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<td>SANBAG</td>
<td>San Bernardino Associated Governments</td>
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<td>SB</td>
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</tr>
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1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The City of Fontana (City) received an application from Patriot Development Partners (applicant) requesting the following approvals for development of the Almond Avenue Warehouse Project (project):

- Master Case No. 19-057
- Tentative Parcel Map No. 19-008 (TTM 20119)
- Design Review Project No. 19-023

The project includes design review for the construction of an approximately 146,864-square-foot, one-story industrial/warehouse facility on an approximately 7.92-acre property located in the Southwest Industrial Park (SWIP) Specific Plan area of the southern part of the City. The project site is composed of three parcels (Assessor’s Parcel Numbers [APNs] 0236-181-13, 0236-181-18, and 0236-181-19). In addition to the industrial/warehouse building, the project would include approximately 56,499 square feet of landscaping area, 18 loading docks, and surface parking for passenger vehicles and trucks.

The application includes Tentative Parcel Map No. 19-008 (TTM 20119) for the consolidation of three parcels into one parcel to facilitate the development of this industrial/warehouse facility.

The project is the subject of analysis in this document pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, the City is the lead agency with principal responsibility to consider the project for approval.

This introduction will discuss the following:

- The requirements of CEQA
- The Program Environmental Impact Report for the SWIP Specific Plan Update and Annexation Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2009091089) (City of Fontana 2012) (herein referred to as the PEIR) certified by the City on May 8, 2012.
- The primary purpose of an addendum to a previously certified environmental impact report (EIR)
- The standards for adequacy of an addendum pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines
- The format and content of this addendum
- The City’s processing requirements to consider the project for approval
- An explanation of the Environmental Checklist (Appendix G of CEQA Guidelines)
- A summary of documents to be incorporated by reference and points of contact for the project
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

CEQA, a statewide environmental law described in Public Resources Code Sections 21000–21177, applies to most public agency decisions to carry out, authorize, or approve actions that have the potential to adversely affect the environment. The overarching goal of CEQA is to protect the physical environment. To achieve that goal, CEQA requires that public agencies identify the environmental consequences of their discretionary actions and consider alternatives and mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce significant adverse impacts when avoidance or reduction is feasible. It also gives other public agencies and the general public an opportunity to comment on the information. If significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided, reduced, or mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to prepare an EIR and balance the project’s environmental concerns with other goals and benefits in a statement of overriding considerations.

1.3 Purpose and Need

The project would help the City meet several of the project objectives identified in the PEIR (City of Fontana 2012). These objectives include the following:

1. Increase and maintain an increased daytime employment population
2. Coordinate land uses and transportation with infrastructure planning
3. Embrace flexible and diverse industrial land uses that foster economic development opportunities for the City of Fontana and surrounding areas
4. Retain and expand existing businesses and business opportunities
5. Improve pedestrian accessibility, vehicular access, and parking to establish safety throughout the SWIP Specific Plan Update area
6. Enhance the streetscape as well as the parking and loading areas throughout the SWIP Specific Plan Update area
7. Tailor land use regulations and design guidelines to custom-fit the SWIP Specific Plan Update area
8. Improve visual and functional linkages between I-10, Slover Avenue, and the City of Fontana
9. Identify areas of priority development and property assemblage opportunities to serve as economic development catalysts.
10. Coordinate and focus change in the SWIP Specific Plan Update area rather than a complete “removal and replacement” transformation to enhance the sense of place and promote aesthetic improvements.
11. Incorporate planning policy that encourages viable development in the future, while paying tribute to Fontana’s past.
1.4 Project Background

The PEIR was prepared and certified by the City in 2012 for the SWIP Specific Plan Update and Annexation Project. The PEIR assessed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed SWIP Specific Plan Update and Annexation Project (City of Fontana 2012), which would add 1,318 acres to the existing Specific Plan area, including the annexation of 472 acres into the City (City of Fontana 2011).

The SWIP Specific Plan was originally adopted by the City in 1983, and was intended to develop the City’s industrial uses south of Interstate (I) 10. The SWIP Specific Plan area originally encompassed approximately 1,800 acres. Since its adoption, the SWIP Specific Plan has been amended numerous times. These amendments have accommodated past annexations into the Specific Plan area, changes in land use designations, and modifications to design and land use regulations (City of Fontana 2011).

In 2011, due to the age of the SWIP Specific Plan and changes that occurred within the Specific Plan area, the City determined that the Specific Plan should be revised to update land uses, regulations, and development standards. In addition, the City intended to use the SWIP Specific Plan Update to promote orderly and compatible growth in newly annexed areas and older areas within the Specific Plan area (City of Fontana 2011).

The SWIP Specific Plan Update was a comprehensive policy and regulatory guidance document for the private use and development of all properties within the Specific Plan Update area. By providing the necessary regulatory and design guidance, the Specific Plan Update ensured that future development of parcels within the SWIP Specific Plan Update area (privately owned lands and publicly owned lands approved for private use and development) would implement the goals and policies of the City of Fontana General Plan. In addition, the SWIP Specific Plan Update includes infrastructure improvements necessary to support development within the Specific Plan Update area (City of Fontana 2011).

The Land Use Plan for the SWIP Specific Plan Update provided for development of nine planning sub-districts. In general, the SWIP Specific Plan Update includes approximately 3,111 acres of industrial, manufacturing, office, commercial, research and development, flex-tech, residential, public, and public/utility right-of-way uses (City of Fontana 2011).

1.5 Format and Content of this Addendum

The following components make up this addendum:

- Introduction (Chapter 1) and Project Description (Chapter 2)
- The completed Environmental Checklist and its associated analyses (Chapter 3), which conclude that the project would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of environmental impacts beyond the levels disclosed in the PEIR
- Other documentation that evaluates the project and/or project site, which are appended to this addendum:
  - Appendix A: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Calculations
  - Appendix B-1: Biological Resources Technical Report
  - Appendix B-2: Arborist Report
  - Appendix C: Cultural Resources Technical Report
1.6 Preparation and Processing of this Addendum

The City directed and supervised the preparation of this addendum. Although prepared with assistance from the consulting firm Dudek, the content contained in, and the conclusions drawn by, this addendum reflect the sole independent judgment of the City.

This addendum will be forwarded, along with the previously certified PEIR, to the City’s decision-making body for review as part of its deliberations concerning the project. A public hearing will be held at a later date to evaluate the project and the adequacy of this addendum. Public comments will be heard at this hearing. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the decision-making body may provide a decision to approve, approve with modifications, or deny approval of the project. If approved, the decision-making body will adopt findings relative to the project’s environmental impacts.

1.7 Initial Study Checklist

The City prepared the project’s Environmental Checklist per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15063(d)(3) and 15168(c)(4). Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines includes a suggested checklist to indicate whether the conditions set forth in Section 15162, which would require a subsequent or supplemental EIR, are met and whether there would be new significant impacts resulting from the project not examined in the PEIR. The checklist can be found in Chapter 3 of this document. Following the checklist, Sections 3.1 through 3.21 include an explanation and discussion of each significance determination made in the checklist.

For this addendum, the following four possible responses to each of the individual environmental issue areas are included in the checklist:

1. New Significant Impact. This response is used to indicate when the project has changed to such an extent that major revisions of the PEIR are required due to the presence of new significant environmental effects.

2. More Severe Impacts. This response is used to indicate when the circumstances under which the project is undertaken have changed to such an extent that major revisions of the PEIR are required because the severity of previously identified significant effects would substantially increase.

3. New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact. This response is used to show when new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the PEIR was certified; it indicates that there are new mitigation measures or alternatives available to substantially reduce significant environmental impacts of the project.

4. No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. This response is used to indicate that the project would not create a new impact or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified environmental impact disclosed in the PEIR.
The Environmental Checklist and accompanying explanation of checklist responses provide the information and analysis necessary to assess relative environmental impacts of the project in the context of environmental impacts addressed in the previously certified PEIR. In doing so, the City will determine the extent of additional environmental review, if any, required for the project.

1.8 Existing Documents to be Incorporated by Reference

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15150, 15168(c)(3), and 15168(d)(2) permit and encourage an environmental document to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data. The City of Fontana General Plan; the Fontana Code of Ordinances; the Fontana Zoning and Development Code; the PEIR and its Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, technical appendices, Findings and Statement of Facts, and associated City Council Resolutions; and the SWIP Specific Plan; which are all herein incorporated by reference pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, are available for review at the following location:

City of Fontana
Community Development Department, Planning Division
8353 Sierra Avenue
Fontana, California 92335

1.9 Points of Contact

The lead agency for this environmental document is the City of Fontana. Any questions about the preparation of this addendum, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Rina Leung, Associate Planner
City of Fontana, Community Development Department, Planning Division
8353 Sierra Avenue
Fontana, California 92335
909.350.6566
rleung@fontana.org
2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location

The project site is located in the southern portion of the City in southwestern San Bernardino County. The project site is immediately bounded by Almond Avenue to the west and Henry J. Kaiser High School to the south. The project site is composed of three parcels (APNs 0236-181-13, 0236-181-18, and 0236-181-19). Addresses associated with the project site include 11021, 11041 and 11099 Almond Avenue. Regional access to the project area is provided by I-10 to the north, I-15 to the east, and State Route (SR) 60 to the south (Figure 1, Project Location).

2.2 Environmental Setting

City of Fontana

The City is located on an alluvial plain flowing southward from the confluence of Lytle Creek and the San Sevaine wash. The San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains to the north, and the Jurupa Hills to the south, provide a dramatic backdrop for the developed areas of the City. In the early 1900s, the City was a diversified agricultural community, producing major commodities such as citrus, grain, grapes, poultry, and swine. In 1942, the area began to transition to a more industrial base with the founding of the Kaiser Steel Mill. By the 1950s, the City was the region’s leading producer of steel and steel-related products. Today, the City is both a bedroom community, with a commuting population of workers, and, due to its suburban location near several major freeway and rail transportation corridors, a major Inland Empire hub of warehousing and distribution centers. These uses are located primarily in the City's southern half, adjacent to the I-10 corridor. Heavy industrial areas surround the former Kaiser Steel plant and along the I-10 corridor between Valley Boulevard and Slover Avenue.

A range of residential neighborhoods has developed in the City. The established single-family and multifamily residential neighborhoods and commercial core of the City is largely contained between Baseline and Valley Boulevard. Newer residential development has occurred along the northern edge of the City west of I-15 and radiating north and south of the SR-210 corridor. A large portion of the City, north of SR-210, still remains to develop as a mix of planned communities and job centers.

Project Site

The approximately 7.92-acre, L-shaped project site contains industrial land uses and activities (primarily trucking and automotive repair and related operations) and approximately three former single-family structures. The project site also includes several storage buildings and sheds, as well as outdoor auto and miscellaneous equipment storage. The remainder of the subject property consists of gravel parking and driveways.

The project site contained agricultural orchards from at least the 1930s through the 1970s, at which time it began to transition—like much of the surrounding area—to more urbanized land uses and activities. By the 1980s, the project site contained much of the structures found on site today.
The City of Fontana General Plan Land Use Map designates the project site as Light Industrial (I-L) (City of Fontana 2018a) (Figure 2, General Plan Land Use). The City’s Zoning Map shows the site as being zoned as the SWIP Specific Plan (within the SWIP Specific Plan area, the project site is located in the Jurupa North Research and Development District [JND]) (City of Fontana n.d.) (Figure 3, Zoning; Figure 4, Southwest Industrial Park Specific Plan Land Use Map).

**Surrounding Land Uses**

The project site is located on developed land and is surrounded by a mix of urbanized land uses primarily related to industrial operations. Specific uses in the immediate project area include the following:

- North: Existing industrial/trucking operations
- East: Existing legal non-conforming residential uses and existing industrial/trucking operations
- South: Henry J. Kaiser High School
- West: Almond Avenue and legal non-conforming residential uses and existing industrial/trucking operations (west of Almond Avenue)

Note that several low-density residential uses, which are largely used for home-based trucking and heavy equipment businesses, are scattered throughout the SWIP Specific Plan area. These residential uses were primarily permitted and constructed under the existing zoning designations in effect prior to circa 2011. When the SWIP Specific Plan Update and Annexation was approved in 2011, new zoning designations were adopted throughout the SWIP Specific Plan area, resulting in these residential properties becoming legal non-conforming uses. Over time, several of these residential properties have since transitioned from operating primarily as residences to operating primarily as trucking/heavy equipment business. For the purposes of the following environmental analysis, because the exact nature of each surrounding property cannot be fully determined, it is conservatively assumed that all surrounding residential structures actively house residents, and thus, are to be considered sensitive receptors.

### 2.3 Proposed Project

The project includes construction of a 146,864-square-foot (gross), one-story industrial/warehouse building on an approximately 7.92-acre site. The industrial/warehouse building would be comprised of 140,864 square feet of warehouse space, 4,000 square feet of office, and 2,000 square feet of mezzanine space. The project would also include 30,032 square feet of landscape area, parking areas for both passenger vehicles and tractor-trailers, and a truck court with loading docks. The project would not contain cold storage space and would have a 32-foot clear height (Figure 5, Site Plan). Figure 6 provides conceptual elevations of the project.

**On-Site and Off-Site Adjacent Improvements**

The project would also include improvements to Almond Avenue along the project’s street frontage, including widening the northbound side of the street along the project frontage to its full buildout width. Other improvements include a landscape setback, new sidewalk, and a parkway landscape strip on the project frontage.

---

1. Exhibit 9.2 in the City of Fontana General Plan identifies Almond Avenue from Slover Avenue to Jurupa Avenue as an Industrial Collector. The ultimate right-of-way for roadways classified as Industrial Collector is 64 feet; thus, given that the project is required to provide half-width improvements, the project would build out the 34-foot northbound side of Almond Avenue fronting the project site.
along Almond Avenue. Consistent with City standards, all existing overhead utility service lines adjoining and interior to the project site would be undergrounded, and new City street lights would be installed along Almond Avenue. A variety of trees, shrubs, plants, and land covers would be planted in the parkway landscape strip and in the landscape areas throughout the project site, in conformance with the City’s approved plant palette list.

**Site Access, Circulation, and Parking**

Access to the project site would be provided by two driveways off Almond Avenue: the first driveway would be a 40-foot-wide truck driveway at the southwestern corner of the project site; the other driveway would be a 35-foot-wide passenger vehicle driveway at the northwestern corner of the site. Paved employee parking lots would be provided on the northern and eastern portions of the project site, a small visitor parking lot would be located towards the southwest corner of the industrial/warehouse building, and the truck court and loading docks will be found to the south. Gated entry is proposed at both the northern and southern drive aisles. The project site would include 90 passenger vehicle parking spaces, 27 trailer parking spaces, and 18 loading docks and a secure bicycle storage area.

**Stormwater System and Other Utility Improvements**

The project site is currently developed and served by some existing utilities, including domestic water. However, in most, if not all, instances, these present utilities are not adequately sized to serve the project, and thus, will be upgraded/replaced during project construction. As such, lateral water lines would be constructed as part of the project and connect to the existing water lines within Almond Avenue to provide adequate domestic and fire water service.

In addition, the site is not presently served by sanitary sewer and stormwater lines. The project would have to extend to the project an existing sewer main located within Almond Avenue south of the site. New lateral sewer lines would be constructed to connect the project to the extended sewer main within Almond Avenue. Along with the sewer main, a municipal stormwater line that currently stops south of the project site would be extended north within Almond Avenue to the project site.

As part of the project, a new engineered storm drain system will be constructed on the project site to collect and treat on-site stormwater runoff. On-site stormwater will be collected and conveyed via a series of inlets and catch basins. Further, on-site stormwater originating in the southern portion of the project site, including the truck court and tractor-trailer parking areas, would be allowed to sheet flow to the approximately 0.8-acre water quality detention/retention basin located between the tractor-trailer parking spaces and the southern project boundary.

**2.4 Project Construction and Phasing**

The project applicant intends to construct the project in a single continuous phase, starting in 2020, with the intent of beginning operations in 2021. It is anticipated that construction would take approximately 6 months. Refer to Appendix A for a more detailed breakdown of the estimated construction schedule and phases.
2.5 Project Approvals

The following discretionary approvals would be required prior to implementing the project:

- Master Case No. 19-057
- Tentative Parcel Map No. 19-008 (TTM 20199)
- Design Review Project No. 19-023
Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title:
   Almond Avenue Warehouse Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
   City of Fontana
   Community Development Department, Planning Division
   8353 Sierra Avenue
   Fontana, California 92335

3. Contact person and phone number:
   Rina Leung, Associate Planner
   City of Fontana, Community Development Department, Planning Division
   8353 Sierra Avenue
   Fontana, California 92335
   909.350.6566
   rleung@fontana.org

4. Project location:
   The project site is located in the southern portion of the City of Fontana in southwestern San Bernardino County. The project site is immediately bounded by Almond Avenue to the west and Henry J. Kaiser High School to the south. The project site is composed of three parcels (APNs 0236-181-13, 0236-181-18, and 0236-181-19). Addresses associated with the project site include 11021, 11041 and 11099 Almond Avenue. Regional access to the project area is provided by I-10 to the north, I-15 to the east, and SR-60 to the south.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:
   Patriot Development Partners
   5710 Crescent Park, Suite 429
   Playa Vista, California 90094

6. General plan designation:
   Light Industrial (I-L)

7. Zoning:
   SWIP Specific Plan (within the SWIP Specific Plan area, the project site is located in the JND)
8. **Description of project.** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):

   The project includes construction of a 146,864-square-foot (gross), one-story industrial/warehouse building on an approximately 7.92-acre site. The industrial/warehouse building would be comprised of 140,864 square feet of warehouse space, 4,000 square feet of office, and 2,000 square feet of mezzanine space. The project would also include 30,032 square feet of landscape area, parking areas for both passenger vehicles and tractor-trailers, and a truck court with loading docks.

   Refer to Section 2, Project Description, for a detailed description of the project and associated improvements.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings):**

   The project site is located on developed land and is surrounded by a mix of urbanized land uses primarily related to industrial operations. Specific uses in the immediate project area include the following:

   - North: Existing industrial/trucking operations
   - East: Existing legal non-conforming residential uses and existing industrial/trucking operations
   - South: Henry J. Kaiser High School
   - West: Almond Avenue and legal non-conforming residential uses and existing industrial/trucking operations (west of Almond Avenue)

   Note that several low-density residential uses, which are largely used for home-based trucking and heavy equipment businesses, are scattered throughout the SWIP Specific Plan area. These residential uses were primarily permitted and constructed under the existing zoning designations in effect prior to circa 2011. When the SWIP Specific Plan Update and Annexation was approved in 2011, new zoning designations were adopted throughout the SWIP Specific Plan area, resulting in these residential properties becoming legal non-conforming uses. Over time, several of these residential properties have since transitioned from operating primarily as residences to operating primarily as trucking/heavy equipment business. For the purposes of the following environmental analysis, because the exact nature of each surrounding property cannot be fully determined, it is conservatively assumed that all surrounding residential structures actively house residents, and thus, are to be considered sensitive receptors.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

    Responsible agencies that may have ministerial authority over the project include the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fontana Fire Protection District, and San Bernardino County Fire Department.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology and Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Land Use and Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise
☐ Population and Housing ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation and Traffic ☐ Utilities and Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☒ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date 11/18/19
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Section 15168(c) of the CEQA Guidelines provides that when the lead agency adopts a program EIR, subsequent activities in the program are examined in light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared. If the lead agency finds that pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, no new effects could occur or mitigation measures would be required, the activity may be approved as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(c)(2)). Pursuant to Section 21166 of CEQA and Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the lead agency determines that one or more of the following conditions are met, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared for the project:

1. Substantial project changes are proposed that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

2. Substantial changes would occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that require major revisions to the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

3. New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified or the negative declaration was adopted shows any of the following:
   a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
   b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than identified in the previous EIR;
   c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or
   d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Where none of the conditions specified in Section 15162 are present, the lead agency can choose not to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)), but may prepare a negative declaration, an addendum, or no further CEQA documentation. Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines states that an addendum to an EIR shall be prepared “if some changes or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.”

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Fontana has determined that an Addendum to the PEIR is the appropriate environmental document for the project. This Addendum reviews the changes proposed by the project and any pertinent changes to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that have occurred since the PEIR was certified. It also reviews any new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with exercise of reasonable diligence at the time that the PEIR was certified. It further examines whether, as a result of any changes or any new information, a subsequent or supplemental EIR may be required. This examination includes an analysis of the provisions of Section 21166 of CEQA and Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines and their applicability to the project.
### 3.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

- a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? *Significant and Unavoidable Impact.*
- b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? *Less-Than-Significant Impact.*
- c) Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? *Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.*
- d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? *Less-Than-Significant Impact.*
Project Significance Determination

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The City of Fontana General Plan Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Chapter (City of Fontana 2018b), identifies both the San Gabriel and the Jurupa Mountains and foothills as visually prominent topographic features that provide a scenic vista from mobile and stationary viewing locations throughout the City. The project site is located over 7 miles south and 1 mile north, respectively, from these scenic resources. Based on these distances and the presence of existing intervening development and topographical variation, the project site is not located within the viewshed of these scenic vistas, and the project would not block views of or from these scenic resources. In addition, the current viewshed within the project area consists predominantly of existing development. Thus, the inclusion of the project within the existing viewshed would be consistent with views currently found throughout the project area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with scenic vistas would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highway Mapping System (Caltrans 2019), the only officially designated state scenic highway in San Bernardino County is a 16-mile portion of SR-38 from South Fork Campground to State Lane. This roadway segment is located approximately 35 miles east of the project site in the San Bernardino Mountains, well outside of view of the project site.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with state scenic highways would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

c) **Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

**Short-Term Construction Impacts**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* Consistent with Mitigation Measure (MM) 4.1-3a from the PEIR, in an effort to minimize temporary construction-related visual impacts, the staging of construction equipment and the cleanliness of construction equipment stored and driven beyond the limits of the construction work area will be strictly controlled. Construction equipment, vehicles, and materials will be staged within a designated screened area on the project site during project construction. Although equipment staging could potentially be viewed from adjacent properties, this would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction.
Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with visual character and quality would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project site is located in a highly developed and urbanized part of the City characterized by a mix of industrial and other land uses. The project site is bound by industrial uses immediately to the north, east, and west and is currently heavily disturbed by existing development. Most of the properties surrounding the project site have General Plan land use designations and zoning for industrial and related land uses. Thus, implementation of the project represents a logical continuation of industrial development in this part of the City. However, given that the project would developing a warehouse building and associated improvements on the project site, consistent with surrounding land uses in the project area, the project would inevitably alter the existing visual character of the project site.

