14: 250 units (19.5% of units in this neighborhood)

Lower income units are not concentrated in a single area of the City, promoting accessible affordable housing to residents throughout Jurupa Valley. Tracts containing lower income RHNA units have a range of TCAC-designations from highest resource to high segregation and poverty. It is important to note that Area 12, where 100% of units are allocated towards the lower income RHNA, is an area of high segregation and poverty. Area 12 is described in detail in Section 2.3, *Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas*. Though Area 12 is an area of high segregation and poverty, amenities are highly accessible in this part of the City. The Eddie Dee Smith Senior Center, Louis Rubidoux Library, and Rubidoux Family Care Center are located in or directly adjacent to Area 12 (Figure E-45 and Figure E-47). Park facilities, school facilities, and food outlets are abundant in Area 12, increasing walkability in this neighborhood where public transit is less accessible (Figure E-46, Figure E-48, Figure E-49, and Figure E-50).

Lower income units are not located exclusively in this tract. Units in Area 12 represents only 6.7% of all lower income units identified. Other sites selected to meet the lower income RHNA are generally located in or adjacent to walksheds for food outlets, parks, and schools (Figure E-46, Figure E-48, and Figure E-49). By identifying sites suitable for lower income units in a variety of tract-types, the City's RHNA strategy promotes mobility for lower income households in the City and meets the needs of lower income households currently residing in low resource tracts or the area of high segregation and poverty.

Sites selected to meet the City's RHNA were deemed suitable for development based on City knowledge and community input. Further, the sites inventory promotes a variety of housing types throughout the City, encouraging mixed-income communities and providing suitable housing for existing communities impacted by fair housing issues (cost burden, overcrowding, etc.). The City's sites inventory and RHNA strategy is described in Chapter D, *Housing Opportunities and Resources*, of this Housing Element.

Table E-32 Distribution of RHNA Units by Neighborhood and AFFH Variable

Site #	Tract	Total Units	Capacity			AFFH Indicators					
			Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	% Non-White	% LMI HH	TCAC Opp. Category	% Cost Burden Owner HHS	% Cost Burden Renter HHS	% Overcrowded HHS
Area 1											
20 27 28 32 82 88	406.05	16	0	0	16	86.65% - 88.66%	58.70%	Moderate	38.20%	61.40%	19.47%
A-01*	406.07	150	150	0	0	74.99%	24.88%	Highest	43.30%	49.80%	4.81%
I-15 SP		508	0	0	508						
Total		674	150	0	524						
Area 2											
15 17 21 24 83 87	406.03	8	0	0	8	80.01%	66.44%	High	32.80%	20.50%	15.48%
Total		8	0	0	8						
Area 3											
16 29 30 81	406.06	8	0	0	8	82.80% - 84.40%	45.92%	Moderate	51.30%	50.90%	18.31%
Total		8	0	0	8						
Area 4											
B-01 B-02 C-01 C-02 D-01 D-02 D-03* D-04** D-05 D-06 C-04*	405.02	823	780	0	43	85.28%	55.19%	Moderate	39%	51%	21.40%

City of Jurupa Valley

Site #	Tract	Total Units	Capacity			AFFH Indicators						
			Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	% Non-White	% LMI HH	TCAC Opp. Category	% Cost Burden Owner HHs	% Cost Burden Renter HHs	% Overcrowded HHs	
C-05* 107 108 14 22 23 25 26 33 86 89 90												
Total	823		780	0	43							
Area 5												
E-01 E-02 E-03 10 47 79 80 102	405.01	129	93	0	36	71.71 – 80.87	45.39	Moderate	36.50%	56.40%	8.36%	
Total		129	93	0	36							
Area 6												
18 19 31 34 35 37 48 71 97	404.03	59	0	0	59	77.56% - 83.43%	50.47%	Moderate	26.80%	40.60%	13.89%	
2 13 38 40 42 49	404.05	78	0	0	78	66.57%	18.92%	High	35.40%	77.40%	2.85%	

