

AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE
SERVICE AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
AND
CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY AND CITY OF RIVERSIDE
FOR
MISSION BOULEVARD BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS AT SANTA ANA RIVER

This Amendment No. 1 to the Service Agreement (hereinafter "AMENDMENT NO. 1") is entered into this _____ day of _____, 2025, by and between the County of Riverside, a political subdivision of the State of California, (hereinafter "COUNTY"), the City of Jurupa Valley, a municipal corporation, (hereinafter "JURUPA") and the City of Riverside, a municipal corporation, (hereinafter "RIVERSIDE") for the development and implementation of a project to replace the existing Mission Boulevard Bridge (BR. No. 56C0071) over Santa Ana River and to reconstruct the approach roadways connecting the new bridge located within the jurisdictional boundaries of both JURUPA and RIVERSIDE.

RECITALS

- A. On September 1, 2015, COUNTY, JURUPA, and RIVERSIDE entered into an agreement entitled "Service Agreement By and Between County of Riverside and City of Jurupa Valley and City of Riverside for Mission Boulevard Bridge Improvements at Santa Ana River" (hereinafter "Agreement"). The Agreement provides the terms and conditions for the development and implementation of a project to replace the existing Mission Boulevard Bridge (BR. No. 56C0071) over Santa Ana River and to reconstruct the approach roadways connecting the new bridge located within the jurisdictional boundaries of both JURUPA and RIVERSIDE.
- B. COUNTY, JURUPA, and RIVERSIDE have completed final plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E).
- C. The project documents took longer than anticipated to complete due to the Army Corps of Engineers' implementation of additional requirements to obtain the Section 404 and Section 408 permits. As a result, the cost of the project has increased, and additional funding will be needed to complete this project.
- D. With this amendment, the COUNTY and the CITIES desire to update the costs and funding needed to complete this project as well as add construction terms.

AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises contained herein, the PARTIES hereto agree as follows:

1. Exhibit A, Project Factsheet, of the Agreement is hereby amended to update the costs and funding needed to complete this project as set forth in Exhibit A, Project Factsheet, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
2. Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, and 12 are hereby added to SECTION 1 of the Agreement, as follows:
 - “9. Furnish a representative to perform the function of Resident Engineer during the construction of the PROJECT.
 10. Furnish qualified support staff to assist the Resident Engineer in, but not limited to, construction surveys, soils and compaction tests, measurement and computation of quantities, testing of construction materials, checking submittals, preparation of estimates and reports, preparation of as-built drawings, and other inspection and staff services necessary to assure that the construction is performed in accordance with the PS&E documents.
 11. Construct the PROJECT in accordance with approved PS&E documents.
 12. Furnish the CITIES with one complete set of as-built plans for each CITY and all contract records, including survey documents, within three hundred and sixty-five (365) days following the completion and acceptance of the PROJECT construction contract. Electronic copies of completed plans are available if CITIES desire.”
3. Paragraph 5 is hereby added to SECTION 3 of the Agreement, as follows:

“5. Deposit with COUNTY \$892,791 upon execution of AMENDMENT NO.1. The remaining balance will be paid per Paragraph 4 in SECTION 3 of the Agreement until the completion of construction, capital, and support activities for the PROJECT.”
4. Paragraph 25 is hereby added to SECTION 4 of the Agreement, as follows:

“25. PARTIES agree that construction by COUNTY of improvements referred to herein which lie within both CITIES rights of way shall not be commenced until an Encroachment Permit to COUNTY, or COUNTY's contractor, authorizing such work has been issued by the CITIES.”
5. Except to the extent specifically modified or amended hereunder, all of the terms, covenants, and conditions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect between COUNTY and CITIES.

1 6. This AMENDMENT NO. 1 shall become effective upon signature of this AMENDMENT NO. 1 by
2 COUNTY and CITIES.

3 7. This AMENDMENT NO. 1 may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which will be an
4 original, but all of which together will constitute one instrument. Each party to this AMENDMENT NO. 1
5 agrees to the use of electronic signatures, such as digital signatures that meet the requirements of the
6 California Uniform Electronic Transactions Act ("CUETA") Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1633.1 to 1633.17), for
7 executing this AMENDMENT NO. 1. The parties further agree that the electronic signatures of the parties
8 included in this AMENDMENT NO. 1 are intended to authenticate this writing and to have the same force
9 and effect as manual signatures. Electronic signature means an electronic sound, symbol, or process
10 attached to or logically associated with an electronic record and executed or adopted by a person with the
11 intent to sign the electronic record pursuant to the CUETA as amended from time to time. The CUETA
12 authorizes use of an electronic signature for transactions and contracts among parties in California,
13 including a government agency. Digital signature means an electronic identifier, created by computer,
14 intended by the party using it to have the same force and effect as the use of a manual signature, and
15 shall be reasonably relied upon by the parties. For purposes of this section, a digital signature is a type of
16 "electronic signature" as defined in subdivision (i) of Section 1633.2 of the Civil Code.

17 IN WITNESS HEREOF, the PARTIES hereto have caused this AMENDMENT NO. 1 to the Agreement to be duly
18 executed this day and year first written above.