To ensure that both current and future development within the City is designed and constructed to conform to existing visual character and quality of the surrounding built environment, the City’s Zoning and Development Code (City of Fontana 2019a) includes design standards related to building size, height, and setback, as well as landscaping, signage, and other visual considerations. These design standards help ensure that adjacent land uses are visually consistent with one another and their surroundings, while reducing the potential for aesthetic conflict. The City reviews design specifications of all development proposals to ensure compliance with all applicable provisions set forth by the Zoning and Development Code. As part of the City’s development review process, project plans are reviewed by City staff, the Development Advisory Board, and the Planning Commission to ensure that projects conform to the Zoning and Development Code and promote the visual character and quality of the surrounding area.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with visual character and quality would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

d) **Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Short-Term Construction Impacts**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project would be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance (City of Fontana 2019b), which prohibits construction during the evening and nighttime hours. As such, project construction would be limited to daytime hours, and nighttime lighting would not be required until the project is operational.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with light and glare would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
Long-Term Operational Impacts

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Consistent with Section No. 30-184 (Light and Glare) of the City’s Zoning and Development Code (City of Fontana 2019a), all lighting used on the project site is required to be directed and/or shielded to prevent the light from adversely affecting adjacent properties, and no structures or features that create adverse glare effects are permitted. Thus, all exterior lighting would be shielded/hooded to prevent light trespass onto nearby properties. In addition, the project would use a variety of non-reflective building materials, and although some new reflective improvements (i.e., windows and building front treatments) would be introduced onto the project site, the project as a whole would not be considered a source of glare in the project area.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with light and glare would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with aesthetics would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measure related to aesthetics:

MM-4.1-3a For future development associated with the project located in or immediately adjacent to residentially zoned property, the following General Condition of Approval shall be imposed: Construction documents shall include language that requires all construction contractors to strictly control the staging of construction equipment and the cleanliness of construction equipment stored or driven beyond the limits of the construction work area. Construction equipment shall be parked and staged within the project site to the extent practical. Staging areas shall be screened from view from residential properties with solid wood fencing or green fence. Construction worker parking may be located off-site with approval of the City; however, on-street parking of construction worker vehicles on residential streets shall be prohibited. Vehicles shall be kept clean and free of mud and dust before leaving the project site. Surrounding streets shall be swept daily and maintained free of dirt and debris.
### 3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- **a)** Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  
  - [ ] New Significant Impact  
  - [ ] More Severe Impacts  
  - [ ] New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact  
  - [x] No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis

- **b)** Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  
  - [ ] New Significant Impact  
  - [ ] More Severe Impacts  
  - [ ] New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact  
  - [x] No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis

- **c)** Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?  
  - [ ] New Significant Impact  
  - [ ] More Severe Impacts  
  - [ ] New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact  
  - [x] No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis

- **d)** Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  
  - [ ] New Significant Impact  
  - [ ] More Severe Impacts  
  - [ ] New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact  
  - [x] No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis

- **e)** Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  
  - [ ] New Significant Impact  
  - [ ] More Severe Impacts  
  - [ ] New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact  
  - [x] No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? No Impact.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? No Impact.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? No Impact.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? No Impact.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? No Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? If so, the extent of the impact should be identified.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. According to the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder (CDOC 2019a), the project site is designated as Urban and Built-up Land. Neither the project site nor the surrounding project area contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively, Important Farmland). In addition, the California Department of Conservation’s 2015/2016 San Bernardino County Williamson Act Map (CDOC 2016) does not identify any land under Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone contracts on the project site or within the project area. Further, the City’s Zoning Map does not show agricultural zoning districts in the broader project area.

In regards to forestland and timberland, per the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Management Landscape Map (CAL FIRE 2003), no public or private land managed for timber is located in the project area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with agricultural lands, agricultural zoning, Williamson Act contracts, forestland, or timberland would occur; the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; and no new mitigation measures are required.
Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with agricultural lands, forestland, or timberland would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to agriculture or forestry resources.

3.3 Air Quality

| III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Significant and Unavoidable.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? Significant and Unavoidable.
c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Less than Significant.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting substantial number of people? No Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, and all of Orange County, and is within the jurisdictional boundaries of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD administers the SCAB’s Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is a comprehensive document outlining an air pollution control program for attaining the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The most recently adopted AQMP for the SCAB is the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017). The 2016 AQMP focuses on available, proven, and cost-effective alternatives to traditional air quality strategies while seeking to achieve multiple goals in partnership with other entities seeking to promote reductions in greenhouse gases (GHGs) and toxic risk, as well as efficiencies in energy use, transportation, and goods movement (SCAQMD 2017).

The purpose of a consistency finding with regard to the AQMP is to determine if a project is consistent with the assumptions and objectives of the regional air quality plans, and if it would interfere with the region’s ability to comply with federal and state air quality standards. The SCAQMD has established criteria for determining consistency with the currently applicable AQMP in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. These criteria are as follows (SCAQMD 1993):

Consistency Criterion No. 1: Whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion No. 2: Whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

To address the first criterion, project-generated criteria air pollutant emissions have been estimated and analyzed for significance and are addressed under Section 3.3(b) below. Detailed results of this analysis are included in Appendix A, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Calculations, of this addendum. As presented in Section 3.3(b), construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD’s thresholds, and the project would therefore be consistent with Criterion No. 1.

The second criterion regarding the potential of the project to exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase is primarily assessed by determining consistency between the proposed project’s land use designations and its potential to generate population growth. In general, projects are considered consistent with, and not in conflict with or obstructing implementation of, the AQMP if the growth they produce in socioeconomic factors is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP (SCAQMD 1993). The SCAQMD primarily uses demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories (e.g., population, housing, and employment by industry) developed by the
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for its 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) (SCAG 2016a). SCAQMD uses this document, which is based in large part on general plans for cities and counties in the SCAB, to develop the AQMP emissions inventory (SCAQMD 2017). The SCAG RTP/SCS, and associated Regional Growth Forecast, are generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the 2016 AQMP is generally consistent with the City’s General Plan.

As discussed in Section 2.2, Environmental Setting, of this addendum the project site is designated in the City’s General Plan as Light Industrial (I-L) (City of Fontana 2018a) and the zoning for the project site is SWIP Specific Plan (within the SWIP Specific Plan area, the project site is located in the JND). The project would be compatible with the I-L Zone and SWIP Specific Plan. As the proposed uses for the project site are consistent with the existing land use designation, no amendments to the General Plan would be required. Accordingly, the proposed project is consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS forecasts used in the SCAQMD AQMP development.

In summary, based on the considerations presented for the two criteria, impacts relating to the project’s potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable AQMP would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with consistency with the AQMP would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and the SCAQMD develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are used in the determination of whether a project’s individual emissions would have a cumulatively considerable contribution on air quality. If a project’s emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable contribution. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant (SCAQMD 2003a).

A quantitative analysis was conducted to determine whether proposed construction activities would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of criteria air pollutants for which the SCAB is designated as nonattainment under the NAAQS or CAAQS. Criteria air pollutants include ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM₂.₅), and lead. Pollutants that are evaluated herein include volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NOₓ), which are important because they are precursors to O₃, as well as CO, sulfur oxides (SOₓ), PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅.

---

2 Information necessary to produce the emissions inventory for the SCAB is obtained from the SCAQMD and other governmental agencies, including the California Air Resources Board, Caltrans, and SCAG. Each of these agencies is responsible for collecting data (e.g., industry growth factors, socioeconomic projections, travel activity levels, emission factors, emission speciation profile, and emissions) and developing methodologies (e.g., model and demographic forecast improvements) required to generate a comprehensive emissions inventory. SCAG incorporates these data into its Travel Demand Model for estimating/projecting vehicle miles traveled and driving speeds. SCAG’s socioeconomic and transportation activities projections in their 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy are integrated in the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017).
Regarding NAAQS and CAAQS attainment status,\(^3\) the SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for national and California O\(_3\) and PM\(_{2.5}\) standards (CARB 2019a; EPA 2019a). The SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for California PM\(_{10}\) standards; however, it is designated as an attainment area for national PM\(_{10}\) standards. The SCAB nonattainment status of O\(_3\), PM\(_{10}\), and PM\(_{2.5}\) standards is the result of cumulative emissions from various sources of air pollutants and their precursors within the SCAB, including motor vehicles, off-road equipment, and commercial and industrial facilities. The SCAB is designated as an attainment area for national and California NO\(_2\), CO, and SO\(_2\) standards. Although the SCAB has been designated as partial nonattainment (Los Angeles County) for the federal rolling 3-month average lead standard, it is designated attainment for the state lead standard.\(^4\)

The proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants for which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have adopted ambient air quality standards (i.e., the NAAQS and CAAQS). Projects that emit these pollutants have the potential to cause, or contribute to, violations of these standards. The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds, as revised in April 2019, set forth quantitative emission significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, which, if exceeded, would indicate the potential for a project to contribute to violations of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Table 1 lists the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds (SCAQMD 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pollutant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO(_x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO(_x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(_{2.5})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TACs and Odor Thresholds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **TACs**\(^b\) | Maximum incremental cancer risk \(\geq 10\) in 1 million  
Cancer Burden \(> 0.5\) excess cancer cases (in areas \(\geq 1\) in 1 million)  
Chronic and acute hazard index \(\geq 1.0\) (project increment) |
| Odor                     | Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402 |

**Source:** SCAQMD 2019.

**Notes:** SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; VOC = volatile organic compounds; NO\(_x\) = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO\(_x\) = sulfur oxides; PM\(_{10}\) = coarse particulate matter; PM\(_{2.5}\) = fine particulate matter; TAC = toxic air contaminant; NO\(_2\) = nitrogen dioxide; ppm = parts per million by volume; \(\mu g/m^3\) = micrograms per cubic meter. 
GHG emissions thresholds for industrial projects, as added in the March 2015 revision to the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, were not include included in Table 1 as they are addressed within the GHG emissions analysis and not the air quality analysis.

---

\(^3\) An area is designated as in attainment when it is in compliance with the NAAQS and/or the CAAQS. The NAAQS and CAAQS are set by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB), respectively, for the maximum level of a given air pollutant that can exist in the outdoor air without unacceptable effects on human health or the public welfare. Attainment = meets the standards; attainment/maintenance = achieve the standards after a nonattainment designation; nonattainment = does not meet the standards.

\(^4\) Re-designation of the lead NAAQS designation to attainment for the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB is expected based on current monitoring data. The phase out of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Since gasoline no longer contains lead, the project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.
The phase out of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Since gasoline no longer contains lead, the project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.

TACs include carcinogens and noncarcinogens.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* Construction of the project would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by on-site sources (e.g., off-road construction equipment, soil disturbance, VOC off-gassing from architectural coatings and asphalt pavement application) and off-site sources (e.g., vendor trucks, haul trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Specifically, entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions. Internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, haul trucks, vendor trucks (i.e., delivery trucks), and worker vehicles would result in emissions of VOC, NO$_x$, CO, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day depending on the level of activity; the specific type of operation; and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Application of architectural coatings, such as exterior paint and other finishes, and application of asphalt pavement would also produce VOC emissions. VOC off-gassing emissions result from evaporation of solvents contained in surface coatings such as in paints and primers used during construction of the facility. CalEEMod calculates the VOC evaporative emissions from application of surface coatings based on the VOC emissions factor, the building square footage, and the assumed fraction of surface area. The VOC content for coatings was assumed to be 50 grams per liter VOC for interior consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1113 for flat and non-flat coating limits. For exterior coating, 100 grams per liter VOC was conservatively assumed in the event exterior coatings require other specialty coating(s), although the majority of the paints and finishes are anticipated to be 50 grams per liter VOC.

The project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 to control dust emissions generated during any dust-generating activities. Standard construction practices that would be employed to reduce fugitive dust emissions include watering of the active dust areas at least two times per day or more depending on weather conditions, which was assumed in CalEEMod.

Emissions from the construction phase of the proposed project were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. Construction is assumed to begin in February 2020 and conclude in July 2020, lasting approximately 6 months. The analysis contained herein is based on the following schedule assumptions (duration of phases is approximate):

- Demolition: 1 month (February 2020)
- Grading – Construct pad and rough site grading: 3 weeks (March 2020)
- Site utilities: 1 month (March 2020 – April 2020)
- Building construction: 3.5 months (March 2020 – July 2020)
- Building construction – Crane only: 3 days (May 2020)
- Application of architectural coatings: 2 weeks (June 2020)
- Fine grading: 2 weeks (June 2020)
- Site concrete: 2 weeks (June 2020)
- Asphalt paving: 3 months (June 2020 – July 2020)
- Landscaping: 1 month (June 2020 – July 2020)
Construction modeling assumptions for equipment and vehicles are provided in Table 2. Applicant-provided values for equipment mix and horsepower were used where available; default values provided in CalEEMod were applied when project-specific information was not available, including equipment load factor. It was assumed that all equipment over 50 horsepower would meet Tier 4 Interim EPA regulatory emission standards consistent with MM 4.2-1a. It is anticipated that approximately 1,333 cubic yards of cut material would be exported and no material would be imported during construction. For the analysis, it was generally assumed that heavy-duty construction equipment would be operating at the site 5 days per week.

Table 2. Construction Scenario Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>One-Way Vehicle Trips</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Usage Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Worker Trips</td>
<td>Average Daily Vendor Truck Trips</td>
<td>Total Haul Truck Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading 1 – Rough Site and Pad</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Utilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building construction</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural coating</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Grading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Concrete</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Construction Scenario Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>One-Way Vehicle Trips</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Worker Trips</td>
<td>Average Daily Vendor Truck Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Paving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix A for details. Equipment noted in parenthesis is the assumed CalEEMod equivalent for modeling. Horsepower noted in parenthesis reflects a project-specific horsepower assumed in place of CalEEMod default values.

Table 3 shows the estimated maximum daily construction emissions associated with the construction phase of the proposed project.

Table 3. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO\textsubscript{x}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{10}</th>
<th>PM\textsubscript{2.5}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pounds per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>63.15</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>87.79</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td>63.15</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>87.79</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO\textsubscript{x} = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO\textsubscript{x} = sulfur oxides; PM\textsubscript{10} = coarse particulate matter; PM\textsubscript{2.5} = fine particulate matter. See Appendix A for complete results. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. These estimates reflect control of fugitive dust required by SCAQMD Rule 403, specifically, watering of active site areas two times per day (SCAQMD 2005).

As shown in Table 3, daily construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO\textsubscript{x}, CO, SO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, or PM\textsubscript{2.5} during project construction. Therefore, construction impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measure is required.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term impacts associated with a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Operation of the proposed project would generate VOC, NO\textsubscript{x}, CO, SO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions from mobile sources, including vehicle trips; area sources, including the use of consumer products, architectural coatings for repainting, and landscape maintenance equipment; and energy sources, including combustion of fuels used for space and water
heating, which are described future below. Unrefrigerated warehouse was selected as the representative land use in CalEEMod because the proposed project would not include cold storage.

**Area Sources**

CalEEMod was used to estimate operational emissions from area sources, including emissions from consumer product use, architectural coatings, and landscape maintenance equipment. Emissions associated with natural gas usage in space heating and water heating are calculated in the building energy use module of CalEEMod, as described in the following text.\(^5\)

Consumer products are chemically formulated products used by household and institutional consumers, including detergents; cleaning compounds; polishes; floor finishes; cosmetics; personal care products; home, lawn, and garden products; disinfectants; sanitizers; aerosol paints; and automotive specialty products. Other paint products, furniture coatings, or architectural coatings are not considered consumer products (CAPCOA 2017). Consumer product VOC emissions are estimated in CalEEMod based on the floor area of non-residential buildings and on the default factor of pounds of VOC per building square foot per day. The CalEEMod default values for consumer products were assumed.

VOC off-gassing emissions result from evaporation of solvents contained in surface coatings such as in paints and primers using during building maintenance. CalEEMod calculates the VOC evaporative emissions from application of surface coatings based on the VOC emission factor, the building square footage, the assumed fraction of surface area, and the reapplication rate. The VOC emission factor is based on the VOC content of the surface coatings, and SCAQMD’s Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings) governs the VOC content for interior and exterior coatings. The model default reapplication rate of 10% of area per year is assumed. Consistent with CalEEMod defaults for non-residential uses, it is assumed that the surface area for painting equals 2.0 times the floor square footage, with 75% assumed for interior coating and 25% assumed for exterior surface coating (CAPCOA 2017). As a conservative measure, CalEEMod default VOC contents were assumed for the reapplication of architectural coatings.

Landscape maintenance includes fuel combustion emissions from equipment such as lawn mowers, rototillers, shredders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chainsaws, and hedge trimmers. The emissions associated from landscape equipment use are estimated based on CalEEMod default values for emission factors (grams per square foot of building space per day) and number of summer days (when landscape maintenance would generally be performed) and winter days.

**Energy Sources**

As represented in CalEEMod, energy sources include emissions associated with building electricity and natural gas usage (non-hearth). Electricity use would contribute indirectly to criteria air pollutant emissions; however, the emissions from electricity use are only quantified for GHGs in CalEEMod, since criteria pollutant emissions occur at the power plant, which is typically off site.

CalEEMod default values for energy consumption for the land use (unrefrigerated warehouse) were applied for the project analysis because the proposed project would not include cold storage. The energy use from non-residential land uses is calculated in CalEEMod based on the California Commercial End-Use Survey database. Energy use in buildings (both natural gas and electricity) is divided by the program

---

\(^5\) CalEEMod also calculates the area source emissions from the combustion of wood or natural gas in stoves and fireplaces; however, the project does not include stoves or fireplaces.
into end-use categories subject to Title 24 requirements (end uses associated with the building envelope, such as the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system, water heating system, and integrated lighting) and those not subject to Title 24 requirements (such as appliances, electronics, and miscellaneous “plug-in” uses).

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations serves to enhance and regulate California’s building standards. The current Title 24, Part 6 standards, referred to as the 2016 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, became effective on January 1, 2017. The 2016 Title 24 standards are assumed within the CalEEMod (CAPCOA 2017). The 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which will be effective January 1, 2020, will further reduce energy used and associated emissions compared to current standards. Consistent with MM 4.2-5a, it was assumed in CalEEMod that the project would exceed 2016 Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 5%.

Mobile Sources

The proposed project would generate criteria pollutant emissions from mobile sources (vehicular traffic) as a result of the employee passenger vehicles (workers) and truck traffic associated with the operation of the warehouse. Emissions from the mobile sources during operation of the proposed project were estimated using a spreadsheet-based model and emissions factors from the CARB Mobile Source Emissions Inventory Model (EMFAC, version 2017), and EPA AP-42 factors for paved road dust generation. Emission calculation equations and assumptions were primarily derived from CalEEMod. The key factors in the mobile source emission calculations include trip rates, trip lengths, fleet mix, and emissions factors for each vehicle, which are described further below.

The project trip rates and the truck fleet mix are based on the Trip Generation Analysis memorandum prepared for the proposed project by Dudek (2019) and included as Appendix H. As detailed in Section 3.17, Transportation, the project is anticipated to generate 176 average daily trips from passenger vehicles and 79 average daily trips from heavy-duty trucks. Of the 79 average daily truck trips, 22% (17 truck trips) were assumed to be 2-axle trucks, 18% (14 truck trips) would be 3-axle trucks, and 60% (48 truck trips) would be 4+-axle trucks. Consistent with CalEEMod default values for San Bernardino County, the worker trip lengths were assumed to be of 16.6 miles per one-way trip. For the heavy-duty trucks, an average truck distance of 40 miles was assumed, consistent with general recommendations from the SCAQMD.

Vehicle emissions occur during startup, operation (running), idling, and from evaporative losses when the engines are resting. The emissions factors for trucks and passenger vehicles were determined using EMFAC2017. EMFAC2017 generates emissions factors, expressed in grams per mile, grams per trip, and grams per vehicle per day for the fleet in a class of motor vehicles within a county for a particular study year. For this analysis, San Bernardino County and calendar year 2021 was selected in EMFAC. For each vehicle emissions factor, aggregated values for model year and speed were assumed.

Consistent with the Trip Generation Analysis (Appendix H), vehicle emission factors were developed for passenger cars and heavy-duty trucks. A composite, or weighted-average, emissions factor was developed for project vehicle types if more than one vehicle category in EMFAC is anticipated to be representative of the project vehicle. For passenger vehicles, the composite emission factor represents the weighted average emission rate by vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for passenger vehicles (light-duty automobiles, LDA), light-duty trucks (LDT1, 0–3,750 pounds), light-duty trucks (LDT2, 3,751–5,750 pounds), and a composite mix of gasoline and diesel-fueled and electric. For the trucks, the percent
breakdown by axle was used to develop the composite emission factor assuming the following vehicle categories EMFAC 2017: 2-axle trucks reflect a mix of light heavy-duty trucks 1 (LHDT1, 8,501 to 10,000 pounds) and light heavy-duty trucks (LHDT2, 10,001 to 14,000 pounds), 3-axle trucks reflect medium heavy-duty trucks (MHDT), and 4+-axle trucks reflect heavy heavy-duty trucks (HHDT).