City of Jurupa Valley

Site #	Tract	Total Units	Capacity			AFFH Indicators					
			Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	% Non-White	% LMI HH	TCAC Opp. Category	% Cost Burden Owner HHS	% Cost Burden Renter HHS	% Overcrowded HHS
50											
53											
57											
59											
64											
98											
Total		137	0	0	137						
Area 7											
36	404.02	22	0	0	22	70.44%	42.86%	Moderate	45%	65.50%	4.47%
39											
41											
44											
45											
55											
PK SP		306	300	0	6						
Total		328	300	0	28						
Area 9											
1	401.02	81	0	0	81	87.41%	41.90%	Low	16.80%	59.50%	15.20%
5											
6											
11											
43											
51											
65											
66	403.03	309	276	0	33	83.79%	30.58%	Moderate (Rapidly Changing)	36.30%	33.50%	13.12%
92											
94											
103											
F-01											
Total		390	276	0	114						
Area 10											
3	403.02	78	0	0	78	57.08% - 75.70%	27.25%	High	37.60%	43.90%	3.96%
8											
75											
77											
84											
85											
91											
93											

City of Jurupa Valley

Site #	Tract	Total Units	Capacity			AFFH Indicators					
			Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	% Non-White	% LMI HH	TCAC Opp. Category	% Cost Burden Owner HHS	% Cost Burden Renter HHS	% Overcrowded HHS
95											
96											
Total		78	0	0	78						
Area 11											
12	402.02	200	129	41	30	67.90%	44.21%	Moderate	49.70%	60.10%	8.07%
74											
78											
H-01											
4	402.04	47	42	0	5	92.18%	72.33%	Low	34.90%	62.60%	29.14%
G-01											
EMR SP		367	0	238	129						
7	403.01	90	0	17	73	78.39% - 88.29%	58.90%	Low	50.20%	61.70%	23.3
54											
67											
68											
69											
70											
72											
76											
106											
Total		704	171	296	237						
Area 12											
99	402.03	144	144	0	0	95.38%	76.47	High Segregation & Poverty	28.80%	57.40%	41.51%
100											
101											
104											
105											
Total		144	144	0	0						
Area 13											
9	402.01	7	0	0	7	65.39% - 84.92%	44.71%	Low	40%	37.90%	21.52%
62											
63											
EMR SP											
Total		238	0	0	238						
Area 14											
52	401.01	264	250	0	14	95.25% - 97.25%	64.95%	Low	23.60%	41.40%	23.86%
56											
58											
60											

Site #	Tract	Total Units	Capacity			AFFH Indicators					
			Lower	Moderate	Above Moderate	% Non-White	% LMI HH	TCAC Opp. Category	% Cost Burden Owner HHs	% Cost Burden Renter HHs	% Overcrowded HHs
61											
73											
RV SP		1,018	0	440	578						
Total		1,282	250	440	592						

I-15 SP = I-15 Corridor Specific Plan

EMR SP = Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan

RV SP = Rio Vista Specific Plan

PK SP = Paradise Knolls Specific Plan

Figure E-44 Distribution of RHNA Units by Neighborhood and Income Level




Figure E-45 Distribution of RHNA Units and Community Centers




Figure E-46 Distribution of RHNA Units and Food Outlet Facilities and Walkshed




Figure E-47 Distribution of RHNA Units and Medical Facilities




Figure E-48 Distribution of RHNA Units and Park Facilities and Walkshed




Figure E-49 Distribution of RHNA Units and School Facilities and Walkshed





Figure E-50 Distribution of RHNA Units and Bus Stop Facilities and Walkshed



2.8. Outreach

State law requires that the preparation, adoption, and implementation of a housing element include a diligent effort to include public participation from all economic segments of the community. A diligent effort means going beyond simply giving the public an opportunity to provide input and should be proactively and broadly conducted through a variety of methods to assure access and participation. AB 686 requires jurisdictions to include a summary of their fair housing outreach capacity. To address these requirements, the housing element must describe meaningful, frequent, and ongoing public participation with key stakeholders.