1 **APPROVALS**

2 **COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

3 **RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL:**

4 _____
5 Dated: _____

6 Dennis Acuna, Director of Transportation

7 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

8 Minh C. Tran, County Counsel

9 _____
10 Dated: _____

11 By Deputy

12 **APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

13 _____
14 Dated: _____

15 _____
16 Chairman, Riverside County Board of Supervisors

17 **ATTEST:**

18 _____
19 Dated: _____

20 **KIMBERLY A. RECTOR**

21 Clerk of the Board (Seal)

2 **CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY:**

3 _____
4 Dated: _____

5 Rod B. Butler, City Manager

6 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

7 Peter M. Thorson, City Attorney

8 _____
9 Dated: _____

10 **ATTEST:**

11 _____
12 Dated: _____

13 Maria Morris, City Clerk

1 **APPROVALS**

2 **CITY OF RIVERSIDE:**

3
4 _____
5 Mike Futrell, City Manager

6
7 **ATTEST:**

8 _____
9
10 Donesia Gause, City Clerk

11
12 **CERTIFIED AS TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS:**

13
14 Mike Futrell

15 Chief Financial Officer

16
17 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

18
19 Tarren Torres

20 Tarren Torres, Deputy City Attorney

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 312092 TAT 12/01/2025

Exhibit A - PROJECT FACTSHEET

Project Title: Mission Blvd. Bridge Over Santa Ana River
Bridge Replacement Project - (Br. No. 56C-0071)
Federal Project Number: BRLSZ-5956(192)

Estimated Total Project Cost: \$91,251,020

Project Scope of Work

This project proposes to replace the existing Mission Boulevard Bridge (Br. No. 56C-0071) over the Santa Ana River near Mount Rubidoux in Riverside County. The existing bridge was slated for seismic retrofitting by Riverside County in cooperation with the California State Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) under the Local Agency Seismic Safety Retrofit Program (LSSRP). An as-built seismic assessment of the existing bridge was performed, and a retrofit strategy was developed to strengthen the structure in April 1997. CALTRANS approved changing the retrofit strategy to total bridge replacement based on the results and recommendations of two subsequent studies. These were a geotechnical study and then a follow-up "Limited Feasibility Study and Final Retrofit Strategy Report," which assessed the bridge site for liquefaction potential and developed alternative retrofit strategies including a total bridge replacement option. Due to the findings of high liquefaction potential of the site soils, significant ground improvements and foundation retrofit measures were necessary. Total replacement of the bridge was approved considering the relatively high cost of proposed foundation improvements and other retrofit measures.

The existing Mission Boulevard Bridge carries four lanes of traffic across the Santa Ana River (two lanes in each direction). It is an 11-span bridge supported on precast/pre-stressed I-Girders with a total length of 1104 feet. The General Plan Classification of the road is Arterial Highway. The bridge is on the Eligible Bridge List (ELB) for the Local Agency Seismic Safety Retrofit Program (LSSRP). The project is programmed to receive federal Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds and qualifies for matching State Seismic Bond Funds (Proposition 1B). The in-kind bridge replacement will include similar bridge length and width with standard shoulders and a multi-purpose trail and a cast-in-place prestressed concrete box girder superstructure. The project is a non-capacity-increasing seismic retrofit project.



Existing Mission Blvd. Bridge at Santa Ana River (Looking West)

Bridge Data

- Existing Length: 1104 ft Existing Width: 61 ft
- Proposed Length: 1127 ft Proposed Width: 88.5 ft
- Designated: Structurally Deficient (SD). Bridge site is subject to liquefaction.
- SR (Sufficiency Rating): 48.6
- Year Built: 1958
- Retrofit Strategy: Total Bridge Replacement

Table 1 – Estimated Project Costs and Funding Sources

Federal HBP Funds (88.53%)		Prop 1B	Funds Used Prior to City of Jurupa Valley Annexation *	Total Cost for City of Jurupa Valley**	Total Cost for City of Riverside **	Total Project Cost
PE/ED	\$3,011,000	\$0	\$0	\$148,000	\$196,000	\$3,355,000
PS&E	\$5,774,717	\$0	\$110,000	\$341,542	\$452,741	\$6,679,000
ROW	\$1,062,360	\$0	\$0	\$59,185	\$78,455	\$1,200,000
Construction	\$58,337,457	\$2,683,980	\$0	\$3,143,749	\$3,575,754	\$67,740,940
Construction Engineering	\$10,606,810	\$0	\$0	\$764,034	\$905,236	\$12,276,080
Total	\$78,792,344	\$2,683,980	\$110,000	\$4,456,510	\$5,208,186	\$91,251,020

*Funds used prior to City of Jurupa Valley Annexation are the costs contributed by County at the time the project was under County jurisdiction.

**The total costs for each City include the local match and non-participating contributions.

Notes:

1. The estimated project costs provided in Table 1
2. The total project cost is \$91,251,020. Of this amount, \$78,792,344 will come from the Highway Bridge Program (HBP). Additionally, \$2,683,980 in State Seismic Bond (Proposition 1B) funds will contribute to the local match. The remaining local match will be funded by the City of Jurupa Valley and the City of Riverside. It is estimated that the City of Jurupa Valley will provide \$4,456,510, while the City of Riverside will contribute \$5,208,186.

Projected Local Matching Funds from Each City:

The border between the cities of Jurupa Valley and Riverside is located near the midpoint of the existing bridge. This results in an approximately 43% to 57% relative cost distribution between the City of Jurupa Valley and the City of Riverside. The estimated share of local matching funds for each city is:

City of Jurupa Valley:

Paid To Date: \$1,011,103

Construction + Construction Management:

FY2026 – FY2027:	\$1,320,782
FY2027 – FY2028:	\$1,377,907
FY2028 – FY2029:	\$613,663

On-site Restoration + Off-site Mitigation:

FY 2028 – 2033:	\$133,055
-----------------	-----------

City of Riverside:

Paid To Date: \$293,550

Construction + Construction Management:

FY2025 – F2026:	\$892,791
FY2026 – FY2027:	\$1,574,328
FY2027 – FY2028:	\$1,569,131
FY2028 – FY2029:	\$702,011

On-site Restoration + Off-site Mitigation:

FY 2028 – 2033:	\$176,375
-----------------	-----------