**Running Exhaust, Tire Wear, and Brake Wear (grams per mile).** The vehicle exhaust, tire wear, and brake wear emission factors developed for trucks and passenger vehicles in grams per mile were then multiplied by the weighted average daily VMT to estimate emissions associated with vehicle travel to and from the site. As explained previously, it was assumed that each worker trip would be 16.6 miles and each truck trip would be 40 miles.

**Starting Exhaust, Hot Soak, Running Loss Evaporative (grams per trip).** The vehicle starting exhaust, hot soak, and running loss evaporative emissions factors developed for trucks and passenger vehicles were then multiplied by the average daily vehicle trips to estimate emissions associated with vehicle travel to and from the site. Truck trips and passenger vehicle trips per day were based on Trip Generation Analysis.

**Resting Loss Evaporation and Diurnal Loss Evaporation (grams per vehicle per day).** The vehicle resting loss evaporative and diurnal loss emissions factors developed for trucks and passenger vehicles were then multiplied by the average daily and annual vehicles, conservatively assumed equal to the average daily trips to estimate emissions associated with vehicles on site idling and resting. Truck trips and passenger vehicle trips per day were based on Trip Generation Analysis.

**Idling (grams per vehicle per minute).** Truck idling was estimated using EMFAC emission factors that were converted to per minute of idling per vehicle. The idling emissions were calculated by multiplying the per minute emission factors by the estimated idle duration of 15 minutes per truck trip, representing up to three idling events of a maximum of 5 minutes of idling each instance.

**Paved Road Dust (grams per mile).** Vehicles that drive on paved roads generate fugitive dust by dispersing the silt from the roads. Paved road dust PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emission factors were developed pursuant to the CalEEMod 2016.3.2 road dust equation and based on road surface silt loading factors from CalEEMod and particle size multipliers from AP-42 Section 13.2.1 Paved Roads (EPA 2011). Emissions were calculated by multiplying the paved road dust emission factors by the VMT.

---

6. HC Emissions (HOTSOAK) that occur immediately after a trip are due to fuel heating as an engine remains hot for up to 35 minutes after being switched off.

7. HC Emissions (RUNLOSS) that occur are a result of hot fuel vapors escape from the fuel system or overwhelm the carbon canister while the vehicle is operating.

8. Emissions that occur while the vehicle is sitting, caused by fuel permeation through rubber and plastic components. Emissions are counted as resting loss emissions if the vehicle has not been operated for 35 minutes and has been stationary, while the ambient temperature is either constant or decreasing.

9. Emission that occur when rising ambient temperatures cause fuel evaporation from vehicles sitting throughout the day. These losses are from leaks in the fuel system, fuel hoses, connectors, as a result of the breakthrough of vapors from the carbon canister. If a vehicle is sitting for a period of time, emissions from the first 35 minutes are considered as hot soak and emissions from the remaining period are considered as diurnal emissions, provided that the ambient temperature is increasing during the remaining period of time.
Off-Road Equipment

While the exact operational off-road equipment is unknown at this time, it was assumed that six electric-operated forklifts would operate for 8 hours per day at the project site.

Table 4 presents the maximum daily emissions associated with operation of the proposed project in 2021 at build out. The values shown are the maximum summer and winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod for area, energy, and off-road emissions sources plus the estimated mobile source emissions using a spreadsheet model and EMFAC emission factors. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A.

### Table 4. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road Equipment</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td><strong>15.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Threshold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
VOC = volatile organic compound; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SOx = sulfur oxides; PM$_{10}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM$_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod, output and operational year 2021. The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding.

As shown in Table 4, maximum daily operational emissions of VOC, NOx, CO, SOx, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ generated by the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s significance thresholds.

As previously discussed, the SCAB has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for O$_3$ and PM$_{2.5}$, and a state nonattainment area for O$_3$, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$. The nonattainment status is the result of cumulative emissions from various sources of air pollutants and their precursors within the SCAB, including motor vehicles, off-road equipment, and commercial and industrial facilities. Construction and operational activities of the proposed project would generate VOC and NOx emissions (precursors to O$_3$) and emissions of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. However, as indicated in Tables 3 and 4, project-generated emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD emission-based significance thresholds for VOCs, NOx, PM$_{10}$, or PM$_{2.5}$.

Cumulative localized impacts would potentially occur if a project were to occur concurrently with another off-site project. Schedules for potential future projects near the project area are currently unknown; therefore, potential impacts associated with two or more simultaneous projects would be considered speculative. However, future projects would be subject to CEQA and would require air quality analysis and, where necessary, mitigation. Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction activity of future projects (14 CCR 15145).
would be reduced through implementation of control measures required by the SCAQMD. Cumulative PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions would be reduced because all future projects would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all sites in the SCAQMD. In addition, cumulative VOC emissions would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutants, and impacts would be less than significant during construction and operation.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term impacts associated with a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

\textbf{c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?}

The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as evaluated below.

\textbf{Sensitive Receptors}

Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. According to the SCAQMD, sensitive receptors include sites such as residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes (SCAQMD 1993).

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project include a residence to the west (approximately 55 feet from the project site boundary) and a school to the south (approximately 65 feet from the project site boundary).

\textbf{Localized Significance Thresholds}

The SCAQMD recommends a localized significance threshold (LST) analysis to evaluate localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project as a result of proposed project activities. The impacts were analyzed using methods consistent with those in the SCAQMD’s Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (2008a). The project is located within Source-Receptor Area 34 (Central San Bernardino Valley). This analysis applies the SCAQMD LST values for a 1-acre site within Source-Receptor Area 34 with a receptor distance of 25 meters (82 feet), given that daily disturbed area for the proposed project would be less than 1 acre.

Project construction activities would result in temporary sources of on-site criteria air pollutant emissions associated with off-road equipment exhaust and fugitive dust generation. According to the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, “off-site mobile emissions from the project should not be included in the emissions compared to the LSTs” (SCAQMD 2008a). Trucks and worker trips associated with the proposed project are not expected to cause substantial air quality impacts to sensitive receptors along off-site roadways since emissions would be relatively brief in nature and would cease once the vehicles pass through the main streets. Therefore, off-site emissions from trucks and worker vehicle trips are not included in the LST analysis. The maximum daily on-site emissions generated construction of the proposed project in each construction year are presented in Table 5 and compared to the SCAQMD localized significance criteria for Source-Receptor Area 34 to determine whether project-generated on-site emissions would result in potential LST impacts.
Table 5. Construction Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NO₂</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM₁₀</th>
<th>PM₂.₅</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pounds per Day (On Site)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD LST Criteria</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2008a.

Notes: NO₂ = nitrogen dioxide; CO = carbon monoxide; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM₂.₅ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; LST = localized significance threshold.

As shown in Table 5, proposed construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs; therefore, localized impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

**CO Hotspots**

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed federal and/or state standards for CO are termed “CO hotspots.” The transport of CO is extremely limited, as it disperses rapidly with distance from the source. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, however, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting sensitive receptors. Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with severely congested intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) (LOS E or worse is unacceptable). Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of a CO hotspot. Additional analysis of CO hotspot impacts would be conducted if a project would result in a significant impact or contribute to an adverse traffic impact at a signalized intersection that would potentially subject sensitive receptors to CO hotspots. As provided in Section 3.17, the proposed project would not cause the LOS to operate at an unacceptable level.

Accordingly, the proposed project would not generate traffic that would contribute to potential adverse traffic impacts that may result in the formation of CO hotspots. This conclusion is supported by the analysis in Section 3.17, which demonstrates that traffic impacts would be less than significant. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the SCAB is steadily decreasing. Based on these considerations, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality with regard to potential CO hotspots.

**Construction Health Risk Assessment**

In addition to impacts from criteria pollutants, certain projects may include emissions of pollutants identified by the state and federal government as toxic air contaminants (TACs) or hazardous air pollutants. State law has established the framework for California’s TAC identification and control project,
which is generally more stringent than the federal project, and is aimed at TACs that are a problem in California. The state has formally identified more than 200 substances as TACs, including the federal hazardous air pollutants, and is adopting appropriate control measures for sources of these TACs.

Health impacts associated with TACs are generally associated with long-term exposure. There are no meaningful sources of TACs for the operating phase of the project and therefore no reason to expect health impacts related to TACs. The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks. In an abundance of caution, a voluntary health risk assessment (HRA) was performed for the proposed project. The following paragraphs describe the HRA, and the detailed assessment is provided in Appendix A.

OEHHA’s most recent guidance is the 2015 Risk Assessment Guidelines Manual (OEHHA 2015), which was adopted in 2015 to replace the 2003 HRA Guidance Manual. The Children’s Environmental Health Protection Act of 1999 (Senate Bill 25), which requires explicit consideration of infants and children in assessing risks from air toxics, requires revisions of the methods for both non-cancer and cancer risk assessment and of the exposure assumptions in the 2003 HRA Guidance Manual. Cancer risk parameters, such as age-sensitivity factors, daily breathing rates, exposure period, fraction of time at home, and cancer potency factors were based on the values and data recommended by OEHHA as implemented in HARP2. SCAQMD’s Modeling Guidance for American Meteorological Society/ Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model (AERMOD) (SCAQMD 2018) and Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis (SCAQMD 2003b) provides guidance to perform dispersion modeling for use in HRAs within the South Coast Air Basin.

Health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. The SCAQMD recommends a carcinogenic (cancer) risk threshold of 10 in one million. Some TACs increase noncancer health risk due to long-term (chronic) exposures. The Chronic Hazard Index (HIC) is the sum of the individual substance chronic hazard indices for all TACs affecting the same target organ system. The HIC estimates for all receptor types used the ‘OEHHA Derived’ calculation method, which uses high-end exposure parameters for the inhalation and next top two exposure pathways and mean exposure parameters for the remaining pathways for non-cancer risk estimates. The HIC is the sum of the individual substance chronic hazard indices for all TACs affecting the same target organ system. A hazard index less than one (1.0) means that adverse health effects are not expected. Within this analysis, noncarcinogenic exposures of less than 1.0 are considered less than significant. The SCAQMD recommends a HIC significance threshold of 1.0 (project increment) and an acute hazard index of 1.0. The exhaust from diesel engines is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and particles, many of which are known human carcinogens. Diesel particulate matter (DPM) has established cancer risk factors and relative exposure values for long term chronic health hazard impacts. No short-term, acute relative exposure values are established and regulated and are therefore not addressed in this assessment.

The dispersion modeling was performed using the American Meteorological Society/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model (AERMOD), which is the model SCAQMD requires for atmospheric dispersion of emissions. AERMOD (version 18081) is a steady-state Gaussian plume model that incorporates air dispersion based on planetary boundary layer turbulence structure and scaling concepts, including treatment of surface and elevated sources, building downwash, and simple and complex terrain (EPA 2019b).

11 The Chronic Hazard Index estimates for all receptor types used the OEHHA Derived calculation method (OEHHA 2015).
Dudek evaluated the project’s potential cancer and noncancer health impacts using exposure periods appropriate to evaluate short-term emission increases (third trimester to 5 months). Emissions dispersion of DPM was modeled using AERMOD, then cancer risk and noncancer health impacts subsequently using the CARB HARP2. HARP2 (ADMRT, version 19121) implements the March 2015 OEHHA age-weighting methodology for assessing toxics risks. The chemical exposure results were then compared to SCAQMD thresholds to assess project significance. Principal parameters of this modeling are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Construction Health Risk Assessment American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model Construction Principal Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological Data</td>
<td>The SCAQMD requires the use of AERMOD for air dispersion modeling. The latest 5-year meteorological data for the Ontario International Airport station (Station ID 3102) from SCAQMD were downloaded, then input to AERMOD. For cancer or chronic noncancer risk assessments, the average cancer risk of all years modeled was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban versus Rural Option</td>
<td>Urban areas typically have more surface roughness as well as structures and low-albedo surfaces that absorb more sunlight—and thus more heat—relative to rural areas. According to SCAQMD guidelines, the urban dispersion option was selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain Characteristics</td>
<td>Digital elevation model files were imported into AERMOD so that complex terrain features were evaluated as appropriate. Per SCAQMD guidance, the National Elevation Dataset (NED) dataset with resolution of 1/3 arc-second was used (SCAQMD 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission Sources and Release Parameters</td>
<td>Air dispersion modeling of construction activities was conducted using emissions generated using CalEEMod, assuming 5 days per week and 22 days per month. The construction area was modeled as a series of adjacent volume sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Release Characterizations</td>
<td>Modeling release parameters were developed for the construction analyses. For modeling construction emissions dispersion using AERMOD, it was assumed that the total site area would have active construction activities for a duration of 5 months. The construction equipment DPM emissions were modeled as a line of adjacent volume sources across the project site to represent project construction with a release height of 5 meters, plume height of 2.33 meters, and plume width of 11.63 meters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological Data</td>
<td>The SCAQMD requires the use of AERMOD for air dispersion modeling. The latest 5-year meteorological data for the Ontario International Airport station (Station ID 3102) from SCAQMD were downloaded, then input to AERMOD. For cancer or chronic noncancer risk assessments, the average cancer risk of all years modeled was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban versus Rural Option</td>
<td>Urban areas typically have more surface roughness as well as structures and low-albedo surfaces that absorb more sunlight—and thus more heat—relative to rural areas. According to SCAQMD guidelines, the urban dispersion option was selected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Appendix A.

EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; AERMOD = American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model; DPM = diesel particulate matter; CalEEMod = California Emissions Estimator Model.

This HRA evaluated impacts using a uniform Cartesian grid of receptors spaced 50 meters apart, 1,000 meters from the project site, and then converted to discrete receptors.

Construction of project components would require use of heavy-duty construction equipment, which is subject to a CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions, and would involve use of diesel trucks, which are also subject to an Airborne Toxics Control Measure. Construction of project components would occur over a total of 6 months and would be periodic and short term within each phase. Following completion of construction activities,
Of importance, it was assumed that for all off-road equipment over 50 horsepower used during project construction would meet Tier 4 interim standards consistent with MM 4.2-1a. The results of the HRA during construction are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Proposed Project Impact</th>
<th>CEQA Threshold</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICR—Residential</td>
<td>Per Million</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICR—Student</td>
<td>Per Million</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.
Notes: CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; HIC = Chronic Hazard Index.

The results of the construction analysis demonstrate that the construction mobile source emissions exhibit MICR residential and student receptors below the 10 in a million threshold and below the HIC threshold. The project construction TACs impact from DPM emissions would be less than significant. Therefore, no new or more severe short-term impacts associated with exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Operational Health Risk Assessment

CARB’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CARB Handbook) encourages consideration of the health impacts of distribution centers that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day on sensitive receptors sited within 1,000 feet from the source in the land use decision-making process (CARB 2005). For the operational health risk, the operation year 2021 was assumed consistent with completion of project construction. Emissions from the operation of the project include truck trips and truck idling emissions. For risk assessment purposes, PM$_{10}$ in diesel exhaust is considered DPM, originating mainly from truck traveling on site and off site and truck idling located at the loading docks. Truck travel and idling emission rates were obtained from CARB’s EMFAC2017. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2021 were used to estimate emissions associated with operation of the project. Truck idling would be limited to 5 minutes in accordance with CARB’s adopted Airborne Toxic Control Measure; however, truck idling was conservatively assumed to idle for 15 minutes.$^{12}$ Therefore, the analysis conservatively overestimates DPM emissions from idling. All deliveries would occur Monday through Friday. The use of forklifts in the loading dock areas would be electric-powered.

Conservatively, a 2021 EMFAC2017 run was conducted and a constant 2021 emission factor data set was used for the entire duration of the analysis (i.e., 30 years). Use of the 2021 emission factors would overstate potential impacts since this approach does not include reductions in emissions due to fleet turnover or cleaner technology with lower emissions. The truck travel DPM emissions were calculated by applying the exhaust PM$_{10}$ emission factor from EMFAC2017 and the total truck trip number over the length of the distance traveled. In addition, the on-site truck idling exhaust emissions were calculated by applying the idle exhaust PM$_{10}$ emission factor from EMFAC2017 and total truck trip over the total idling time (i.e., 15 minutes).

$^{12}$ Although the project is required to comply with CARB’s idling limit of 5 minutes, on-site idling emissions was estimated for 15 minutes of truck idling, which would take into account on-site idling while the trucks are waiting to pull up to the loading dock, idling at the loading dock, and idling during check-in and check-out.
The dispersion modeling was performed using AERMOD (version 18081). The truck traffic was modeled as a line of alternating volume sources from Interstate 10 to the project site and truck travel on site to estimate emissions at proximate receptors. Truck idling was modeled as stationary sources.

As described above, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. The SCAQMD recommends a carcinogenic (cancer) risk threshold of 1.0 in one million. Some TACs increase noncancer health risk due to long-term (chronic) exposures. A hazard index less than one (1.0) means that adverse health effects are not expected. Within this analysis, noncarcinogenic exposures of less than 1.0 are considered less than significant. The SCAQMD recommends a HIC significance threshold of 1.0 (project increment) and an acute hazard index of 1.0. The exhaust from diesel engines is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and particles, many of which are known human carcinogens. DPM has established cancer risk factors and relative exposure values for long term chronic health hazard impacts. No short-term, acute relative exposure values are established and regulated and are therefore not addressed in this assessment.

Dudek evaluated the project’s potential cancer and noncancer health impacts using exposure periods appropriate to evaluate long-term emission increases (third trimester to 30 years). Emissions dispersion of DPM was modeled using AERMOD, then cancer risk and noncancer health impacts subsequently using the CARB HARP2 (ADMRT, version 19121). The chemical exposure results were then compared to SCAQMD thresholds to assess project significance. Principal parameters of this modeling are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. Operational Health Risk Assessment American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model Operational Principal Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological Data</td>
<td>The SCAQMD requires the use of AERMOD for air dispersion modeling. The latest 5-year meteorological data for the Ontario International Airport station (Station ID 3102) from SCAQMD were downloaded, then input to AERMOD. For cancer or chronic noncancer risk assessments, the average cancer risk of all years modeled was used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban versus Rural Option</td>
<td>Urban areas typically have more surface roughness as well as structures and low-albedo surfaces that absorb more sunlight—and thus more heat—relative to rural areas. According to SCAQMD guidelines, the urban dispersion option was selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain Characteristics</td>
<td>Digital elevation model files were imported into AERMOD so that complex terrain features were evaluated as appropriate. Per SCAQMD guidance, the National Elevation Dataset (NED) dataset with resolution of 1/3 arc-second was used (SCAQMD 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission Sources and Release Parameters</td>
<td>Air dispersion modeling of operational activities was conducted using emissions generated using EMFAC2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Release Characterizations</td>
<td>Modeling release parameters were developed for the operational analyses. For modeling operational emissions dispersion using AERMOD, delivery truck traffic was modeled as a line of alternating volume sources with 12 feet truck width and 6 feet truck height (SJVAPCD 2006). The truck idling emissions were modeled as a stationary source with 12.6 feet exhaust height and 0.1 meter exhaust diameter (SJVAPCD 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: See Appendix A. EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; AERMOD = American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model; DPM = diesel particulate matter; CalEEMod = California Emissions Estimator Model.*

This HRA evaluated impacts using a uniform Cartesian grid of receptors spaced 50 meters apart, 1,000 meters from the project site, and then converted to discrete receptors.
For the operational health risk, the HRA assumes exposure would start in the 3rd trimester through 30 years for all residential sensitive receptor locations. The exposure duration for a student would start at age 14 through age 18 at a high school. The SCAQMD has also established noncancerous risk parameters for use in HRAs since some TACs increase non-cancer health risk due to long-term (chronic) exposures. Noncarcinogenic risks are quantified by calculating a hazard index, expressed as the ratio between the ambient pollutant concentration and its toxicity or REL, which is a concentration at or below which health effects are not likely to occur. The chronic hazard index is the sum of the individual substance chronic hazard indices for all TACs affecting the same target organ system, similarly calculated for acute hazard index. The results of the HRA during operation are provided in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Parameter</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Project Impact</th>
<th>CEQA Threshold</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Individual Cancer Risk – Residential</td>
<td>Per Million</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Hazard Index – Residential</td>
<td>Index Value</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute Hazard Index – Residential</td>
<td>Index Value</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD 2019.
Notes: CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act.
See Appendix A.

The results of the operational analysis demonstrate that the exhibit MICR for the student and residential receptors are below the 10 in a million threshold and HIC threshold. The project operational TACs impact from DPM emissions would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term impacts associated with exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Health Effects of Criteria Air Pollutants

Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions; however, estimated construction and operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD mass-emission daily thresholds as shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. As previously discussed, the SCAB has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for O\textsubscript{3} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} and a state nonattainment area for O\textsubscript{3}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}.

Health effects associated with O\textsubscript{3} include respiratory symptoms, worsening of lung disease leading to premature death, and damage to lung tissue (CARB 2019b). VOCs and NO\textsubscript{x} are precursors to O\textsubscript{3}, for which the SCAB is designated as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS. The contribution of VOCs and NO\textsubscript{x} to regional ambient O\textsubscript{3} concentrations is the result of complex photochemistry. The increases in O\textsubscript{3} concentrations in the SCAB due to O\textsubscript{3} precursor emissions tend to be found downwind from the source location to allow time for the photochemical reactions to occur. However, the potential for exacerbating excessive O\textsubscript{3} concentrations would also depend on the time of year that the VOC emissions would occur because exceedances of the O\textsubscript{3} ambient air quality standards tend to occur between April and October when solar radiation is highest. The holistic effect of a single project’s emissions of O\textsubscript{3} precursors is...
speculative because of the lack of quantitative methods to assess this impact. Because construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in O₃ precursor emissions (i.e., VOCs or NOₓ) that would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, as shown in Tables 3 and 4, the proposed project is not anticipated to substantially contribute to regional O₃ concentrations and their associated health impacts.