In preparing the 6th Cycle Housing Element, involvement with community members was prioritized to fully understand their values and ideas for the future. Several opportunities were available for community members and housing interest groups to express their input and weigh in on housing issues. Although in-person outreach was limited due to COVID-19 constraints, the community adapted and found meaningful ways to get involved in the Housing Element update process through digital engagement platforms and virtual meetings. A summary of outreach activities conducted during the planning effort is provided below. Appendix C of the Housing Element contains community engagement materials used to inform and solicit input from the public during the process, including public notices, the Community Housing Survey, and community workshops.

Website and Community Housing Survey

In winter 2020-21, the City launched the Housing Element Update webpage and online Community Housing Survey (in English and Spanish). The website contained educational information about the purpose and process for the Housing Element, project updates, and notices of upcoming opportunities to participate. This included the opportunity to sign up for an email list for future updates for the public study sessions and workshops that were planned for community participation.

To date, the Community Housing Survey has resulted in 231 responses. To connect with as many residents of Jurupa Valley as possible, the survey was promoted through the City's Planning Commission and City Council meetings, the City's email list, the City's Facebook page, and the City's website. The survey was open to the public through the Housing Element development process, and the responses demonstrated that the community's interests and concerns reflected those found in the data and demographics. The responses from a majority of the survey takers show that those with the greatest need for housing in Jurupa Valley are seniors, large families, young adults, and homeless persons. The responses also reveal that the community does not see any difficulty in finding housing but does see the need for affordable housing and would like to see more diversity in affordable housing. Through the survey, the City also received a wide variety of comments on housing that are available in full in Appendix C of the Housing Element.

A summary of the survey responses identified the following housing concerns and desires for the City:

- Desire to increase the variety of housing types and affordability
- Desire to see government assistance for the maintenance of existing homes
- Desire to see housing developed near access to community and commercial amenities
- Desire to provide housing to those who are in the special need categories (i.e., those who are homeless, single parent household, seniors or living with disabilities)

The survey was provided in English and Spanish. To reach growing population of Spanish speakers living in the community, the outreach notices were also provided in English and Spanish. In addition to the

normal methods of distribution and legal noticing; the many utility companies, public agencies, and nonprofit organizations that operate in the City were able to provide their customers access to the information available through their websites and utility bills. These survey results captured the community's sentiments towards the current housing issues present in Jurupa Valley.

The City incorporated the data into the overall analysis of the Housing Element and the main concerns of the community were reviewed and addressed in the Housing Opportunities and Resources Section of this Housing Element. The responses received from the community resulted in specific emphasis on affordable housing and diversity of in future housing types.

Planning Commission and City Council Study Sessions: Housing Element Overview, Sites Inventory and New Housing Laws

Public input was facilitated by means of separate Study Sessions conducted with the Planning Commission and the City Council on March 10, 2021 and April 15, 2021, respectively, that provided an overview of Housing Element requirements and housing law and a discussion of the City's RHNA and potential housing sites to meet the RHNA. The Planning Commission and City Council were generally supportive of the need for additional housing sites in the City and indicated areas of the City where additional housing and density would be most feasible, including within the Specific Plan areas and along the City's major transportation corridors. The meetings were noticed as follows and open for public participation and comment.

- Notices were mailed to interested persons and public agencies.
- Notices were posted at City Hall.
- Notices were posted on the City's website.
- Notices were placed in the Press Enterprise.

Community Workshops

On April 5 and 6, 2021 public workshops were conducted on the Housing Element, one in English and one in Spanish. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the workshops were conducted via teleconference with computer stations available at City Hall for participants without computer access. The workshops were advertised on the City's website, community websites, and through social media. During the workshops, City staff provided an overview of Housing Element requirements and housing law and a discussion of the City's RHNA and potential housing sites to meet the RHNA. Participants were then encouraged to provide their input on housing issues and needs in Jurupa Valley. Overall, participants agreed that lack of affordable housing is the biggest housing issue in Jurupa Valley.

During these workshops the participants also emphasized the following concerns and desires for the City to address:

- Desire to increase the variety of housing types and affordability,
- Desire to locate higher density housing near transportation corridors,
- Desire to see more multi-family dwelling development and small lot or condo developments to increase the income variety of the community,
- Desire to see more shared open spaces in the community and developments with less traditional lawns.