Health effects associated with NOₓ include lung irritation and enhanced allergic responses (CARB 2019b). Construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate NOₓ emissions that would exceed the SCAQMD mass daily thresholds; therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO₂ or contribute to associated health effects. In addition, the SCAB is designated as in attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO₂ and the existing NO₂ concentrations in the area are well below the NAAQS and CAAQS standards.

Health effects associated with CO include chest pain in patients with heart disease, headache, light-headedness, and reduced mental alertness (CARB 2019b). CO tends to be a localized impact associated with congested intersections. CO hotspots were discussed previously as a less-than-significant impact. Thus, the proposed project’s CO emissions would not contribute to the health effects associated with this pollutant.

Health effects associated with PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ include premature death and hospitalization, primarily for worsening of respiratory disease (CARB 2019b). As with O₃ and NOₓ, and as shown in Tables 3 and 4, the proposed project would not generate emissions of PM₁₀ or PM₂.₅ that would exceed the SCAQMD’s thresholds. Accordingly, the proposed project’s PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ emissions are not expected to cause an increase in related health effects for this pollutant.

Therefore, no new or more severe significant contribution to adverse health impacts associated with criteria pollutants would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

d) **Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting substantial number of people?**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The occurrence and severity of potential odor impacts depend on numerous factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Potential odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement application. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction would be less than significant.

Land uses and industrial operations associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food-processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding (SCAQMD 1993). The project entails operation of a warehouse; therefore, project operations would result in an odor impact that is less than significant.
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with other emissions, including odors, would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with air quality would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to air quality:

**MM-4.2-1a**

All construction equipment shall be maintained in good operating condition so as to reduce emissions. The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction equipment is being properly serviced and maintained as per the manufacturer’s specification. Maintenance records shall be available at the construction site for City verification. The following additional measures, as determined applicable by the City Engineer, shall be included as conditions of the Grading Permit issuance:

- Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
- Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site.
- Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.
- Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM10 generation.
- Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization, and ensure that all vehicles and equipment will be properly tuned and maintained according to manufacturers’ specifications.
- Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export). If the lead agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained the lead agency shall use trucks that meet EPA 2007 model year NOx and PM emissions requirements.
- During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards, or higher according to the following:
  - January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.
  - Post-January 1, 2015: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all
construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.

- A copy of each unit’s certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

**MM-4.2-1b** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, all applicants shall submit construction plans to the City of Fontana denoting the proposed schedule and projected equipment use. Construction contractors shall provide evidence that low emission mobile construction equipment will be utilized, or that their use was investigated and found to be infeasible for the project. Contractors shall also conform to any construction measures imposed by the SCAQMD as well as City Planning Staff.

**MM-4.2-1c** All paints and coatings shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule 1113. Specifically, the following measures shall be implemented, as feasible:

- Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under AQMD Rule 1113.
- Construct or build with materials that do not require painting.
- Require the use of pre-painted construction materials.

**MM-4.2-1d** Projects that result in the construction of more than 19 single-family residential units, 40 multifamily residential units, or 45,000 square feet of retail/commercial/industrial space shall be required to apply paints either by hand or high volume, low pressure (HVLP) spray. These measures may reduce volatile organic compounds (VOC) associated with the application of paints and coatings by an estimated 60 to 75 percent. Alternatively, the contractor may specify the use of low volatility paints and coatings. Several of currently available primers have VOC contents of less than 0.85 pounds per gallon (e.g., Dulux professional exterior primer 100 percent acrylic). Top coats can be less than 0.07 pounds per gallon (8 grams per liter) (e.g., lifemaster 2000-series). This latter measure would reduce these VOC emissions by more than 70 percent. Larger projects should incorporate both the use of HVLP or hand application and the requirement for low volatility coatings.

**MM-4.2-1e** All asphalt shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule 1108.

**MM-4.2-1f** Prior to the issuance of grading permits or approval of grading plans for future development projects within the project area, future developments shall include a dust control plan as part of the construction contract standard specifications. The dust control plan shall include measures to meet the requirements of SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Phase and schedule activities to avoid high-ozone days and first-stage smog alerts.

- Discontinue operation during second-stage smog alerts.
- All haul trucks shall be covered prior to leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas.
• Comply with AQMD Rule 403, particularly to minimize fugitive dust and noise to surrounding areas.
• Moisten soil each day prior to commencing grading to depth of soil cut.
• Water exposed surfaces at least twice a day under calm conditions, and as often as needed on windy days or during very dry weather in order to maintain a surface crust and minimize the release of visible emissions from the construction site.
• Treat any area that will be exposed for extended periods with a soil conditioner to stabilize soil or temporarily plant with vegetation.
• Wash mud-covered tires and undercarriages of trucks leaving construction sites.
• Provide for street sweeping, as needed, on adjacent roadways to remove dirt dropped by construction vehicles or mud, which would otherwise be carried off by trucks departing project sites.
• Securely cover all loads of fill coming to the site with a tight-fitting tarp.
• Cease grading during periods when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.
• Provide for permanent sealing of all graded areas, as applicable, at the earliest practicable time after soil disturbance.
• Use low-sulfur diesel fuel in all equipment.
• Use electric equipment whenever practicable.
• Shut off engines when not in use.

MM-4.2-2c All industrial and commercial facilities shall post signs requiring that trucks shall not be left idling for prolonged periods pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485, which limits idle times to not more than five minutes.

MM-4.2-2d The City shall require that both industrial and commercial uses designate preferential parking for vanpools.

MM-4.2-2e The proposed commercial and industrial areas shall incorporate food service.

MM-4.2-2f All industrial and commercial site tenants with 50 or more employees shall be required to post both bus and MetroLink schedules inconspicuous areas.

MM-4.2-2g All industrial and commercial site tenants with 50 or more employees shall be requested to configure their operating schedules around the MetroLink schedule to the extent reasonably feasible.

MM-4.2-2j All residential, commercial, and industrial structures shall be required to incorporate light-colored roofing materials.

MM-4.2-2k Prior to approval of future development projects within the project area, the City of Fontana shall conduct a project-level environmental review to determine potential vehicle emission impacts associated with the project(s). Mitigation measures shall be developed for each project as it is considered to mitigate potentially significant impacts to the extent feasible. Potential mitigation measures may require that facilities with over 250 employees (full or part-time employees at a worksite for a consecutive six-month period calculated as a monthly average), as required by the Air Quality Management Plan, implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs.
**MM-4.2-2I** New warehouse facilities or distribution centers that generate a minimum of 100 truck trips per day, or 40 truck trips with transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or TRU operations exceeding 300 200 hours per week shall not be located closer than 1,000 feet from any existing or proposed sensitive land use such as residential, a hospital, medical offices, day care facilities, and/or fire stations (pursuant to the recommendations set forth in the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook), unless the increase in health risk for such sensitive receptors due to an individual project is shown to be less than the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s thresholds of significance (Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk ≥ 10 in 1 million; Cancer Burden > 0.5 excess cancer cases [in areas ≥ 1 in 1 million]; and Chronic & Acute Hazard Index ≥ 1.0 [project increment]). With regard to expansions/modifications of existing warehouse facilities or distribution centers, this mitigation measure shall be applied to the resulting incremental net increase in truck trips or TRU operations, and any resulting net increase in health risk impacts, as compared to those existing at the time an expansion/modification project is proposed.

### 3.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Less-Than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Less-Than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Consistent with MM-4.3-1a of the PEIR, a biological resources technical report (Appendix B-1) was prepared for the project in September 2019 by Dudek. The biological resources technical report included a pre-field review of the latest available relevant literature, published research, maps, soil data, data on biological baselines, special-status habitats, and species distributions to determine those biological resources that have the potential to occur within the project site and surrounding 100-foot buffer (the study area). Further, Dudek also performed a biological reconnaissance-level survey of the study area on August 9, 2019.

As stated in the biological resources technical report, the study area is entirely developed and surrounded by residential and industrial development. Portions of the study area contain an active truck repair business and an abandoned property that previously was used as a residence. Operable and inoperable trucks and vehicles are scattered across the northern portion of the study area. No natural or native vegetation communities were observed on the study area; however, scattered non-native ruderal (weedy) species were observed in small patches where the ground was not covered by concrete or asphalt.

Vegetation Communities and Land Covers

As illustrated on Figure 7, Biological Resources Map, three non-natural land covers occur on the study area: ornamental plantings, disturbed land, and developed land. Ornamental plantings typically refer to areas that have been previously developed and now contain herb, shrub, or tree species that have been planted for the development and are regularly maintained. These areas typically lack understory species and are regularly subjected to disturbance. Vegetation typically consists of non-native ornamental species that have been planted. The ornamental planting mapped on the study area are characterized by a planted row of gum tree (Eucalyptus sp.) along the northern property boundary. Developed land typically includes areas that have been constructed upon and do not contain any naturally occurring vegetation. These areas are generally characterized as graded land with asphalt and concrete placed upon it. Developed areas mapped for the study area include the existing paved and developed portions of the project site. No vegetation was observed within developed areas on the study area. The disturbed or barren mapping unit refers to areas that lack vegetation but still retain a pervious surface, or that are dominated by a sparse cover of ruderal vegetation such as Maltese star-thistle (Centaurea melitensis), wild oat, black mustard, spiny sowthistle (Sonchus asper), and prickly lettuce (Lactuca serriola). Disturbed land mapped on the study area is located outside of the project site on an undeveloped property east of the project site. The ornamental plantings, disturbed land, and developed land covers are not considered sensitive vegetation communities.

---

13 While the ornamental plantings and developed land mapping units are not recognized by the Natural Communities List (CDFW 2019), the units are described by Oberbauer et al. (2008) to accommodate the lack of conformity of the observed communities.
Plant Species

The project site is composed entirely of developed and disturbed areas. No plant species listed or proposed for listing as rare, threatened, or endangered by either the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service were detected within the study area during the reconnaissance survey. Additionally, no plant species considered sensitive by the California Native Plant Society were detected.

Dudek performed a review of literature, existing documentation, and geographic information system data to evaluate the potential for special-status plant species to occur within the study area. Each special-status plant species was given a rating of not expected, low, medium, or high based on relative location of known occurrences, vegetation communities, soils, and elevation. Based on the results of the literature review and database searches, 73 special-status plant species were identified as previously occurring within the region. However, all of these species are not expected to occur within the study area based on the soils, current disturbance levels, vegetation communities (habitat) present, elevation ranges, and previous known locations based on the California Natural Diversity Database and California Native Plant Society records. The complete results of this potential to occur evaluation for special-status plants are included in Appendix B-1. No listed or special-status plant species have the potential to occur within the study area due to the lack of suitable habitat. Additionally, there is no U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designated critical habitat for listed plant species within the study area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Wildlife Species

The project site is entirely restricted to developed and disturbed areas. No wildlife species listed or proposed for listing as rare, threatened, or endangered by either the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service were detected within the study area during the reconnaissance survey conducted on August 9, 2019.

Dudek performed a review of literature, existing documentation, and geographic information system data to evaluate the potential for special-status wildlife species to occur within the study area. Each special-status wildlife species was given a rating of not expected, low, moderate, or high based on relative location of known occurrences, vegetation communities, and elevation. Based on the results of the literature review and database searches, 41 special-status wildlife species were identified as occurring within the region. However, these species are not expected or they have low potential to occur within the study area based on the vegetation communities (habitat) present, elevation ranges, and previous known locations based on the California Natural Diversity Database. The complete results of this potential to occur evaluation for special-status wildlife are included in Appendix B-1.

Although the area surrounding the study area is mapped as supporting Delhi sands, the project site does not support this type of soil and is characterized by disturbed land supporting patches of ruderal vegetation. All surface soils have been compacted and constructed upon so that either no exposed soils are present or any soils observed have gravel placed over them for transporting and storing vehicles and
equipment. Additionally, no native plant communities or suitable habitat for the Delhi sands flower-loving fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis*) occurs on the study area and there is no potential for this species to occur on the study area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species would occur and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project site is located entirely on disturbed and developed land. No natural vegetation communities are present within the project footprint, and as such, no impacts to riparian or sensitive vegetation communities would occur as a result of the project.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with riparian or sensitive vegetation communities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The assessment of potential jurisdictional waters in the study area determined there are no waterways or drainages within or immediately adjacent to the study area that would be subject to regulatory agency jurisdiction. An intermittent stream is located approximately 1.2 miles to the west of the study area, well outside of any project impact areas. Additionally, there are no areas capable of supporting wetlands on the study area, and no riparian habitats were observed. No soils mapped on the study area are considered hydric.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with federally protected wetlands would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect large patches of natural open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals. Wildlife corridors contribute to population viability by assuring continual exchange of genes between populations, providing access to adjacent habitat areas for foraging and mating, and providing routes for recolonization of habitat after local extirpation or ecological catastrophes (e.g., fires).

Habitat linkages are small patches that join larger blocks of habitat and help reduce the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation. Habitat linkages provide a potential route for gene flow and long-term
dispersal of plants and animals and may serve as primary habitat for smaller animals, such as reptiles and amphibians. Habitat linkages may be continuous habitat or discrete habitat islands that function as stepping stones for dispersal.

The entire study area is surrounded by development and no portions of the study area function as wildlife corridors or linkages that connect to larger habitat areas in the region, such as the Santa Ana River further to the south. Due to the limited size of the project and existing surrounding development, construction of the proposed project would not result in an impact to any wildlife corridors or habitat linkages.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildlife movement corridors or native wildlife nursery sites would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The City’s Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance (Chapter 28, Article III of the City’s Code of Ordinances) regulates the planting, maintenance, protection, and removal of trees and shrubs on public streets, parks, and other City-owned property. The project site currently contains eucalyptus (Eucalyptus spp.) windrows along its northern and southern boundaries and various other ornamental species scattered throughout the site. Pursuant to the City’s Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance, tree replacement is required for potential impacts to the types of trees that will be removed by the project.

The Arborist Report prepared for the project (Appendix B-2) discusses tree plantings required by Ordinance. As part of the Arborist Report, all applicable on-site trees were inventoried and evaluated, and all on-site trees are expected to be removed by the project. The City’s Code of Ordinances requires replacement of living protected trees at a replacement ratio dependent on overall condition and size. As further outlined in the Arborist Report, the City requires replacement trees for all eligible trees removed from the project site. To accomplish this, the project will be required to plant a combination of 15-gallon, 24-inch box, 36-inch box, and 48-inch box trees on site, in addition to shrubs, groundcover, and other landscape plantings.

Therefore, given that compliance with the City’s Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance is required, no new or more severe impacts associated with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

f) **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The study area does not occur within any proposed or existing habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans for local or regional protection of species. Therefore, construction of the project will not result in an impact to any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with an adopted habitat conservation plan would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with biological resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to biological resources:

**MM-4.3-1a** The City of Fontana Planning Division shall require that all future project applicants prepare a Biological Assessment prior to the issuance of grading permits. The Biological Assessment shall include a vegetation map of the project area, analysis of the impacts associated with plant and animal species and habitats, and conduct habitat evaluations for burrowing owl, Delhi Sands flower-loving fly, San Diego pocket mouse, western mastiff bat, western yellow bat, and San Diego desert woodrat. If any of these species are determined to be present, then coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or California Department of Fish and Game shall be conducted to determine what, if any, permits or clearances are required prior to development.

**MM-4.3-1b** Any future land disturbance for site-specific developments within the project site shall be conducted outside of the State-identified bird nesting season (February 15 through September 1). If construction during the nesting season must occur, the site shall be evaluated by a City-approved biologist prior to ground disturbance to determine if nesting birds exist on-site. If any nests are discovered, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest, depending on the species and type of construction activity. Only construction activities approved by the biologist shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated.

**MM-4.3-1d** The City shall encourage the preservation of natural habitat in conjunction with private or public development projects.

**MM-4.3-1g** Evidence of satisfactory compliance shall be provided by Project applicant with any required State and/or Federal permits, prior to issuance of grading permits for individual projects.
3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The project site contains industrial land uses and activities (primarily trucking and automotive repair and related operations) and approximately three former single-family structures. The project site also includes several storage buildings and sheds, as well as outdoor auto and miscellaneous equipment storage. The remainder of the subject property consists of gravel parking and driveways.

According to historic aerial photographs of the project site, the site was undeveloped agricultural land up to at least 1967, and was developed sometime between then and 1994 (NETR 2019). In addition, historic U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps show the project site as vacant as late as 1975. As such, it is assumed that the project site was developed between 1975 and 1994, making the existing on-site structures between 25 and 44 years old.
As defined by the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), a historical resource is a resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), has been identified as significant in a historical resource survey, or is listed on a local register of historical resources. The criteria for listing resources in the CRHR were developed to be in accordance with previously established criteria developed for listing in the NRHP.

For a building to be considered historic, it typically must be at least 50 years old so sufficient time has passed to determine whether the events or characteristics of the building will have a contribution to history (OHP 2015). As previously noted, the existing structures on the project site are between 25 and 44 years old, and thus, not yet eligible to be considered historic resources. In addition, regardless of age, due to evident and substantial structural changes made to these buildings over the decades, the historical integrity of these properties is no longer intact, and these structures are highly unlikely to be eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR.

Further, the City of Fontana General Plan Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Chapter, which included an inventory of potentially historic resources within the City, did not identify any on-site buildings that would meet the above listed criteria (City of Fontana 2018b). Consistent with MM-4.4-1a from the PEIR, only if there is evidence that suggests the potential for historic resources on the project site are additional field surveys, research, and evaluation warranted. In this case, based on the aforementioned evidence, such subsequent assessment is not required.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with historical resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Consistent with MM-4.4-2a, cultural resources background research and a records search were conducted (Appendix C). The records searches conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center indicated that no previously recorded prehistoric, historic, or built-environment resources are located within the project site. Within 1 mile of the project site there are 32 previously recorded sites, although none of these previously recorded sites are located on or directly adjacent to the project site.

The project site is located in a highly developed and urbanized part of the City and is currently heavily disturbed by existing development. As such, there is little potential for the inadvertent discovery of subsurface archaeological or other cultural resources materials during earthwork activities. However, as with all other subsurface construction activity, there is always a chance—despite the developed condition of the project site—for inadvertent discovery of buried, unrecorded cultural resources within the site. Thus, MM-4.4-2b and MM-4.4-2c from the PEIR would be required to minimize impacts related to the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, tribal cultural, and other types of cultural resources.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts to archaeological resources would occur and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Given the developed nature of the project area, earthwork activities associated with project construction are unlikely to uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. However, if human remains are uncovered during construction activity, the applicant and its construction contractors are required by law to stop work and contact the county coroner. California Health and Safety Code, Section No. 7050.5, requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area reasonably suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the county coroner has examined the remains. If the county coroner determines or has reason to believe the remains are those of a Native American, they must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, and the Native American Heritage Commission will notify the Most Likely Descendant. The Most Likely Descendant may recommend means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and items associated with Native Americans. As such, if Native American remains were uncovered during project construction, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the appropriate authorities are notified and that discovered remains are treated with the appropriate respect and dignity.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with disturbance of human remains would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with cultural resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to cultural resources:

MM-4.4-1a A qualified archaeologist shall perform the following tasks, prior to construction activities within project boundaries:

- Subsequent to a preliminary City review, if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources, a field survey for historical resources within portions of the project site not previously surveyed for cultural resources shall be conducted.
- Subsequent to a preliminary City review, if evidence suggests the potential for historic resources, the San Bernardino County Archives shall be contacted for information on historical property records.
- Subsequent to a preliminary City review, if evidence suggests the potential for sacred land resources, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted for information regarding sacred lands.
- All historical resources within the project site, including archaeological and historic resources older than 50 years, shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and guidelines followed according to the California Office of Historic Preservation’s handbook “Instructions for Recording Historical Resources.”
archaeologist shall then submit two (2) copies of the completed forms to the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center for the assignment of trinomials.

- The significance and integrity of all historical resources within the project site shall be evaluated, using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important archaeological resources and/or 36 CFR 60.4 for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

- Mitigation measures shall be proposed and conditions of approval (if a local government action) recommended to eliminate adverse project effects on significant, important, and unique historical resources, following appropriate CEQA and/or National Historic Preservation Act’s Section 106 guidelines.

- A technical resources management report shall be prepared, documenting the inventory, evaluation, and proposed mitigation of resources within the project site, following guidelines for Archaeological Resource Management Reports prepared by the California Office of Historic Preservation, Preservation Planning Bulletin 4(a), December 1989. One copy of the completed report, with original illustrations, shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center for permanent archiving.

**MM-4.4-1b** If any historical resources and/or human resources are encountered before or during grading, the developer shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities and to take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study.

**MM-4.4-2a** A qualified archaeologist shall perform the following tasks, prior to construction activities within project boundaries:

- Subsequent to a preliminary City review, if evidence suggests the potential for prehistoric resources, a field survey for prehistoric resources within portions of the project site not previously surveyed for cultural resources shall be conducted.

- Subsequent to a preliminary City review, if evidence suggests the potential for sacred land resources, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted for information regarding sacred lands.

- All prehistoric resources shall be inventoried using appropriate State record forms and two (2) copies of the completed forms shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center.

- The significance and integrity of all prehistoric resources within the project site shall be evaluated using criteria established in the CEQA Guidelines for important archaeological resources.

- If human remains are encountered on the project site, the San Bernardino County Coroner’s Office shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find, and all work shall be halted until a clearance is given by that office and any other involved agencies.

- All resources and data collected within the project site shall be permanently curated at an appropriate repository within San Bernardino County.
MM-4.4-2b If any prehistoric archaeological resources are encountered before or during grading, the developer shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities and to take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study. With the assistance of the archaeologist, the City of Fontana shall:

- Enact interim measures to protect undesignated sites from demolition or significant modification without an opportunity for the City to establish its archaeological value.
- Consider establishing provisions to require incorporation of archaeological sites within new developments, using their special qualities at a theme or focal point.
- Pursue educating the public about the area’s archaeological heritage.
- Propose mitigation measures and recommend conditions of approval (if a local government action) to eliminate adverse project effects on significant, important, and unique prehistoric resources, following appropriate CEQA guidelines.
- Prepare a technical resources management report, documenting the inventory, evaluation, and proposed mitigation of resources within the project area. Submit one copy of the completed report, with original illustrations, to the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center for permanent archiving.

MM-4.4-2c Where consistent with applicable local, State and federal law and deemed appropriate by the City, future site-specific development projects shall consider the following requests by the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians and Morongo Band of Mission Indians:

In the event Native American cultural resources are discovered during construction for future development, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the overall project may continue during this period:

- Initiate consultation between the appropriate Native American tribal entity (as determined by a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards) and the City/project applicant;
- Transfer cultural resources investigations to the appropriate Native American entity (as determined by a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards) as soon as possible;
- Utilize a Native American Monitor from the appropriate Native American entity (as determined by a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards) where deemed appropriate or required by the City, during initial ground disturbing activities, cultural resource surveys, and/or cultural resource excavations.
## 3.6 Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Energy – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

### Project Significance Determination

a) **Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

b) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Although the PEIR did not specifically address this question, the PEIR found that implementation of the SWIP Specific Plan would not significantly increase the demand for electricity and natural gas supply above existing conditions upon incorporation of recommended mitigation measures. The PEIR disclosed that all future development within the SWIP Specific Plan area would be required to comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulation (of which Part 6 establishes the state’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards), development standards and design requirements related to sustainability and energy conservation contained in the City’s Municipal Code, and current and future state legislation, executive orders, and regulatory guidance to maximize energy efficiency. Additionally, the PEIR found that as time elapsed, newer and more efficient technologies would likely emerge and be incorporated into future development to reduce energy consumption. Further, the PEIR also included MM-
4.2-5a, which requires future development to incorporate design features that would minimize the consumption of energy. All of the above would apply to both construction and operation the project.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with energy would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to energy:

**MM-4.2-5a** Prior to the issuance of building permits, future development projects shall demonstrate the incorporation of project design features that achieve a minimum of 28.5 percent reduction in GHG emissions from non-mobile sources as compared to business as usual conditions. With regard to expansions/modifications of existing facilities, this mitigation measure shall be applied to the resulting incremental net increase in enclosed floor area. Future project shall include but not be limited to, the following list of potential design features (which include measures for reducing GHG emissions related to Transportation and Motor Vehicles).

**Energy Efficiency**

- Design buildings to be energy efficient and exceed Title 24 requirements by at least 5 percent.
- Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Site and design building to take advantage of daylight.
- Use trees, landscaping and sunscreens on west and south exterior building walls to reduce energy use.
- Install light-colored "cool" roofs and cool pavements.
- Provide information on energy management services for large energy users.
- Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems (e.g., minimum of Energy Star rated equipment).
- Implement design features to increase the efficiency of the building envelope (i.e., the barrier between conditioned and unconditioned spaces).
- Install light emitting diodes (LEDs) for traffic, street, and other outdoor lighting.
- Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting.

**Renewable Energy**

- Ensure buildings are designed to have “solar ready” roofs.
- Use combined heat and power in appropriate applications.
**Water Conservation and Efficiency**

- Create water-efficient landscapes with a preference for a xeriscape landscape palette.
- Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.
- Design buildings to be water-efficient. Install water-efficient fixtures and appliances (e.g., EPA WaterSense labeled products).
- Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.
- Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and vehicles.
- Implement low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Retaining storm water runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site).
- Devise a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and location. The strategy may include many of the specific items listed above, plus other innovative measures that are appropriate to the specific project.
- Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives.

**Solid Waste Measures**

- Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas.
- Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.

**Transportation and Motor Vehicles**

- Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.
- Promote ride sharing programs (e.g., by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles, and providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides).
- Create local “light vehicle” networks, such as neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) systems.
- Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure to encourage the use of low or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations).
- Promote “least polluting” ways to connect people and goods to their destinations.
- Incorporate bicycle lanes and routes into street systems, new subdivisions, and large developments.
- Incorporate bicycle-friendly intersections into street design.
- For commercial projects, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. For large employers, provide facilities that encourage bicycle commuting (e.g., locked bicycle storage or covered or indoor bicycle parking).
- Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points.

**MM-4.8-6a** The City should provide growth projections to utility companies periodically as the basis for their projection of facility and service needs to support community development.

### 3.7 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan would result in the following impacts:

- a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. Less-Than-Significant Impact.
  - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Less-Than-Significant Impact.
- b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Less-Than-Significant Impact.
- c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? Less-Than-Significant-Impact.
- d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? Less-Than-Significant Impact.
- e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? No Impact.
- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The Alquist-Priolo Zones Special Studies Act defines active faults as those that have experienced surface displacement or movement during the last 11,000 years. The nearest Alquist-Priolo Zone is the Devore and Cucamonga fault traces, located in the northern portion of the City, approximately seven miles from the project site. According to the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, although several earthquake faults exist within and in proximity to the City, no faults exist beneath the project site (City of Fontana 2017). Additionally, based on a review of the California Department of Conservation regulatory maps (CDOC 2019b), the project site is not located in a designated earthquake fault zone.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with fault rupture would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Similar to other areas located in the seismically active Southern California region, the City is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake. However, the project site is not located within an active fault zone, and the site would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in this seismic region. Additionally, the project would be designed in accordance with all applicable provisions established in the incumbent version of the California Building Code, which sets forth specific engineering requirements to ensure structural integrity during a seismic event (CBC 2016). Compliance with these requirements would reduce the potential risk to both people and structures with respect to strong seismic ground shaking.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Liquefaction occurs when partially saturated soil loses its effective stress and enters a liquid state, which can result in the soil’s inability to support structures above. Liquefaction can be induced by ground-shaking events and is dependent on soil saturation conditions. According to the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is located in an area of low liquefaction susceptibility (City of Fontana 2017). As such, the project would not be substantial affected by liquefaction.
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with liquefaction would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Based upon a review of the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located in an area identified as susceptible to slope instability (City of Fontana 2017). The project site consists of flat parcels within a developed industrial area and is not located adjacent to any potentially unstable topographical feature such as a hillside or riverbank.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with landslides would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Short-Term Construction Impacts

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Ground surfaces that will be temporarily exposed during construction could result in erosion or loss of soil during storm events. Construction projects that involve the disturbance of 1 or more acres of soil, including clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation, are required to obtain coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit). The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) (SWRCB 2019). The SWPPP must contain site maps that depict the location of best management practices (BMPs), such as silt fencing, sandbag berms, and general good housekeeping methods intended to prevent the off-site discharge of soil or construction materials in stormwater. Implementation of a Construction General Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP and installation of BMPs, would reduce the potential for both stormwater runoff and soil erosion impacts.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Following construction of the project, ground surfaces would be covered by the proposed warehouse building or otherwise stabilized with landscaping and paving. The stormwater generated on site, along with any sediments contained within the stormwater, would be directed into the on-site engineered stormwater system and treated prior to discharge into the municipal storm drain system.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan lists the types of geologic hazards known to occur in the City as slope instability leading to possible mudflow, liquefaction, and collapsible or expansive soils. Based on a review of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located in an area identified as susceptible to slope instability and liquefaction risk is considered low (City of Fontana 2017). The project site is flat and is not located adjacent to any potentially unstable topographical feature, such as a hillside or riverbank. Additionally, the majority of the project site is mapped as tujunga loamy sand (USDA 2019), which is not made up of clay materials typically associated with expansive soils.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with unstable geologic units/soils and expansive soils would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project would connect directly to the municipal sanitary sewer system and would not require septic tanks or any other alternative wastewater disposal system.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with the adequacy of soils and septic systems would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The PEIR found that while the City is situated primarily upon surface exposures of Quaternary younger fan deposits of Holocene age having low paleontological sensitivity, well-dissected Pleistocene older fan deposits are also mapped within the City. These deposits have a high potential to contain fossil resources. In addition, a paleontological resource has been discovered south of the project site, within the western Jurupa Hills in the vicinity of Live Oaks.

The southern portions of the SWIP Specific Plan area, including the project site, may be underlain with older Pleistocene fan deposits and may have moderate potential to produce Pleistocene vertebrate fossils. Thus, excavations that extend into the Pleistocene Alluvium have a potential of containing substantial fossil vertebrate specimens, and future development within the SWIP Specific Plan boundaries could directly or indirectly impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Given the project site’s location within the southern, more paleontologically sensitive part of the SWIP Specific Plan area, a paleontological resources mitigation program will be prepared by a qualified paleontologist prior to issuance of a grading permit to address the treatment of any unearthed paleontological resources, consistent with MM-4.4-3b from the PEIR.
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts to paleontological resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with geology and soils would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to geology and soils (paleontological resources):

MM-4.4-3a A qualified paleontologist shall conduct a pre-construction field survey of any project site within the Specific Plan Update area that is underlain by older alluvium. The paleontologist shall submit a report of findings that provides specific recommendations regarding further mitigation measures (i.e., paleontological monitoring) that may be appropriate.

MM-4.4-3b Should mitigation monitoring be recommended for a specific project within the project site, the program shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

- Assign a paleontological monitor, trained and equipped to allow the rapid removal of fossils with minimal construction delay, to the site full-time during the interval of earth-disturbing activities.
- Should fossils be found within an area being cleared or graded, earth-disturbing activities shall be diverted elsewhere until the monitor has completed salvage. If construction personnel make the discovery, the grading contractor shall immediately divert construction and notify the monitor of the find.
- All recovered fossils shall be prepared, identified, and curated for documentation in the summary report and transferred to an appropriate depository (i.e., San Bernardino County Museum).
- A summary report shall be submitted to City of Fontana. Collected specimens shall be transferred with copy of report to San Bernardino County Museum.
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Project Significance Determination

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate (e.g., temperature, precipitation, or wind patterns) lasting for an extended period of time (i.e., decades or longer). The Earth’s temperature depends on the balance between energy entering and leaving the planet’s system, and many factors (natural and human) can cause changes in Earth’s energy balance. The greenhouse effect is the trapping and buildup of heat in the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface (the troposphere). The greenhouse effect is a natural process that contributes to regulating the Earth’s temperature, and it creates a livable environment on Earth. Human activities that emit additional GHGs to the atmosphere increase the amount of infrared radiation that gets absorbed before escaping into space, thus enhancing the greenhouse effect and causing the Earth’s surface temperature to rise. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project contributes to this impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs. Thus, GHG impacts are recognized exclusively as cumulative impacts (CAPCOA 2008).
A GHG is any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere; in other words, GHGs trap heat in the atmosphere. As defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 38505(g) for purposes of administering many of the state’s primary GHG emissions reduction programs, GHGs include CO₂, methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride (see also CEQA Guidelines section 15364.5). The three GHGs evaluated herein are CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O because these gases would be emitted during proposed project construction and operation.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change developed the global warming potential (GWP) concept to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The reference gas used is CO₂; therefore, GWP-weighted emissions are measured in metric tons (MT) of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e). Consistent with CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, this GHG emissions analysis assumed the GWP for CH₄ is 25 (i.e., emissions of 1 MT of CH₄ are equivalent to emissions of 25 MT of CO₂), and the GWP for N₂O is 298, based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007).

As discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, the proposed project is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the SCAQMD. In October 2008, the SCAQMD proposed recommended numeric CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions for lead agencies to use in assessing GHG impacts of residential and commercial development projects as presented in its Draft Guidance Document—Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (SCAQMD 2008b). This document, which builds on the previous guidance prepared by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, explored various approaches for establishing a significance threshold for GHG emissions. The draft interim CEQA thresholds guidance document was not adopted or approved by the Governing Board. However, in December 2008, the SCAQMD adopted an interim 10,000 MT CO₂e per-year screening level threshold for stationary source/industrial projects for which the SCAQMD is the lead agency (SCAQMD 2008c). The 10,000 MT CO₂e per-year threshold, which was derived from GHG reduction targets established in Executive Order S-3-05, was based on the conclusion that the threshold was consistent with achieving an emissions capture rate of 90% of all new or modified stationary source projects.

The SCAQMD formed a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group to work with SCAQMD staff on developing GHG CEQA significance thresholds until statewide significance thresholds or guidelines are established. From December 2008 to September 2010, the SCAQMD hosted working group meetings and revised the draft threshold proposal several times, although it did not officially provide these proposals in a subsequent document. The SCAQMD has continued to consider adoption of significance thresholds for residential and general land-use development projects. The most recent proposal issued by SCAQMD, issued in September 2010, uses the following tiered approach to evaluate potential GHG impacts from various uses (SCAQMD 2010):

**Tier 1.** Determine if CEQA categorical exemptions are applicable. If not, move to Tier 2.

**Tier 2.** Consider whether or not the proposed project is consistent with a locally adopted GHG reduction plan that has gone through public hearing and CEQA review, that has an approved inventory, includes monitoring, etc. If not, move to Tier 3.

---

14 Climate-forcing substances include greenhouse gases (GHGs) and other substances such as black carbon and aerosols. This discussion focuses on the seven GHGs identified in the California Health and Safety Code Section 38505; impacts associated with other climate-forcing substances are not evaluated herein.
Tier 3. Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of screening thresholds for individual land uses. The 10,000 MT CO$_2$e per-year threshold for industrial uses would be recommended for use by all lead agencies. Under option 1, separate screening thresholds are proposed for residential projects (3,500 MT CO$_2$e per year), commercial projects (1,400 MT CO$_2$e per year), and mixed-use projects (3,000 MT CO$_2$e per year). Under option 2, a single numerical screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO$_2$e per year would be used for all non-industrial projects. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable screening threshold, move to Tier 4.

Tier 4. Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of applicable performance standards for the project service population (population plus employment). The efficiency targets were established based on the goal of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The 2020 efficiency targets are 4.8 MT CO$_2$e per-service population for project-level analyses and 6.6 MT CO$_2$e per-service population for plan-level analyses. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable efficiency targets, move to Tier 5.

Tier 5. Consider the implementation of CEQA mitigation (including the purchase of GHG offsets) to reduce the project efficiency target to Tier 4 levels.

To determine the proposed project’s potential to generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment, its GHG emissions were compared to the SCAQMD recommended quantitative threshold of 3,000 MT CO$_2$e per year.

Construction GHG Emissions

Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with use of off-road construction equipment, on-road haul and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. The SCAQMD Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (2008b) recommends that “construction emissions be amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies.” Thus, the total construction GHG emissions were calculated, amortized over 30 years, and added to the total operational emissions for comparison with the GHG significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO$_2$e per year. The determination of significance, therefore, is addressed in the operational emissions discussion following the estimated construction emissions.

CalEEMod was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the construction scenario described in Section 3.3. Construction of the project is anticipated to commence in February 2020, lasting a total of 6 months and reaching completion in July 2020. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment and off-site sources include haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. Table 10 presents construction GHG emissions for the project in 2020 from on-site and off-site emission sources.
Table 10. Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metric Tons per Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>410.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>411.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>411.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Emissions (over 30 years)</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent. See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 10, the estimated total GHG emissions during construction of would be approximately 412 MT CO₂e. Estimated project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 14 MT CO₂e per year. As with project-generated construction air quality pollutant emissions, GHG emissions generated during construction of the project would be short-term in nature, lasting only for the duration of the construction period, and would not represent a long-term source of GHG emissions. Because there is no separate GHG threshold for construction, the evaluation of significance is discussed in the operational emissions analysis in the following text.

Operational GHG Emissions

CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 was used to estimate potential project-generated operational GHG emissions from area sources (landscape maintenance), natural gas combustion, electrical generation, water supply and wastewater treatment, solid waste, and off-road equipment (electric forklifts). As with the air quality analysis, mobile source GHG emissions were estimated using a spreadsheet model based on EMFAC 2017 emission factors. Emissions from each category—area sources, energy sources, mobile sources, solid waste, water supply and wastewater treatment, and off-road equipment—is discussed in the following text with respect to the project. For additional details, see Section 3.3 for a discussion of operational emission calculation methodology and assumptions, specifically for area, energy (natural gas), and mobile sources. Operational year 2021 was assumed to be the first full year of operation following completion of construction.

Area Sources

CalEEMod was used to estimate GHG emissions from the project’s area sources, which include operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment, which produce minimal GHG emissions. It was assumed that 100% of the landscaping equipment would be gasoline powered. Consumer product use and architectural coatings result in VOC emissions, which are analyzed in air quality analysis only, and low-to-no GHG emissions.

Energy Sources

The estimation of operational energy emissions was based on CalEEMod land use defaults and units or total area (i.e., square footage) of the project’s land uses. For non-residential buildings, CalEEMod energy intensity value (electricity or natural gas usage per square foot per year) assumptions were based on the California Commercial End-Use Survey database. Emissions are calculated by multiplying the energy use by the utility carbon intensity (pounds of GHGs per kilowatt-hour for electricity or 1,000 British thermal
units for natural gas) for CO₂ and other GHGs. Annual natural gas (non-hearth) and electricity emissions were estimated in CalEEMod using the emissions factors for SCE, which would be the energy source provider for the project. CalEEMod default energy intensity factors (CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O mass emissions per kilowatt-hour) for SCE is based on the value for SCE’s energy mix. Senate Bill X1 2 established a target of 33% from renewable energy sources for all electricity providers in California by 2020 and SB 350 calls for further development of renewable energy, with a target of 50% by 2030. The CO₂ emissions intensity factor for utility energy use in CalEEMod was adjusted consistent with SCE’s 2016 Power Content Label, which reported that 28% of the power mix was generated by eligible renewable sources (SCE 2017). As explained under air quality, it was assumed that the project would exceed 2016 Title 24 building energy efficiency standards by 5% consistent with MM 4.2-5a.

**Mobile Sources**

All details for criteria air pollutants discussed in Section 3.3 are also applicable for the estimation of operational mobile source GHG emissions. It was assumed that the warehouse would operation 7 days per week; therefore, 365 days of vehicle emissions were assumed. Regulatory measures related to mobile sources include AB 1493 (Pavley) and related federal standards. AB 1493 required that CARB establish GHG emission standards for automobiles, light-duty trucks, and other vehicles determined by CARB to be vehicles that are primarily used for noncommercial personal transportation in the state. In addition, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and EPA have established corporate fuel economy standards and GHG emission standards, respectively, for automobiles and light-, medium-, and heavy-duty vehicles. Implementation of these standards and fleet turnover (replacement of older vehicles with newer ones) will gradually reduce emissions from the project’s motor vehicles. The effectiveness of fuel economy improvements was evaluated to the extent it was captured in the EMFAC2014 emission factors for motor vehicles in 2021.

**Solid Waste**

The project would generate solid waste, and therefore, result in CO₂e emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. CalEEMod default values for solid waste generation were used to estimate GHG emissions associated with solid waste.

**Water and Wastewater**

Supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water for the project require the use of electricity, which would result in associated indirect GHG emissions. Similarly, wastewater generated by the proposed project requires the use of electricity for conveyance and treatment, along with GHG emissions generated during wastewater treatment. Water consumption estimates for both indoor and outdoor water use and associated electricity consumption from water use and wastewater generation were estimated using CalEEMod default values.

**Off-Road Equipment**

As explained under air quality, while the exact operational off-road equipment is unknown at this time, it was conservatively assumed that six electric-operated forklifts would operate for 8 hours per day at the project site.
The estimated operational (year 2021) project-generated GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, motor vehicles, solid waste generation, water usage and wastewater generation, and off-road equipment are shown in Table 11.

### Table 11. Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metric tons per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>124.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1,733.72</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1,754.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply and wastewater</td>
<td>132.68</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>142.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road equipment</td>
<td>104.74</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>105.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,196.69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amortized Construction Emissions** | 13.73

**Operation + Amortized Construction Total** | 2,210.42

**Notes:** CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent

See Appendix A for detailed results.