These comments have been incorporated into the development of the Housing Opportunities and Resources Section of this Housing Element.

Public Review Draft Housing Element

The Draft Housing Element was made available for public review at City Hall and on the City's website beginning on May 20, 2021. Notices to inform the public and stakeholders about the availability of the Draft Housing Element were mailed and emailed to housing interest groups, including all homeowner's associations in the City, and announcements of the Draft Housing Element were sent to subscribers of the City's email service, community agencies, and Facebook.

Planning Commission and City Council Joint Study Session: Final Sites Inventory and Draft Housing Element

On May 20, 2021, a joint study session was conducted with the Planning Commission and the City Council on the Final Sites Inventory (Housing Element Appendix A), Proposed Redesignation/Rezone Sites (Housing Element Appendix B), and the Draft Housing Element itself. This study session provided an overview of the Draft Housing Element and a detailed overview of the sites inventory. The meeting was noticed and open for public participation and comment. In addition, the City directly invited housing interest groups, including affordable housing developers and nonprofits, senior care providers, property management companies, and the Chamber of Commerce. A notice was also mailed to representatives of all homeowner's associations in the City.

This study session was attended by Planning Commissioners, City Council members, community members, and community interest group representatives. The study session was livestreamed through the City website, and community members were provided the opportunity to send in written comments ahead of the session on May 20, 2021. The study session began with an overview of the Draft Housing Element and the timeline of the development and community involvement with this document. The presentation also included a review of the Sites Inventory and ability of the City to meet its RHNA allocation based on existing and proposed land use designations and known development projects. The presentation was then followed by a discussion about proposed sites for redesignation/rezone to the City's highest density residential designation (HHDR) and R-3 zone and the criteria used to select sites. Sites were chosen to best encapsulate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) as set by the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) of California. The discussion centered on vacant and underutilized sites available in the City of Jurupa Valley.

City Council had the following comments and, based on individual study sessions, the draft document and the list of sites provided, they voiced their desires to see the following:

- Desire to see highest density housing around commercial development
- Desire to see fewer industrial uses around housing
- Desire to see that no more housing get built directly in areas that are currently impacted by traffic issues
- Desire to see quality housing through designs and buffering to reduce the effects of pollutants to housing sites

All of the comments provided by City Council members were included and responded to through the programs in this document. For example, the housing sites proposed for redesignation and rezoning have been located near current commercial developments and future commercial developments so that the community will have access to amenities.

Planning Commissioners provided comments on the sites and the following desires:

- Desire to house as many people as possible in the community as part of a balancing act with jobs
- Desire to see that the development for highest density housing infill and transit corridors spread the density throughout the city
- Desire for inclusionary and mixed income developments for the residents to encourage healthy development

These comments were taken into account when writing the Housing Element and were used to modify the overall Sites Inventory and proposed redesignation/rezone sites. The current housing policies in the Housing Element also include programs to address the diversity of housing for different incomes, to address the concentration and location of highest density housing, and to address environmental justice needs for housing developments.

This meeting was attended by the public and watched through the livestream available on the City website. This meeting was recorded and kept for future record. Representatives from the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) and Inland Equity, two local environmental justice groups, attended the meetings and spoke of their comments on the Draft Housing Element and also wrote into the City concerning potential additional programs to further the development of affordable for all.

The nonprofits discussed the following desires for inclusion in the City's Housing programs:

- Desire for rent control in Jurupa Valley
- Desire to raise fines through code enforcement for substandard housing in both rental and ownership
- Desire for elimination of the lowest density residential zoning
- Desire for programs to assist with housing ownership rather than renting
- Desire to relocate the potential housing sites farther away from transportation corridors
- Desire to see inclusionary and mixed housing

The comments received by the City at this study session from these two nonprofit groups have been addressed by the programs of the Housing Element, including a study for an inclusionary housing ordinance, the special criteria of potential housing site inventory selection, and the continued work by the code enforcement team to deal with substandard housing. As the City continues to grow and attempts to accommodate the development of the community, it makes all efforts to provide better housing for all income levels through the proposed programs.