As shown in Table 11, estimated annual project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 2,197 MT CO₂e per year as a result of project operation. Estimated annual project-generated operational emissions in 2021 and amortized project construction emissions of approximately 14 MT CO₂e per year would be approximately 2,210 MT CO₂e per year. Annual operational GHG emissions with amortized construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD recommended threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the project’s GHG contribution would not be cumulatively considerable and is less than significant.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with the generation of GHG emissions would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.**

**Consistency with the Attorney General Recommendations**

The project would not prevent the SWIP Specific Plan from achieving the Attorney General’s recommendations and would achieve a minimum of 28.5% reduction in GHG emissions from business-as-usual conditions with implementation of the mitigation measures as identified in the SWIP EIR. The proposed project would not conflict with the Attorney General’s recommended measures that are identified in the SWIP EIR including measures for energy efficiency, renewable energy, water conservation and efficiency, solid waste, land uses, and transportation and motor vehicles. Table 12 presents an evaluation of how the proposed project would comply with the Attorney General’s 2008 recommended measures (Attorney General 2008).
Table 12. Compliance with Attorney General's Recommendation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attorney General's Recommended Measures</th>
<th>Compliance with Attorney General's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design buildings to be energy efficient. Site buildings to take advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping and sun screens to reduce energy use.</td>
<td>The project is consistent with and does not conflict with the goals and objectives of these measures. The proposed project would comply with the current Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency code requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install light colored “cool” roofs, cool pavements, and strategically placed shade trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install solar and wind power systems, solar and tankless hot water heaters, and energy-efficient heating ventilation and air conditioning. Educate consumers about existing incentives.</td>
<td>The project would not conflict with this measure. As required by the current Title 24 building standards, the project would be required to satisfy the mandatory requirements for being solar ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Conservation and Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create water-efficient landscapes.</td>
<td>The project does not conflict with these measures or prohibit the SWIP Specific Plan from implementation of these measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and location. The strategy may include many of the specific items listed above, plus other innovative measures that are appropriate to the specific project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation in new developments. Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement low-impact development practices that maintain the existing hydrologic character of the site to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Retaining storm water runoff on-site can drastically reduce the need for energy-intensive imported water at the site.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solid Waste Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste and adequate recycling containers located in public areas.</td>
<td>The project does not conflict with this measure. The proposed project would provide the requisite waste bins as required by the City’s municipal code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Compliance with Attorney General’s Recommendation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attorney General’s Recommended Measures</th>
<th>Compliance with Attorney General’s Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include mixed-use, infill, and higher density in development projects to support the reduction of vehicle trips, promote alternatives to individual vehicle travel, and promote efficient delivery of services and goods.</td>
<td>The project does not conflict with these measures or prohibit the SWIP Specific Plan from implementation of these measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and create open space and parks. Preserve existing trees, and plant replacement trees at a set ratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include pedestrian and bicycle-only streets and plazas within developments. Create travel routes that ensure that destinations may be reached conveniently by public transportation, bicycling or walking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit idling time for commercial vehicles, including delivery and construction vehicles.</td>
<td>The project does not conflict with this measure. Additionally, the project would be required to limit idle times pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote “least polluting” ways to connect people and goods to their destinations.</td>
<td>The project does not conflict with this measure or prohibit the SWIP Specific Plan from implementation of this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create bicycle lanes and walking paths directed to the location of schools, parks and other destination points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For commercial projects, provide adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. For large employers, provide facilities that encourage bicycle commuting, including, e.g., locked bicycle storage or covered or indoor bicycle parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SWIP = Southwest Industrial Park.

Consistency with CARB’s Scoping Plan

The Scoping Plan (approved by CARB in 2008 and updated in 2014 and 2017) provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. The Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to specific projects, nor is it intended to be used for project-level evaluations.15 Under the Scoping Plan, however, there are several state regulatory measures aimed at the identification and reduction of GHG emissions. CARB and other state agencies have adopted many of the measures identified in the Scoping Plan. Most of these measures focus on area source emissions (e.g., energy usage, high-GWP GHGs in consumer products) and changes to the vehicle fleet (i.e., hybrid, electric, and more fuel-efficient vehicles) and associated fuels (e.g., Low Carbon Fuel Standard), among others.

15 The Final Statement of Reasons for the amendments to the CEQA Guidelines reiterates the statement in the Initial Statement of Reasons that “[t]he Scoping Plan may not be appropriate for use in determining the significance of individual projects because it is conceptual at this stage and relies on the future development of regulations to implement the strategies identified in the Scoping Plan” (CNRA 2009).
The Scoping Plan recommends strategies for implementation at the statewide level to meet the goals of AB 32 and establishes an overall framework for the measures that will be adopted to reduce California’s GHG emissions. Table 13 highlights measures that have been, or will be, developed under the Scoping Plan and presents the proposed project’s consistency with Scoping Plan measures. The proposed project would comply with all regulations adopted in furtherance of the Scoping Plan to the extent required by law and to the extent that they are applicable to the proposed project.

Table 13. Proposed Project Consistency with Scoping Plan GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Measure</th>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Proposed Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Clean Cars</td>
<td>T-1</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project’s employees would purchase vehicles in compliance with CARB vehicle standards that are in effect at the time of vehicle purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Carbon Fuel Standard</td>
<td>T-2</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by a project applicant or lead agency. Nonetheless, this standard would be applicable to the fuel used by vehicles that would access the project site (i.e., motor vehicles driven by the proposed project’s employees would use compliant fuels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets</td>
<td>T-3</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project is not related to developing GHG emission reduction targets. To meet the goals of SB 375, the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS is applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would not preclude the implementation of this strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Clean Transit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last-Mile Delivery</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in VMT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Efficiency Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tire Pressure</td>
<td>T-4</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> These standards would be applicable to the light-duty vehicles that would access the proposed project site. Motor vehicles driven by the proposed project’s employees would maintain proper tire pressure when their vehicles are serviced. The proposed project’s employees would replace tires in compliance with CARB vehicle standards that are in effect at the time of vehicle purchase. Motor vehicles driven by the proposed project’s employees would use low-friction oils when their vehicles are serviced. The proposed project’s employees would purchase vehicles in compliance with CARB vehicle standards that are in effect at the time of vehicle purchase. In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fuel Efficiency Tire Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low-Friction Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Solar-Reflective Automotive Paint and Window Glazing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship Electrification at Ports (Shore Power)</td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Proposed Project Consistency with Scoping Plan GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Measure</th>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Proposed Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods Movement Efficiency Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Port Drayage Trucks</td>
<td>T-6</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transport Refrigeration Units Cold Storage Prohibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cargo Handling Equipment, Anti-Idling, Hybrid, Electrification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goods Movement Systemwide Efficiency Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Commercial Harbor Craft Maintenance and Design Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clean Ships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vessel Speed Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Duty Vehicle GHG Emission Reduction</td>
<td>T-7</td>
<td>Consistent. Heavy-duty vehicles would be required to comply with CARB GHG reduction measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tractor-Trailer GHG Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heavy-Duty Greenhouse Gas Standards for New Vehicle and Engines (Phase I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicle Hybridization Voucher Incentive Proposed Project</td>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project medium- and heavy-duty vehicles (e.g., delivery trucks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>could take advantage of the vehicle hybridization action, which would reduce GHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emissions through increased fuel efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium and Heavy-Duty GHG Phase 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Speed Rail</td>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and Natural Gas Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency Measures (Electricity)</td>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project would comply with the current Title 24 Building Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency Standards. In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency (Natural Gas)</td>
<td>CR-1</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project would comply with the current Title 24 Building Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency Standards. In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Water Heating (California Solar Initiative Thermal Program)</td>
<td>CR-2</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project is not anticipated to require substantial amounts of hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water to make solar water heating feasible. Nonetheless, the proposed project would include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>solar water heating if necessitated and feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Heat and Power</td>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13. Proposed Project Consistency with Scoping Plan GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Measure</th>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Proposed Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewables Portfolio Standard (33% by 2020)</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The electricity used by the proposed project would benefit from reduced GHG emissions resulting from increased use of renewable energy sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables Portfolio Standard (50% by 2050)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The electricity used by the proposed project would benefit from reduced GHG emissions resulting from increased use of renewable energy sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1 Million Solar Roofs (California Solar Initiative, New Solar Home Partnership, Public Utility Programs) and Earlier Solar Programs</td>
<td>E-4</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Use Efficiency</td>
<td>W-1</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Recycling</td>
<td>W-2</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>W-3</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> This is applicable for the transmission and treatment of water, but it is not applicable for the proposed project. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuse Urban Runoff</td>
<td>W-4</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy Production</td>
<td>W-5</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> Applicable for wastewater treatment systems. In addition, the proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Green Building Initiative: Leading the Way with State Buildings (Greening New and Existing State Buildings)</td>
<td>GB-1</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project would be required to be constructed in compliance with state or local green building standards in effect at the time of building construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Standards Code (Greening New Public Schools, Residential and Commercial Buildings)</td>
<td>GB-1</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project’s buildings would meet green building standards that are in effect at the time of design and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Code: Voluntary Programs at the Local Level (Greening New Public Schools, Residential and Commercial Buildings)</td>
<td>GB-1</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project’s buildings would meet green building standards that are in effect at the time of design and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greening Existing Buildings (Greening Existing Homes and Commercial Buildings)</td>
<td>GB-1</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is applicable for existing buildings only; it is not applicable for portions of the proposed project except as future standards may become applicable to existing buildings. For proposed project building that would be retrofitted, the buildings would meet current applicable building standards at the time of design and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency and Co-Benefits Audits for Large Industrial Sources</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13. Proposed Project Consistency with Scoping Plan GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Measure</th>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Proposed Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas Extraction GHG Emission Reduction</td>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce GHG Emissions by 20% in Oil Refinery Sector</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG Emissions Reduction from Natural Gas Transmission and Distribution</td>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery Flare Recovery Process Improvements</td>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the Local Air Districts to Evaluate Amendments to Their Existing Leak Detection and Repair Rules for Industrial Facilities to Include Methane Leaks</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling and Waste Management Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Methane Control Measure</td>
<td>RW-1</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the Efficiency of Landfill Methane Capture</td>
<td>RW-2</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Commercial Recycling</td>
<td>RW-3</td>
<td>Consistent. During both construction and operation of the proposed project, the project would comply with all state regulations related to solid waste generation, storage, and disposal, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act, as amended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Production and Markets for Compost and Other Organics</td>
<td>RW-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic/Aerobic Digestion</td>
<td>RW-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Producer Responsibility</td>
<td>RW-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Preferable Purchasing</td>
<td>RW-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forests Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Forest Target</td>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High GWP Gases Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Systems: Reduction of Refrigerant Emissions from Non-Professional Servicing</td>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>Consistent. The proposed project’s employees would be prohibited from performing air conditioning repairs and would be required to use professional servicing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFs Limits in Non-Utility and Non-Semiconductor Applications</td>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) in Semiconductor Manufacturing</td>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>Not applicable. The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Proposed Project Consistency with Scoping Plan GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Measure</th>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Proposed Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limit High GWP Use in Consumer Products</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The proposed project’s employees would use consumer products that would comply with the regulations that are in effect at the time of manufacture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning Refrigerant Leak Test During Vehicle Smog Check</td>
<td>H-5</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> Motor vehicles driven by the proposed project’s employees would comply with the leak test requirements during smog checks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Equipment Refrigerant Management Program – Refrigerant Tracking/Reporting/Repair Program</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Equipment Refrigerant Management Program – Specifications for Commercial and Industrial Refrigeration</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆ Leak Reduction Gas Insulated Switchgear</td>
<td>H-6</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Reduction in Methane and Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) Emissions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Reduction in Black Carbon Emissions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane Capture at Large Dairies</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td><strong>Not applicable.</strong> The proposed project would not prevent CARB from implementing this measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CARB = California Air Resources Board; VMT = vehicle miles traveled; SB = Senate Bill; N/A = not applicable; SF₆ = sulfur hexafluoride.

Consistency with Executive Order S-3-05 and Senate Bill 32

- **EO S-3-05.** This EO establishes the following goals: GHG emissions should be reduced to 2000 levels by 2010, to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
- **SB 32.** This bill establishes for a statewide GHG emissions reduction target whereby CARB, in adopting rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emissions reductions, shall ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to at least 40% below 1990 levels by December 31, 2030.

This section evaluates whether the GHG emissions trajectory after proposed project completion would impede the attainment of the 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction goals identified in EOs B-30-15 and S-3-05.
To begin, CARB has expressed optimism with regard to both the 2030 and 2050 goals. It states in the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan that “California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 GHG emissions limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32” (CARB 2014, p. ES2). With regard to the 2050 target for reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels, the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan states the following (CARB 2014, p. 34):

This level of reduction is achievable in California. In fact, if California realizes the expected benefits of existing policy goals (such as 12,000 megawatts of renewable distributed generation by 2020, net zero energy homes after 2020, existing building retrofits under AB 758, and others) it could reduce emissions by 2030 to levels squarely in line with those needed in the developed world and to stay on track to reduce emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Additional measures, including locally driven measures and those necessary to meet federal air quality standards in 2032, could lead to even greater emission reductions.

In other words, CARB believes that the state is on a trajectory to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction targets set forth in AB 32, EO B-30-15, and EO S-3-05. This is confirmed in the 2017 Scoping Plan, which states (CARB 2017):

The Scoping Plan builds upon the successful framework established by the Initial Scoping Plan and First Update, while identifying new, technologically feasible and cost-effective strategies to ensure that California meets its GHG reduction targets in a way that promotes and rewards innovation, continues to foster economic growth, and delivers improvements to the environment and public health, including in disadvantaged communities.

The proposed project would not interfere with implementation of any of the above-described GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050 because the project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s draft interim threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year (SCAQMD 2010). This threshold was established based on the goal of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Because the proposed project would not exceed the threshold, this analysis provides support for the conclusion that the project would not impede the state’s trajectory toward the above-described statewide GHG reduction goals for 2030 or 2050. In addition, the project would comply with laws and regulations that would reduce GHG emissions.

Furthermore, the proposed project would not conflict with the state’s trajectory toward future GHG reductions. In addition, since the specific path to compliance for the state in regards to the long-term goals will likely require development of technology or other changes that are not currently known or available, specific additional mitigation measures for the project would be speculative and cannot be identified at this time. The proposed project’s consistency would assist in meeting the City’s contribution to GHG emission reduction targets in California. With respect to future GHG targets under SB 32 and EO S-3-05, CARB has also made clear its legal interpretation that it has the requisite authority to adopt whatever regulations are necessary, beyond the AB 32 horizon year of 2020, to meet SB 32’s 40% reduction target by 2030 and EO S-3-05’s 80% reduction target by 2050; this legal interpretation by an expert agency provides evidence that future regulations will be adopted to continue the state on its trajectory toward meeting these future GHG targets.
Based on the above considerations, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and no mitigation is required. This impact would be less than significant.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with applicable GHG reduction plans, policies, or regulations would occur; the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; and no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusions

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with GHG emissions would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to GHG emissions:

**MM-4.2-5a** See Section 3.6, Energy.

### 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

d) Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

g) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? No Impact.
Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Short Term Construction Impacts

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. During project construction, potentially hazardous materials would be handled on site. These materials would include gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and other petroleum-based products used to operate and maintain construction equipment. Handling of these potentially hazardous materials would be temporary and would coincide with the short-term construction phase. Although these materials could be stored on site, storage would be required to comply with the guidelines established by the manufacturer’s recommendations. Consistent with federal, state, and local requirements, transport, removal, and disposal of hazardous materials from the project site would be conducted by a permitted and licensed service provider. Any handling, transport, use, or disposal would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations, including the EPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Caltrans, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the San Bernardino County Fire Department (the Certified Unified Program Agency for San Bernardino County).

Because of the age of the existing on-site buildings, there is a possibility that potentially hazardous building materials such as asbestos-containing material (ACM) or lead-based paint (LBP) could be encountered during demolition activities. Consistent with MM-4.5-2c from the PEIR, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, a Certified Environmental Professional will confirm the presence or absence of ACMs and LBPs prior to structural demolition/renovation activities. Should ACMs or LBPs be present, demolition materials containing ACMs and/or LBPs will be removed and disposed of at an appropriate permitted facility.

Pursuant to MM-4.5-2a and MM-4.5-2b from the PEIR, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (Appendix D-1) was prepared in accordance with American Society of Testing and Materials Standards and Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries. The Phase I ESA investigated the potential for site contamination and identified specific recognized environmental conditions (RECs) requiring additional investigation and assessment. Based on the identification of on-site RECs and the recommendations of the Phase I ESA, a Phase II ESA (Appendix D-2) was subsequently prepared to further evaluate the RECs. As part of this process, nine soil borings were taken on the project site at depths of 0.5, 2, and 5 feet below ground surface. The collected soil samples were sealed, labeled, recorded on chain-of-custody documentation, and transported to a certified laboratory facility for testing.

The results of the soil testing found that the project site includes localized areas of shallow soils containing higher than acceptable levels of contaminants such as arsenic, lead, chromium, Aroclor, and toluene. In compliance with MM-4.5-2a and MM-4.5-2b from the PEIR, the Phase II ESA included recommendations that the project applicant must abide by in order ensure that on-site contaminated soils are properly removed from the project site, characterized, and disposed of off site.
Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with creation of a hazard to the public or the environment due to hazardous materials would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Potentially hazardous materials associated with project operations would include materials used during typical cleaning and maintenance activities. Although these potentially hazardous materials would vary, they would generally include household cleaning products, paints, fertilizers, and herbicides and pesticides. Many of these materials are considered household hazardous wastes, common wastes, and/or universal wastes by the EPA, which considers these types of wastes to be common to businesses and households and to pose a lower risk to people and the environment than other hazardous wastes when properly handled, transported, used, and disposed of (EPA 2019c). Federal, state, and local regulations typically allow these types of wastes to be handled and disposed of with less stringent standards than other hazardous wastes, and many of these wastes do not have to be managed as hazardous waste. Additionally, any potentially hazardous material handled on the project site would be limited in both quantity and concentrations, consistent with other similar industrial uses located in the City, and any handling, transport, use, and disposal would comply with applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations. Further, as mandated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA n.d.), all hazardous materials stored on the project site would be accompanied by a Material Safety Data Sheet, which would inform employees and first responders as to the necessary remediation procedures in the case of accidental release.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with creation of a hazard to the public or the environment due to hazardous materials would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Henry J. Kaiser High School is located immediately south of the project site. MM-4.5-1a mandates that the City require new facilities involved in the production, use, storage, transport or disposal of hazardous materials be located a safe distance from land uses that may be adversely impacted by such activities, including schools. However, as previously discussed, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. As such, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste in proximity to a school.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with emitting or handling hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of a school would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
d) Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. According to the Phase I ESA (Appendix D-1), at least two current or former occupants of the project site were listed in regulatory databases. No violations were reported in connection with these compliance-related listings and the Phase I ESA stated that inclusion on these databases was not considered a REC for future development of the project site.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with hazardous materials sites would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The nearest operational public-use airport to the project site is Ontario International Airport, which is located approximately 10 miles west, well outside of the project area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with public airport and private airstrip hazards would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Roadway facilities that are designated in the General Plan Community Mobility and Circulation Chapter (City of Fontana 2018c) as major, primary, or secondary highways, as well as other streets with regional access, are assumed to serve as evacuation routes in the event of a regional emergency. Local access to the project site would be provided by Almond Avenue. While its feasible that one travel lane on Almond Avenue may be temporarily closed due to street improvements required during construction, the remaining lane(s) would remain open, and regional access would be preserved throughout construction of the project. This construction-period lane closure would be short term, and the lane would reopen upon completion of construction activities. Additionally, consistent with MM-4.5-6a, prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant will be required to prepare a traffic control plan for implementation during the construction phase. Among other items, the traffic control plan may include provisions such as providing a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls should only a single lane be available during construction.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with emergency response or evacuation plans would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
g) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The project site is located in a highly developed part of the City outside of an urban-wildland interface. The project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2008), and the nearest natural open space area is found more than 1 mile south of the site.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildland fires would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

**Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project**

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to hazards and hazardous materials:

**MM-4.5-1a** The City shall require that new proposed facilities involved in the production, use, storage, transport or disposal of hazardous materials be located a safe distance from land uses that may be adversely impacted by such activities. Conversely, new sensitive facilities, such as schools, child-care centers, and senior centers, shall not to be located near existing sites that use, store, or generate hazardous materials.

**MM-4.5-1b** The City shall assure the continued response and capability of the San Bernardino County Fire Department/Fontana Fire Protection District to handle hazardous materials incidents in the City and along the sections of freeways that extend across the City.

**MM-4.5-1c** The City shall require all businesses that handle hazardous materials above the reportable quantity to submit an inventory of the hazardous materials that they manage to the San Bernardino County Fire Department – Hazardous Materials Division in coordination with the Fontana Fire Protection District.

**MM-4.5-1d** The City shall identify roadways along which hazardous materials are routinely transported. If essential facilities, such as schools, hospitals, child care centers or other facilities with special evacuation needs are located along these routes, identify emergency response plans that these facilities can implement in the event of an unauthorized release of hazardous materials in their area.

**MM-4.5-2a** A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be prepared in accordance with American Society of Testing and Materials Standards and Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries prior to issuance of a Grading Permit for future development within the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall investigate the potential for site contamination, and will identify Specific Recognized Environmental Conditions (i.e., asbestos containing materials, lead-based paints, polychlorinated biphenyls, etc.) that may require remedial activities prior to land acquisition or construction.
MM-4.5-2b Prior to potential remedial excavation and grading activities within the site (if remediation is required), impacted areas shall be cleared of all maintenance equipment and materials (e.g., solvents, grease, waste oil), construction materials, miscellaneous stockpiled debris (e.g., scrap metal, pallets, storage bins, construction parts), above ground storage tanks, surface trash, piping, excess vegetation and other deleterious materials. These materials shall be removed off-site and properly disposed of at an approved disposal facility. Once removed, a visual inspection of the areas beneath the removed materials shall be performed.

Any stained soils observed underneath the removed materials shall be sampled. In the event concentrations of materials are detected above regulatory cleanup levels during demolition or construction activities, the project applicant shall comply with the following measures in accordance with Federal, State, and local requirements:

- Excavation and disposal at a permitted, off-site facility;
- On-site remediation, if necessary; or
- Other measures as deemed appropriate by the County.

MM-4.5-2c Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, a Certified Environmental Professional shall confirm the presence or absence of ACMs and LBPs prior to structural demolition/renovation activities. Should ACMs or LBPs be present, demolition materials containing ACMs and/or LBPs shall be removed and disposed of at an appropriate permitted facility.