As part of the City efforts to include all comments from the community meetings, the meetings were recorded and are all available on the City website. The City continues to do community outreach, surveys, and community meetings while also making sure that they meet the action plan developed through Consolidated Plan (2018-2022), Annual Action Plan (2020-2021), and the Citizen's Participation Plan with the goal to generate significant public participation in the consolidated planning process, including any amendments to the Consolidated Plan, the Annual Action Plan, the AFH, and the CAPER. Input will be sought particularly from low- and moderate-income persons and groups residing within various areas of the City where program funds will be used.

On May 27, 2021, the Draft Housing Element was updated with comments received from the City Council and Planning Commission Joint session and then reposted on the City website for public review of the 6th Cycle. The announcement for this draft availability was posted on the City's website and social media platforms and was sent to all community parties. The update draft was also sent to HCD for the first

review. The typical Housing Element review period is 60 days, and on July 23, 2021 the City met with the staff from HCD to review the state’s preliminary comments, which were formally provided to the City in writing on July 26, 2021. The City has incorporated changes requested by the state in a revised Draft Housing Element Update.

On October 5, 2021, the City made the revised Draft Housing Element with HCD-requested updates available on the City’s website with an invitation for comments. This document was posted on social media, sent to local agencies, and emailed to commissioners, council members, community groups, and others requesting notification. As of October 15, 2021, the City had not received any comments from the public on the revised Draft Housing Element; however, the document remained available for public review and comment through February 7, 2022. The intention was to keep all community members informed of any changes and updates to the Housing Element and obtain as many comments as possible to best create a document that suits the needs of the people of Jurupa Valley.

On November 10, 2021, the Planning Commission considered the Housing Element Update at a duly noticed public hearing. The Planning Commission received a detailed overview of the Housing Element Update and invited members of the public to address the Commission. However, no members of the public asked to be heard. The Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the Housing Element Update to the City Council.

On December 2, 2021, the City Council considered the Housing Element Update at a duly noticed public hearing. The Mayor invited members of the public to address the Council on the Housing Element Update. However, no members of the public asked to be heard. Following discussion of the Housing Element Update the Council made minor modifications to the sites inventory and unanimously approved the Housing Element Update. In addition, the Council authorized the Community Development Director to make any non-substantive, technical modifications to the document based on further comments from HCD without the need for re-approval by the City Council.

On December 13, 2021, the City received the second comment letter from HCD on the Housing Element. The letter acknowledged that the City had responded to many of HCD’s previous comments and requested additional information and clarification on the AFFH and other topics.

On February 7, 2022, the City made the second revision of the Housing Element available on the City’s website with an invitation for comments. This document was posted on social media, sent to local agencies, and emailed to commissioners, council members, community groups, and others requesting notification. The revision reflected changes made to the Housing Element in response to HCD’s letter of December 13, 2021. As of February 21, 2022, the City received one comment on the revised Housing Element Update related to whether the revised proposal for the Emerald Meadows Ranch Specific Plan was included in the document. As stated in Section D, the revised proposal was not included as it is early in the process and has not been reviewed or approved by the City. The revised draft Housing Element was submitted to HCD on February 22, 2022 for review and certification.

2.9. Summary of Fair Housing Issues

Findings from Jurupa Valley Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

Community Profile

- The Hispanic ethnic population represent about 49% of the City’s total population, which is higher than the countywide total of 50%. All minority groups in the City account for over three-quarters of the City total population.

- The majority (52%) of Jurupa Valley households spoke Spanish as their primary language. Sixteen percent of these Spanish-speaking households had limited English proficiency and are considered linguistically isolated. Although smaller in number, households that spoke Asian/Pacific Islander languages as their primary language, had the largest degree of linguistic isolation at 21%.
- The Section 8 Housing Voucher Program administered by the Housing Authority of Riverside County (HARC) assists low-income renters living in Jurupa Valley with majority of these renters are homeless senior and/or disabled households. In 2018, approximately 1,700 households were on the waitlist for federal rental assistance.
- Seniors (age 65+) represent 11% of Jurupa Valley's population. Some of the characteristics of elderly residents included: limited mobility; increased medical attention due to health complications; and, restricted fixed income, such as Social Security, pension programs and retirement income. Many elderly people also have difficulty completing normal, everyday tasks without assistance.
- The number of Jurupa Valley residents age 18 and older with some type of disability totaled about 11% of the City's total population of the same age group. The top three disabilities among persons age 5 and older include those with ambulatory difficulty, independent living difficulty, and cognitive difficulty. It was estimated that approximately two-thirds of the City's elderly population had ambulatory difficulty.
- Over one-half of the homes in Jurupa Valley are about 40 years and older. This compares to about one-third of the homes countywide. In general, homes built more than 30 years ago are likely to require structural renovation and increased maintenance, resulting in greater costs for the owner. Older homes can also create health and safety problems for occupants, as many deteriorated structures often do not meet current building code standards and lack safety features such as fire suppression, home security devices, and seismic safety retrofits. In addition, there are greater lead-based paint related health risks.
- The average household size in Jurupa Valley was 4.0 as compared to 3.3 countywide. About 30% of the City's households were considered large households (5 or more persons per household). Large households are a special needs group because of the lack of available affordable housing of adequate size. To save for necessities such as food, clothing, transportation, and medical care, lower- and moderate-income large households may reside in smaller units, resulting in overcrowding.
- Overcrowding (defined as more than one person per room) occurred in 11% of the City's total occupied units and severe overcrowding (more than 1.5 persons per room) occurred in 5% of the total occupied units. More overcrowding occurred in rental units than owner-occupied units. This indicates the need for larger rental units and/or more rental subsidies to allow large households to afford adequately sized units.
- The most prevalent housing problem facing Jurupa Valley households was overpayment on housing cost. A household is considered to be overpaying for housing if housing costs (rent plus utilities) make up more than 30% of the household's gross monthly income. Overpaying occurred with 41% of the total occupied units. Renter households tended to overpay more for housing than owners occupied households.

Fair Housing Profile

- Fair housing education and outreach to housing providers and owners is provided through the Fair Housing Council of Riverside County (FHCRC), the California Apartment Owner's Association (CAA), and for properties with Section 8 rent vouchers, the Housing Authority of the County of Riverside (HACR). Given the characteristics of Jurupa Valley's apartment stock as predominately older and in smaller complexes, a large segment of the City's rentals are not managed by professional management companies and small "mom and pop" managers may not be trained in fair housing laws. As small property managers/owners are typically the primary violators of fair housing laws, targeted outreach to this group by the FHCRC remains critical.
- Consistent with state and national trends, the leading basis of discrimination complaints in Riverside County over the past five years (7/2013-6/2018) are as follows: physical disability (51%), mental disability (12%), race (10%), familial status (8%), national origin (7%), and sex (3%). In Jurupa Valley's first year contracting with FHCRC, 21 discrimination cases were opened, including 16 related to physical disability, and one case based on each of the following protected classes: mental disability, race, familial status, sex and age. It will be important to monitor discrimination complaints in the City over time to more fully assess patterns and to appropriately tailor FHCRC's outreach.
- There is a gap in understanding by many landlords about the requirements under the Federal fair Housing Act to provide reasonable accommodation or reasonable modifications for persons with disabilities. Lack of understanding of these Federal requirements is a leading reason why persons with disabilities encounter discrimination when seeking housing or attempting to maintain their housing.

Public Sector Impediments

- There is currently no mechanism specified in the Zoning Code to allow reasonable accommodation exceptions to zoning requirements for individuals with disabilities. This process should be placed in the Code to ensure that it is formalized and consistently applied.
- Based on the affordability gap analysis conducted in the City's Housing Element, market rents in Jurupa Valley are beyond the level of affordability of lower income (<80% AMI) households, and housing sales prices are beyond the level of affordability of moderate income (<120% AMI) households. Local tools including inclusionary zoning and density bonuses can be used to facilitate the production of units affordable to low- and moderate-income households, and further goals for economic integration.