MM-4.5-6a Prior to the issuance of grading permits, future developers shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan for implementation during the construction phase. The Plan may include the following provisions, among others:

- At least one unobstructed lane shall be maintained in both directions on surrounding roadways.
- At any time only a single lane is available, the developer shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls to allow travel in both directions.
- If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway segment, the developer shall provide appropriate signage indicating detours/alternative routes.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? **Less-Than-Significant Impact.**

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? **Less-Than-Significant Impact.**
c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

iv. impede or redirect flood flows? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

d) Would the project result in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? No Impact.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Short Term Construction Impacts

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Project construction would include earthwork activities that could potentially result in erosion, which could subsequently degrade downstream water quality and/or violate water quality standards. The State Water Resources Control Board requires dischargers whose projects disturb 1 acre of soil or more to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit (Water Quality Order 2009-0009-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and ground disturbances such as trenching, stockpiling, or excavation. Since the project would include clearing and grading of an area more than 1 acre in size, a Construction General Permit would be required prior to the start of construction.

The Construction General Permit requires development and implementation of an SWPPP. The SWPPP identifies which structural and nonstructural BMPs will be implemented on site, such as sandbag barriers, gravel driveways, dust controls, and construction worker training. The implementation of a Construction General Permit, including preparation of an SWPPP and incorporation of BMPs, would reduce both stormwater runoff and soil erosion impacts to acceptable levels, which would subsequently minimize the opportunity for impacts to downstream receiving waters.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
Long-Term Operational Impacts

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Once the project is operational, the primary source of pollutants would be from passenger vehicles and trucks located on surface parking areas and loading docks. Potential pollutants of concern with a parking lot and warehouse loading area include trash and debris, oil and grease, organic compounds, and heavy metals. The stormwater generated on site, along with any pollutants contained within the stormwater, would be directed into the on-site engineered stormwater system and treated prior to discharge into the municipal storm drain system.

Therefore, no new or more severe long-term operational impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would be the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Groundwater Supplies

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located within the service area of the Fontana Water Company (FWC). According to FWC’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (FWC 2016), FWC currently obtains water from three different sources: local groundwater basins (primarily the Chino Basin), local surface water, and imported surface water.

FWC pumps groundwater from 15 active wells located within the Chino Basin, from 4 active wells located within the Rialto Basin, from 3 active wells within the No Man’s Land Basin (unnamed basin located between the Chino and Rialto Basins), and from 10 active wells located within Lytle Basin Creek.

Groundwater levels within these basins are both individually and collectively monitored by their respective watermasters to prevent future overdraft of the groundwater basins. Legal, regulatory, and other mechanisms are currently in place to ensure that the amount of groundwater pumped in the broader project region does not exceed safe yields/operating safe yields. Thus, although the project would rely on water supplies that would be composed, at least in part, of groundwater, all extraction of groundwater for use by FWC is actively managed to prevent overdraft, ensure the long-term reliability of the groundwater basins, and avoid adverse effects to groundwater supplies.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with groundwater supplies would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Groundwater Recharge

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Under the proposed conditions, on-site stormwater would drain into an engineered stormwater system, which, along with pervious areas on the project site such as landscape areas and the approximately 0.8-acre detention/retention basin located on the southern part of the project site, would allow water to drain into subsurface soils and maximize the natural infiltration capacity.
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with groundwater recharge would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

c) **Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Given that no stormwater drainage facilities currently serve the existing project site, development of the project and installations of the new on-site engineered stormwater system would inevitably alter the existing on-site drainage pattern. However, instead of allowing uncontrolled stormwater flows to be conveyed off site, the proposed engineered storm drain system will be constructed on the project site to collect and treat on-site stormwater runoff. On-site stormwater will be collected and conveyed via a series of inlets and catch basins. Further, on-site stormwater originating in the southern portion of the project site, including the truck court and tractor-trailer parking areas, would be allowed to sheet flow to the approximately 0.8-acre detention/retention basin located near the southern project boundary. As such, although the project would alter the existing drainage pattern on the project site, this change would not result in adverse effects related to erosion, siltation, flooding, and polluted runoff.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with existing drainage patterns would occur; the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; and no new mitigation measures are required.

d) **In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06065C0036H (FEMA 2008), the project site is located outside of both a 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard Zone (100-year floodplain) and 0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard Zone (500-year floodplain). Additionally, per the County of San Bernardino General Plan Hazard Overlays map, the project site is located outside of a dam inundation area. Further, because of the project’s inland location, relatively flat topography, and lack of an adjacent perennial body of water, the project site would not be susceptible to tsunami, mudflow, or seiche.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with flooding, tsunami, mudflow, seiche, or inundation would occur; the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; and no new mitigation measures are required.

e) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Refer to responses provided for Impact 3.10(a) and 3.10(b).
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with hydrology and water quality would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

**Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project**

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to hydrology and water quality.

### 3.11 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Significance Determination**

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

- a) Would the project physically divide an established community? *Less-Than-Significant Impact.*
- b) Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? *Less-Than-Significant Impact.*

**Project Significance Determination**

- a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

  *No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The physical division of an established community is typically associated with the construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility.
within an existing community or between a community and an outlying area. Currently, the project site
is located within a largely industrial area of the City, and thus, is not used as a connection between two
established, defined, residential communities.

Instead, connectivity in the surrounding project area is facilitated via local roadways and pedestrian
facilities. Despite the nearby scattered residential uses, the project would not impede movement between
these residences within the project area, within an established community, or from one established
community to another. Further, the project would include improvements such as a new sidewalk that
would improve pedestrian connectivity and safety along the project frontage.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with the physical division of an established
community would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no
new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project conflict cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan,
policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The City’s General Plan Land Use Map designates the
project site as Light Industrial (I-L) (City of Fontana 2018a). The City’s Zoning Map shows the site as being
zoned as the SWIP Specific Plan (within the SWIP Specific Plan area, the project site is located in the JND)
(City of Fontana 2011). According to the SWIP Specific Plan, the JND is intended to “encourage small
business development by allowing a mixture of development types and uses including light industrial,
warehousing, logistics-based distribution, office, flex tech, research and development, and service
commercial” (City of Fontana 2011).

A review of Table 7-2 of the SWIP Specific Plan, which lists permitted, conditionally permitted, and non-
permitted uses within the JND, found that both “Logistics and Distribution Facilities” and “Warehouse
Facilities” uses are permitted in the JND. Thus, based on a review of both the SWIP Specific Plan and the
project, the proposed industrial/warehouse building is a permitted use within the JND. As such, it follows
that the project’s land use, proposed activities, and development intensity were already assumed and
evaluated in the SWIP Specific Plan and PEIR, respectively, and the project would then be consistent with
local plans, policies, and regulations that were previously adopted to guide land use decisions and to
avoid or mitigate environmental effects.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with applicable land use plans, policies, and
regulations would occur; the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; and no
new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with land use and planning would occur, and the level
of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to land use and planning.
3.12 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? **No Impact.**

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? **No Impact.**

Project Significance Determination

a) **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

b) **Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, there are no gas, geothermal, or other known wells located on or in the vicinity of the project site; the nearest wells to the project site are located over 1 mile north near the Fontana Speedway and over 5 miles east within the City of Colton (CDOC 2019c). Additionally, maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation show that the project site is located within an MRZ-3 area, which is an area containing inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance (CDOC 2019d). Nonetheless, the project site is located in an urbanized, industrial portion of the City and is bound by existing and future development in all directions. Mineral resource mining is not a compatible use with existing surrounding land uses. Additionally, the project site is not large enough to extract mineral resources effectively. Considering the existing surrounding land
uses and the incompatibility of mineral resource extraction activities in the project area, potential significant mineral resources within the project area are considered unavailable for extraction.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with mineral resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with the mineral resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to mineral resources.

3.13 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

c) Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The City’s General Plan Noise and Safety Chapter includes goals, policies, and actions that pertain to protecting new development from noise impacts through compatible use with surrounding areas, road maintenance standards, and setbacks (City of Fontana 2018d). The chapter establishes that standards for exterior and interior noise levels shall be consistent with the City Code of Ordinances (Chapter 18), which provides guidelines to evaluate the acceptability of noise impacts. A noise technical report (Appendix E) was prepared by Dudek in May 2019 to evaluate the noise generation potential associated with construction and operation of the proposed project. As part of the noise technical report, noise measurements with manual traffic counts were conducted at noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to the project site on September 5, 2019. In addition, one long-term noise measurement was also taken September 5–6, 2019. These measurements were intended to determine the existing noise levels in the project vicinity near noise-sensitive land uses, resulting from traffic or from other sources. Table 14 provides the location, date, and time the noise measurements were taken. These locations are also depicted as ST1 through ST6 (short-term) and LT1 (long-term) on Figure 8, Noise Measurement Locations.
### Table 14. Measured Short-Term Sound Levels and Traffic Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;eq1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;max2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>MT&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>HT&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>B&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>MC&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>10990 Almond Avenue (Residential)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 9:12 a.m. to 9:27 a.m.</td>
<td>65.6 dB</td>
<td>85.1 dB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>11010 Almond Avenue (Residential)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 9:35 a.m. to 9:50 a.m.</td>
<td>67.2 dB</td>
<td>86.5 dB</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>11041 Almond Avenue (Residential)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 10:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.</td>
<td>65.8 dB</td>
<td>85.0 dB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>11112 Almond Avenue (Residential)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 10:25 a.m. to 10:40 a.m.</td>
<td>64.3 dB</td>
<td>80.5 dB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>North end of Kaiser High School (southern edge of north parking lot)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 11:11 a.m. to 11:26 a.m.</td>
<td>64.3 dB</td>
<td>91.2 dB</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>North end of Kaiser High School (athletic field)</td>
<td>9/5/2019 11:30 a.m. to 11:46 a.m.</td>
<td>58.9 dB</td>
<td>74.6 dB</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Appendix E.

**Table Notes:**

1. Equivalent Continuous Sound Level (Time-Average Sound Level)
2. Maximum Sound Level
3. Medium Trucks
4. Heavy Trucks
5. Busses
6. Motorcycles

n/a not applicable – traffic counts not conducted because the local roadway was not readily visible from the measurement location.

**General Notes:**

Temperature 83°F to 89°F, sunny, calm winds.

**Construction Noise**

Noise generated by project construction equipment would include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that, when combined, can reach high levels. The number and mix of construction equipment would likely vary during the following stages:

- Demolition
- Site preparation
- Grading
- Building construction
- Paving
- Architectural coating
With the noise sources identified above, a noise analysis was performed using a model developed by the Federal Highway Administration called the Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2008). Input variables for Roadway Construction Noise Model consist of the receiver/land use types, the equipment type (i.e., backhoe, crane, truck, etc.), the number of equipment pieces, the duty cycle for each piece of equipment (i.e., percentage of each time period the equipment typically is in operation), and the distance between the construction noise source and the sensitive receiver.

Table 15 provides a summary of the construction noise levels by each stage at the nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations. Based on the stages of construction, noise impacts associated with the project are expected to create temporary high noise levels at the nearby receptor locations. Noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the project include a residence to the west (approximately 55 feet from the project site/construction boundary) and a school to the south (approximately 65 feet from the construction boundary). To assess peak construction noise levels, this analysis used the highest noise impacts when the equipment with the highest reference noise level is operating at the closest point from the center of primary construction activity to each receptor location. Additionally, this construction noise assessment is focused on noise levels that would occur at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers; construction noise levels at other receivers further away from the site would be less. Table 15 presents the summary results of the construction noise analysis.

**Table 15. Construction Noise Model Results Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Residences Noise at Representative Receiver Distances (Leq [dBA])</th>
<th>School to the South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearest Source/Receiver Distance (Approx. 55 feet)</td>
<td>Typical Source/Receiver Distance (Approx. 200 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading 1 - Rough Site and Pad</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenching</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading 2 - Fine Grading</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Concrete</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Appendix E.*

The City has set operational restrictions to control noise impacts associated with construction. According to Section 18-63(b)(7), Construction or Repairing of Buildings or Structures, of the City’s Zoning and Development Code, “The erection (including excavating) demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure other than between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays except in the case of urgent necessity.” Although the City limits the hours of construction activity, it does not specifically address construction noise limits. To address noise from construction activities on the project site, the exterior noise level standard of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for stationary noise sources (Section 30-182) was used to evaluate noise impacts from construction of the proposed project.
Based on the Roadway Construction Noise Model analysis, average noise levels from construction activities are calculated to create noise levels at sensitive residential receivers that exceed the construction noise level limit of 65 dBA equivalent noise level (L_{eq}) at nearby sensitive receiver locations within the City. As such, construction noise impacts are considered significant.

As mentioned previously, the project would be located within the SWIP, and as such would be required to comply with the mitigation measures contained in the PEIR (see end of this noise discussion). Implementation of mitigation measure would minimize noise levels from construction activities at residences in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Given that construction is a temporary, short-term impact, and that the noise ordinance does not contain a specific noise limit for construction activities, this mitigation would reduce construction noise to less than significant.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with construction noise levels would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Project-Generated On-Site Operation Noise**

The project-related operational noise sources are expected to include idling trucks, delivery truck activities, backup alarms, loading and unloading of dry goods, rooftop air conditioning units, and parking lot vehicle movements. The operational analysis provide in the noise technical report (Appendix E) shows that the unmitigated project-related operational noise levels approaching 65 dBA L_{eq} are equal to or below the City’s 65 dBA L_{eq} exterior noise level standards at all of the off-site noise-sensitive receiver locations, including Henry J. Kaiser High School to the south of the project site.

Further, this analysis demonstrates that the project-related noise level increases to the existing noise environment at all noise-sensitive receiver locations would be less than the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise guidance for noise level increases, and thus, would be less than significant during daytime and nighttime hours. The operational noise level impacts associated with the proposed project activities, such as the idling trucks, delivery truck activities, backup alarms, loading and unloading of dry goods, rooftop air conditioning units, and parking lot vehicle movements would be at acceptable levels of significance.

Therefore, no new or more severe with on-site project-generated operational noise impacts would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Project-Generated Off-Site Traffic Noise**

**Roadway Noise**

The proposed project would result in the addition of vehicle trips that would increase traffic noise. A potentially significant project impact would occur where project traffic would increase noise levels from below 65 decibels (dB) community noise equivalent level (CNEL) to above 65 dB CNEL (where noise-sensitive land uses exist adjacent to the identified roadway segment) and where project traffic would increase noise levels from below 70 dB CNEL to above 70 dB CNEL (for roadway segments within industrial zones). In addition, where existing roadway noise levels are less than 60 dBA CNEL, a 5 dBA CNEL increase would be considered significant; where existing roadway traffic noise is in the range 60 to 65 dBA CNEL, an increase of 3 dBA CNEL would be significant; and where roadway traffic noise is already in excess of 65 dBA CNEL, a 1.5 dBA CNEL increase would be significant.
Acoustical calculations (using standard noise modeling equations adapted from the Federal Highway Administration noise prediction model) were performed for the following scenarios: existing and existing plus project. The existing roadway traffic volumes were obtained from the Fontana General Plan Update, Background Report (Stantec 2016). Project trip generation volumes were based on the Almond Avenue Warehouse, Fontana Trip Generation Technical Memorandum (Appendix F). The modeling calculations take into account the posted vehicle speed, average daily traffic volume, and the estimated vehicle mix. Table 16 presents the noise level results for each scenario.

### Table 16. Traffic Noise Levels for Local Roadways Under Existing and Existing plus Project Scenarios (dBA CNEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Segment</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing + Project</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almond Avenue (Jurupa Avenue to Santa Ana Avenue)</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Avenue (Almond Avenue to Cherry Avenue)</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Avenue (Almond Avenue to Cherry Avenue)</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Avenue (Santa Ana Avenue to Slover Avenue)</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix E.

With respect to the traffic noise analysis results presented in Table 16, Almond Avenue, Santa Ana Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Cherry Avenue would continue to have noise exposure levels above 65 dBA CNEL; however, project traffic noise contributions along all roadway segments would be well below 1 dBA, indicating that project added traffic would have an imperceptible increase to roadway traffic noise levels. The project would therefore not create or contribute to a significant traffic-related noise impact.

Therefore, no new or more severe with off-site project-generated roadway traffic noise impacts would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

### b) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The main concern associated with groundborne vibration is annoyance; however, in extreme cases, vibration can cause damage to buildings, particularly those that are old or otherwise fragile. Some common sources of groundborne vibration are trains and construction activities such as blasting, pile-driving, and heavy earth-moving equipment. The primary source of groundborne vibration occurring as part of the project is construction activity.

According to Caltrans, D-8 and D-9 Caterpillars, earthmovers, and trucks have not exceeded 0.10 inches/second peak particle velocity at 10 feet. Since the closest off-site residence is located not closer than 55 feet, vibration from construction activities at the closest sensitive receiver would not exceed the significance threshold of 0.20 inches/second peak particle velocity. Vibration-sensitive instruments and operations may require special consideration during construction. Vibration criteria for sensitive equipment and operations are not defined and are often case specific. As a guide, major construction activity within 200 feet and pile driving within 600 feet may be potentially disruptive to vibration-sensitive...
operations (Caltrans 2002). There are no known vibration-sensitive facilities within 200 feet of the project, and pile driving would not be employed in project construction. Therefore, project construction would not result in a significant impact associated with groundborne vibration.

Therefore, no new or more severe short-term construction impacts associated with vibration levels would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located approximately 5.1 miles east of Ontario International Airport, is within the Airport Influence Area of Ontario International Airport, and is within the 65–70 dBA CNEL aircraft noise contour zone (City of Ontario 2011). However, the proposed project is a warehouse type use and would not introduce new noise-sensitive receivers (such as residential) into the project area. During construction, workers would be in a high-noise area and would have personal protective equipment as necessary, and thus would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from the airport. Therefore, this is considered to be no impact, and is not addressed further.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with public airport and private airstrip noise would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with noise would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to noise:

MM-4.7-1a The following measures shall be implemented when construction is to be conducted within 500 feet of any sensitive structures or has the potential to disrupt classroom activities or religious functions.

- The City shall restrict noise intensive construction activities to the days and hours specified under Section 18-63 of the City of Fontana Municipal Code. These days and hours shall also apply any servicing of equipment and to the delivery of materials to or from the site.
- All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and sound control devices (e.g., intake silencers and noise shrouds) no less effective than those provided on the original equipment and no equipment shall have an un-muffled exhaust.
- The City shall require that the contractor maintain and tune-up all construction equipment to minimize noise emissions.
- Stationary equipment shall be placed so as to maintain the greatest possible distance to the sensitive use structures.
• All equipment servicing shall be performed so as to maintain the greatest possible distance to the sensitive use structures.

• If construction noise does prove to be detrimental to the learning environment, the City shall allow for a temporary waiver thereby allowing construction on Weekends and/or holidays in those areas where this construction is to be performed in excess of 500 feet from any residential structures.

• The construction contractor shall provide an on-site name and telephone number of a contact person. Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the City or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party. In the event that construction noise is intrusive to an educational process, the construction liaison will revise the construction schedule to preserve the learning environment.

**MM-4.7-1b** Should potential future development facilitated by the project require off-site import/export of fill material during construction, trucks shall utilize a route that is least disruptive to sensitive receptors, preferably major roadways (Interstate 10, Interstate 15, SR-66, Sierra Avenue, Beech Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Slover Avenue). Construction trucks should, to the extent practical, avoid the weekday and Saturday a.m. and p.m. peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

### 3.14 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM TO THE PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTHWEST INDUSTRIAL PARK SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE AND ANNEXATION ALMOND AVENUE WAREHOUSE PROJECT

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project would require a temporary construction workforce and a permanent operational workforce, both of which could potentially induce population growth in the project area. The temporary workforce would be needed to construct the project. The number of construction workers needed during any given period would largely depend on the specific stage of construction, but will likely fluctuate between a few and several dozen workers on a daily basis.

Because the future tenant is not yet known, the number of jobs that the project would generate cannot be precisely determined. Thus, for purposes of analysis, employment estimates are calculated using average employment density factors reported by the Southern California Association of Governments in their publication Employment Density Study. This publication reports that for every 2,111 square feet of warehouse space in San Bernardino County, the median number of jobs supported is one employee (SCAG 2001). The proposed warehouse would be 146,864 square feet, and as such, the estimated number of employees required for operation would be approximately 70 people.

According to the Southern California Association of Governments Demographics and Growth Forecast (appendix to the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy [SCAG 2016a]), employment in the City is anticipated to grow from 47,000 in 2012 to 70,800 in 2040 (SCAG 2016b). The project-related increase in employment would be minimal in comparison to the anticipated increase in the Demographics and Growth Forecast.

Overall, the project’s temporary and permanent employment requirements would very likely be met by the City’s existing labor force without people needing to relocate into the project region. The project would not stimulate population growth or a population concentration above what is assumed in local and regional land use plans.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with population growth would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site currently contains approximately three former single-family structures. However, the owners of these properties have previously entered into voluntary purchase agreements with the applicant and have voluntarily vacated the project site. Given that the City has an estimated vacancy rate of 4.2%, equating to approximately 2,227 vacant dwelling units (U.S. Census Bureau 2016), the former residents living on the project site have access to new housing in or around the project area.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with the displacement of housing or people would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with population and housing would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to population and housing.

3.15 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

   i. Fire protection? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
   iii. Schools? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
   v. Other public facilities? Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

   i) Fire protection?