Private Sector Impediments

- The approval rate for home purchase loans in Jurupa Valley in 2017 was below the Countywide average by 3.5% (84.5% compared to 88.0% for Riverside County). In general, all nearby counties had similar home purchase approval rates.
- Mortgage loan denial rates in Jurupa Valley were higher than Riverside County. The lowest denial rates in Jurupa Valley were among Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (7.1%), followed by Asians (13.5%), and Whites (14.2%). Denial rates of Hispanics were at 15.0%, with African Americans having the highest denial rates at 27.5%. Countywide loan denial rates were higher among African Americans (16.2%), Hispanic (12.4%) and Asian (13.0%) applicants than Whites (11.0%).

2.10. Local Data and Knowledge

As part of the Housing Element Update, the City sent out a Community Housing Survey in Spanish and English to collect data concerning information about the community needs and concerns with existing housing. While the questions were concentrated on access to housing and opportunities for change in this update to the Housing Element, the survey results were still revealing about the different types of housing we see in Jurupa. The survey results reveal that inhabitants of the City believe there is a lack of housing for those who are elderly, young professionals, and the homeless, which is addressed within this analysis and the Housing Element. The survey results also provided insight to the type of housing the community wants to see. This included both inclusionary housing, less high density but more affordable units which is limited in Jurupa Valley currently. The data and notes from all outreach related to the Housing Element can be found in the Appendix C of that document.

2.11. Identification and Prioritization of Contributing Factors

Concentration of Special Needs Groups

Low resource areas, and one area of high segregation and poverty, are generally concentrated on the eastern side of the City, while the western side is comprised mostly of highest and high resource tracts. While concentrations of racial/ethnic minority groups, LMI households, persons with disabilities, and children in female-headed households are scattered throughout the City, many of the tracts/block groups in these low resource areas have concentrations of special needs groups.

Priority Level: (High)

Contributing Factors

- Lack of private investment
- Location and type of affordable housing
- Inaccessible sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, or other infrastructure

Substandard Housing Conditions

Approximately 20% to 40% Jurupa Valley's housing stock has at least 1 of the 4 severe housing problems monitored by CHAS (incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing facilities, more than one person per room, and cost burden greater than 50%). Approximately 42% of the owner-occupied units in the City were built before 1980, and 18% were built before 1960. Of the City's renter-occupied units, 47% were built before 1980, and 21% were built before 1960. Many of these housing units may be susceptible to deterioration and may need rehabilitation.

Priority Level: (Medium)

Contributing Factors

- Age of housing stock
- Cost of repairs or rehabilitation

Displacement Risk of Low Income Residents Due to Economic Pressures

The HCD Data Viewer has identified several communities that may be at risk of displacement. Many of these communities have a higher concentration of overpaying renters, persons with disabilities, and

racial/ethnic minorities. The vulnerable communities on the eastern side of the City are also considered low resource areas.

Priority Level: (Low)

Contributing Factors

- Unaffordable rents
- Concentration of poverty in some tracts
- Availability of affordable housing

3. Summary and Conclusions

In addition to incorporating the City's AI and Action Plan recommendations into the Housing Element process, the City gained additional Fair Housing Insights through the AB 686 analysis, including the review of the RHNA sites inventory. The review of the RHNA sites provided an understanding of sites that could better serve the needs of the community to attain fair housing in Jurupa Valley and due to the diversity of housing sites considered for the 6th Cycle Housing Element there were no changes needed.

Strategies and actions to implement priorities and goals may include, but are not limited to:

- Enhancing mobility strategies and promoting inclusion for protected classes
- Encouraging development of new affordable housing in high-resource areas
- Implementing place-based strategies to encourage community revitalization, including preservation of existing affordable housing
- Protecting existing residents from displacement

Table 5.56 in the Housing Element summarizes Jurupa Valley's intended Fair Housing implementation actions.

As seen in the matrix, the City intends to complete the necessary actions to meet the needs of the State law for AFFH. These actions are integrated into the action plan for the overall 6th Cycle Housing Element with the specialized time frames for expedited implementation. The reasoning for these actions to be called out specifically is to ensure that they get completed in a timely manner to better serve the community of Jurupa Valley. These actions are intended to alleviate the main issues identifies in this AFFH analysis; however, the City continues to use other actions in the new Housing Element that will be implemented over the entirety of the 2021-2029 planning period.