   **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Fire protection and emergency response services are provided by the Fontana Fire Protection District (FFD), which is part of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The FFD operates six fire stations, with Station 74 (11500 Live Oak Avenue) located approximately 0.75 miles southeast from the project site (FFD 2019). Based on the proximity of the project site to the existing FFD facilities, the average response times in the project area, and the fact that the project site is already located within FFD’s service area, the project could be adequately served by the FFD without the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, facilities.

   Additionally, the project would neither directly nor indirectly induce population growth in the City, and the proposed land use and activities are not expected to result in an increase in calls for service to the project site in comparison to the existing conditions. Overall, it is anticipated that the project would be adequately served by existing FFD facilities, equipment, and personnel.

   Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with FPD facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

   ii) Police protection?

   **No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Police protection services are provided by the Fontana Police Department (FPD). The FPD operates out of its headquarters located at 17005 Upland Avenue, roughly 4.6 miles northeast of the project site. Per the FPD, average response time in the greater project
area for Priority 1 (emergency) calls is 7 minutes 18 seconds (FPD 2019). Similar to fire protection services, the project site is already within the service area of the FPD, and once operational, the project would continue to be served by the FPD.

Further, the project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the City, and the proposed land use and activities are not expected to result in an increase in calls for service to the project site in comparison to the existing conditions. Overall, it is anticipated that the project would be adequately served by existing FPD facilities, equipment, and personnel.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with FPD facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iii) Schools?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the City. The number of employees hired to construct and operate the project would be minimal and would likely already reside within the broader project area. As such, it is not anticipated that people would relocate to the City as a result of the project, and thus, an increase in school-age children requiring public education is not expected to occur.

Nonetheless, similar to other development projects in the City, the project would be subject to Senate Bill (SB) 50, which requires the payment of mandatory impact fees to offset any impact to school services or facilities. In accordance with SB 50, the project applicant would pay its fair share of impact fees based on the square footage of new industrial development (currently $0.56 per square foot [FUSD 2017]). These impact fees are required of most residential, commercial, and industrial development projects in the City.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with school facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iv) Parks?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Refer to response provided in Section 3.16, Recreation.

v) Other Public Facilities?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Given the lack of population growth that would result from the project, it is unlikely that the project would increase the use of libraries and other public facilities. However, the project applicant would still be required to pay their fair share of development impact fees to help offset incremental impacts to libraries by helping fund capital improvements and expenditures.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with other public facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with public services would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to public services:

**MM-4.8-1a** The City shall continue to work towards a ratio of 1.4 sworn officers per 1,000 residents.

**MM-4.8-1g** The City shall maintain an average police and fire response time of 4 to 5 minutes.

**MM-4.8-2a** The City shall maintain an average fire response time of 4 to 5 minutes.

**MM-4.8-2b** The City shall continue to maintain an ISO fire rating of Class 3.

**MM-4.8-2c** The City shall ensure that new fire stations are built in areas of new development so that response times are not eroded.

**MM-4.8-3a** Planning and development in the City shall continue to be integrated with the needs of school districts for new facilities.

**MM-4.8-3d** The City shall continue to withhold building permits until verification that applicable school fees have been collected by the appropriate school district.

### 3.16 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. RECREATION</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project consists of the construction and operation of a 240,800-square-foot high-cube warehouse/distribution facility. Neither the construction nor the operation of the project would generate new permanent residents that would increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities would occur or be accelerated.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with recreational facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with recreation facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified mitigation measures related to recreation; however, none of the measures are applicable to the project.
3.17 Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVILTRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? Significant and Unavoidable.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. As provided in the Trip Generation memorandum (Appendix F), Table 17 provides a summary of trip generation estimates for the project based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Warehousing use (ITE Code 150). Additionally, per the City’s direction on a similar project, the South Coast Air Quality Management
District (SCAQMD) Warehouse Truck Trip Study Data Results and Usage (2014) recommended warehouse (non-cold storage buildings) truck fleet mix was utilized to estimate project-related truck traffic. It is estimated that passenger cars would account for 69% of the total trips generated by a warehouse facility while the truck trips would account for approximately 31% of the total trips generated by a warehouse facility. The total percentage of truck trips were further divided among 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4+ axle trucks per the SCAQMD study. These truck trips generated by the project were then converted to Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) trips by using recommended PCE factors. PCE factors consistent with the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) 2016 Update and recommended by City were used to estimate the total PCE trips for the project.

Table 17. Trip Generation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daily Trip Rate/ Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing (ITE Code 150)</td>
<td>1.74/TSF</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Trip Rate for Vehicle Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars (1.201/TSF)</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Axle Trucks (0.118/TSF)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Axle Trucks (0.096/TSF)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ Axle Trucks (0.325/TSF)</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers; TSF = Thousand Square Feet; PCE = Passenger Car Equivalent.
Some of the totals may not match due to rounding error.
2 Vehicle Mix from SCAQMD 2014.
3 Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) factors from SANBAG 2016 and City of Fontana recommended factor of 2.5 PCE for 2-axle and 3-axle trucks.

As shown in Table 17, the proposed project would generate approximately 256 daily trips, with 25 trips (19 inbound and 6 outbound) in the AM peak hour and 28 trips (8 inbound and 20 outbound) in the PM peak hour. Adjusting for PCE, the trip generation is approximately 398 daily PCE trips, 39 AM PCE peak hour trips (30 inbound and 9 outbound) and 44 PM PCE peak hour trips (12 inbound and 32 outbound).
The City’s engineering department relies on the guidance provided in Appendix B of the San Bernardino County CMP (SANBAG 2016) to determine whether preparation of a traffic impact analysis is required. According to this guidance, should a project have the potential to add 250 or more two-way peak-hour trips\(^{16}\) or 50 or more two-way peak-hour trips to a state highway facility, a traffic impact analysis is necessary. These peak-hour trip criteria generally represent a threshold of vehicle trips at which a typical intersection would have the potential to be significantly impacted. Thus, if a project does not contribute 250 or more two-way peak-hour trips or 50 or more two-way peak-hour trips to a state highway facility, then the project would be consistent with the City’s traffic policies and would result in a less-than-significant impact on the circulation system. As such, given that the project would not generate enough peak-hour trips to exceed the above thresholds, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

*No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.* The PEIR determined that because the City has a standard program (circulation development fees) to fund regional improvements, the San Bernardino Associated Governments considers the City exempt from CMP traffic impact analysis and no CMP analysis was required for the SWIP Specific Plan.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focuses on newly adopted criteria (vehicle miles traveled [VMT]) adopted pursuant to SB 743 for determining the significance of transportation impacts. Pursuant to SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis changes from vehicle delay to VMT. The related updates to the CEQA Guidelines required under SB 743 were approved on December 28, 2018. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(c), the provisions of Section 15064.3 shall apply prospectively. A lead agency may elect to be governed by the provision of Section 15064.3 immediately. The provisions must be implemented statewide by July 1, 2020. The traffic analysis in this section relies on level of service to characterize impacts since neither the City nor County has adopted VMT significance thresholds. As such, project traffic impacts are determined on a capacity-based level-of-service analysis for the project (see Impact 3.17[a], above). Since the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), impacts would not occur.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with VMT would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

---

\(^{16}\) *A peak-hour trip is generally defined as the number of vehicle trips that occur within the most congested 60 minutes between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. (AM peak hour) and between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. (PM peak hour).*
c) **Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project would include improvements to Almond Avenue along the project’s street frontage, including widening the northbound side of the street along the project frontage to its full buildout width. Other improvements include a landscape setback, new sidewalk, and a parkway landscape strip on the project frontage along Almond Avenue. Additionally, access to the project site would be provided by two driveways off Almond Avenue: the first driveway would be a 40-foot-wide truck driveway at the southwestern corner of the project site; the other driveway would be an at least 35-foot-wide passenger vehicle driveway at the northwestern corner of the site.

Despite these proposed improvements, the project does not propose any substantial changes to roadway or intersection geometry. All improvements within the public right-of-way are required to comply with standards set forth by the City to ensure that the project does not introduce an incompatible design feature that would impede operations on Almond Avenue or any other roadway.

Under the existing conditions, a sidewalk does not exist along the project frontage. As such, given that the project will construct this improvement, pedestrian connectivity along the east side of Almond Avenue will be improved. In addition, to avoid potential conflicts between pedestrians and passenger vehicles and trucks entering and exiting the project site, the City’s Department of Engineering, as part of their standard review process, requires that line-of-sight calculations and drawings be provided by the project applicant to confirm that project driveways are designed and constructed to allow for maximum periphery visibility for drivers as they enter and exit the property.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with hazardous design features would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

d) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Emergency access to the project site will be provided by two new driveway entrances from Almond Avenue. The project driveways will be designed and constructed according to City standards under the direction of a licensed and qualified engineer. Similarly, the parking areas and internal drive aisles have been designed to comply with width, clearance, and turning-radius requirements set forth by the City, which would ensure that all areas on the project site would be accessible to emergency responders during both project construction and operation.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with emergency access would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with transportation would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.
**Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project**

**MM-4.9-1mm**  
Prior to issuance of a grading permit, applicants for future development associated with the project shall prepare site-specific traffic studies, to the satisfaction of the City’s Engineering Department. As determined by these subsequent traffic studies, traffic improvements identified as mitigation measures in this Program EIR shall be implemented as a condition of the approved future development project, either through direct construction by the project applicant and/or through development impact fees.

**MM-4.9-1nn**  
The City of Fontana shall perform monitoring of traffic generation and phasing of development within the project area to defer or eliminate identified improvements due to potential circulation impact changes or reduced land use intensities. This monitoring shall be achieved through project-specific traffic studies tied to future development within the Specific Plan Update area with land use in excess of 100,000 square feet of nonresidential land use.

### 3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? *Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.*

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? *Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.*

### Project Significance Determination

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**

i) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Consistent with MM-4.4-2a, cultural resources background research and a records search were conducted (Appendix C). The records searches conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center indicated that no previously recorded prehistoric, historic, built-environment, or tribal cultural resources are located within or adjacent to the project site. Additionally, the project site is located in a highly developed and urbanized part of the City and is currently heavily disturbed by existing development. As such, there is little potential for the inadvertent discovery of subsurface archaeological or other cultural resources materials during earthwork activities. Furthermore, as previously discussed in Impact 3.5(a), the existing structures on the project site are not yet eligible to be considered historic resources. Regardless of age, due to evident and substantial structural changes made to these buildings over the decades, the historical integrity of these properties is no longer intact, and these structures are highly unlikely to be eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR. Further, the City’s General Plan Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Chapter, which included an inventory of potentially historic resources within the City, did not identify any on-site buildings, sites, features, places, or cultural landscapes within the project site (City of Fontana 2018b).
Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with historic resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**ii)** *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Consistent with MM-4.4-2a, cultural resources background research and a records search was conducted (Appendix C). The records searches conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center indicated that no previously recorded prehistoric, historic, or built-environment resources are located within or adjacent to the project site.

The project site is located in a highly developed and urbanized part of the City and is currently heavily disturbed by existing development. As such, there is little potential for the inadvertent discovery of subsurface archaeological or other cultural resources materials during earthwork activities. However, as with all other subsurface construction activity, grading and other earthwork, there is always a chance—despite the developed condition of the project site—for inadvertent discovery of buried, unrecorded cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources, within the site. Thus, MM-4.4-2b and MM-4.4-2c from the PEIR would be required to minimize impacts related to the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and other types of cultural resources.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with tribal cultural resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with tribal cultural resources would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

**Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project**

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to tribal cultural resources:

MM-4.4-1a, MM-4.4-1b, MM-4.4-2a, MM-4.4-2b, and MM-4.4-2c (see Section 3.5, Cultural Resources).
### 3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.
b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Project Significance Determination

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Water Facilities

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located within the service area of the FWC. According to FWC’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, FWC currently obtains water from three sources: local groundwater basins (primarily the Chino Basin), local surface water, and imported surface water (FWC 2016).

The Urban Water Management Plan contains existing and projected water supplies and demands for the City during dry-year scenarios. Table 18 shows projected water supplies during multiple-dry year conditions, which represents worst-case conditions during extended periods of drought when supplies would be reduced.

Table 18. Projected Multiple-Dry Year Supply and Demand Comparison (Acre-Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dry-Year Scenario</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Dry Year, First Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>37,757</td>
<td>44,714</td>
<td>47,759</td>
<td>50,523</td>
<td>53,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>37,757</td>
<td>44,714</td>
<td>47,759</td>
<td>50,523</td>
<td>53,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Dry Year, Second Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>36,462</td>
<td>43,180</td>
<td>46,120</td>
<td>48,790</td>
<td>51,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>36,462</td>
<td>43,180</td>
<td>46,120</td>
<td>48,790</td>
<td>51,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Dry Year, Third Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>29,998</td>
<td>29,998</td>
<td>37,945</td>
<td>40,141</td>
<td>42,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>29,998</td>
<td>29,998</td>
<td>37,945</td>
<td>40,141</td>
<td>42,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FWC 2016.
Once operational, the project would consume water at a rate of approximately 2.61 acre-feet per year, based on FWC water consumption rates (0.33 acre-feet per acre per year for industrial use) (IEUA 2016a). Based on the project’s usage rate, the project would represent a nominal percentage of FWC’s present and future water supplies for both single- and multiple-dry-year scenarios. As such, the project’s future water demands would be met through projected future water supplies and would be conveyed and treated via existing infrastructure without the need for new or expanded facilities.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with water facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Wastewater Treatment Facilities**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) provides wastewater treatment service throughout the City. The IEUA currently operates four regional wastewater treatment facilities, including Regional Plant No. 1 (RP-1), RP-4, RP-5, and Carbon Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility (IEUA 2016a). The City is located within the RP-1 service area. According to the IEUA’s Urban Water Management Plan (IEUA 2016b), RP-1 has a rated, permitted treatment capacity of 44 million gallons per day (gpd) and is currently treating an average of 28 million gpd, or only 65% of its capacity (IEUA 2016b).

Once operational, the project would generate wastewater at a rate of approximately 19,800 gpd, based on wastewater generation rates previously approved by the IEUA (2,500 gpd/acre for industrial use). The amount of wastewater generated by the project would equate to a nominal percentage of RP-1’s additional surplus capacity, representing only a nominal increase in the amount of wastewater treated daily by the wastewater treatment plant.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

**Stormwater Drainage Facilities**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** A new engineered storm drain system will be constructed on the project site to collect and treat on-site stormwater runoff. On-site stormwater will be collected and conveyed via a series of inlets and catch basins. Further, on-site stormwater originating in the southern portion of the project site, including the truck court and tractor-trailer parking areas, would be allowed to sheet flow to the approximately 0.8-acre detention/retention basin located between the tractor-trailer parking spaces and the southern project boundary. All on-site stormwater runoff will be collected and treated on the project site without the need for new or expanded facilities.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with stormwater drainage facilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.
Other Wet and Dry Utilities

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is currently developed and served by some existing utilities, including most wet and dry facilities. However, in most, if not all, instances, these present utilities are not adequately sized to serve the project, and thus, will be upgraded/replaced during project construction. Any improvements required to existing electrical, natural gas, or telecommunications utilities will happen within the project site and will occur as part of the project analyzed herein. As such, any upgrades to existing electrical, natural gas, or telecommunications utilities are already evaluated as part of the overall project and no additional environmental impacts not already assessed in this document would occur.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with other wet and dry utilities would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. See response provide to Impact 3.19(a).

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. See response provide to Impact 3.19(a).

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. Solid waste generated in the City is collected and transported by the City’s solid waste removal franchisee, which is permitted and licensed to collect and transport solid waste. Once collected, solid waste is transported to sorting/disposal facilities permitted to accept residential and commercial solid waste, with each facility’s operations routinely inspected by regional and state regulatory agencies for compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations.

Non-durable wholesale distributors on average generate 6,931 pounds of waste material per employee per year. Of the total waste generation, approximately 4,070 pounds is diverted per employee per year (CIWMB 2006). Assuming that the project will employ a maximum of 70 employees, the project could produce approximately 485,170 pounds (243 tons) of solid waste per year, or 1,329 pounds (0.66 tons) per day. Note that these estimates represent a conservative, worst-case scenario and do not include credit for the diversion requirements set forth by Assembly Bill 939. The City has met the 50% solid waste diversion rate since 2000 (City of Fontana 2019a). Assuming that this diversion rate holds into the future, it is estimated that roughly half of the daily amount of solid waste generated by the project—or approximately 665 pounds (0.33 tons)—would require disposal at a permitted landfill facility.
The nearest permitted and active municipal waste landfill to the project site is the 498-acre (408-disposal-acre) Mid-Valley Landfill in the City of Rialto (CalRecycle 2019). The Mid-Valley Landfill has a permitted throughput of 7,500 tons per day, or more than 2.7 million tons per year. The amount of solid waste produced by the project would represent a nominal percentage of the land facility’s permitted daily throughput and an equally small increase in the amount of solid waste processed at the facility per year. All collection, transportation, and disposal of any solid waste generated by the project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. In particular, Assembly Bill 939 requires that at least 50% of solid waste generated by a jurisdiction be diverted from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, or composting. Cities, counties, and regional agencies are required to develop a waste management plan that would achieve a 50% diversion from landfills (California Public Resources Code, Section 40000 et seq.).

As required by existing regulations, any hazardous materials collected on the project site during demolition, construction, or operational activities would be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider at a facility permitted to accept such hazardous materials.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with permitted landfill capacity and solid waste statutes and regulations would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with utilities and service systems would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR identified the following applicable mitigation measures related to utilities and services systems:

**MM-4.8-6a** The City should provide growth projections to utility companies periodically as the basis for their projection of facility and service needs to support community development.

**MM-4.8-6c** The City shall collaborate with utility companies to achieve the maximum undergrounding of utility lines commensurate with available funds.

**MM-4.8-7a** The City shall work closely with water supply agencies to assure the continued supply of water.

**MM-4.8-7c** The City shall manager urban runoff to minimize water supply contamination.

**MM-4.8-8a** The City shall maintain its current Master Plan of Sewers as the basis for development of a sewer system to serve the community.

**MM-4.8-9c** The City shall continue to provide services to resident and business citizens that facilitate community cleanup, curbside collections and diversion of oil and other hazardous waste materials.
### 3.20 Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>XX. WILDFIRE</strong> – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Significance Determination**

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project would result in the following impacts:

a) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

i. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? *No Impact.*

ii. Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? *No Impact.*
iii. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? No Impact.

iv. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? No Impact.

Project Significance Determination

i) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located in a highly developed part of the City outside of an urban–wildland interface. The project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2008), and the nearest natural open space area is found more than 1 mile south of the site. Additionally, as discussed in Impact 3.9(f), the project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildland fire would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

ii) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. A project could result in an impact related to the exacerbation of wildfire risks if the project was located in or near a state responsibility area or in or near lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, and the project were to result in modifications to climatic, topographic, vegetation, weather conditions, or other factors that subsequently increase the severity of a wildfire. The project site is located in a highly developed part of the City outside of an urban–wildland interface, and the project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2008). The nearest natural open space area is found more than 1 mile south of the site. Given the highly developed location of the project area and distance between the project site and nearest natural open space, implementation of the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildland fire would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iii) Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located in a highly developed part of the City and would connect to existing infrastructure (i.e., aboveground and underground utility lines, roads, etc.) located within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The project would require that this existing
infrastructure be maintained throughout the life of the project; however, the maintenance of this infrastructure would not exacerbate fire risks because the project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2008). The nearest natural open space area is found more than 1 mile south of the site. Given the highly developed location of the project area and distance between the project site and nearest natural open space, implementation of the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildland fire would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

iv) Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis. The project site is located in a highly developed part of the City outside of an urban-wildland interface. The project site is not located within or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CAL FIRE 2008), and the nearest natural open space area is found more than 1 mile south of the site. The project would result in grading to a level surface, altering the existing drainage pattern of the site. However, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site. Due to the proposed grading of the site, the relatively flat surrounding lands, and the fact that the site would be paved for development and parking, it is unlikely that the project would expose people or structures to downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Therefore, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildland fire would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR; no new mitigation measures are required.

Conclusion

In conclusion, no new or more severe impacts associated with wildfire would occur, and the level of impact would not change from the level identified in the PEIR. No new mitigation measures are required.

Existing Mitigation Measures Applicable to Project

The PEIR did not require any mitigation measures related to wildfire.
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>New Significant Impact</th>
<th>More Severe Impacts</th>
<th>New Ability to Substantially Reduce Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Significance Determination

The PEIR determined that development in accordance with the SWIP Specific Plan project, including construction and operation of the project, would result in the following impacts:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Less-Than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? **Significant and Unavoidable.**

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? **Significant and Unavoidable.**

**Project Significance Determination**

a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** As discussed and analyzed in this addendum, the project would not degrade the quality of the environment. For the reasons discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, the project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

In addition, for the reasons identified in Section 3.5, the project site does not contain any important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, and no impacts to such resources would occur. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as previously analyzed in the PEIR.

b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?** (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** Similar to the project originally analyzed in the PEIR, the current project has the potential to result in incremental environmental impacts that are part of a series of approvals that were anticipated under the PEIR. The PEIR considered the project’s cumulatively considerable impacts where effects had the potential to degrade the quality of the environment as a result of buildout consistent with the SWIP Specific Plan, which included development of the project site. The PEIR determined that cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, noise, public services (parks), recreation, and transportation were significant and unavoidable. As discussed herein, the current project’s impacts would be consistent with the level of impact disclosed in the PEIR; no new or more severe impacts would occur. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in any new cumulative impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant cumulative impact as previously analyzed in the PEIR.
c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis.** The project would not create adverse environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Assuming approval of the project, the project would allow for development of an industrial/warehouse land use and associated improvements. None of the proposed uses or activities would result in any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, above and beyond what was already discussed and detailed in the PEIR. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of a significant impact as previously identified and analyzed in the PEIR.
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