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SECTION A. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE IS/MND

I. Format and Content of the IS/MND

The content and format of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is designed to meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This report is organized as follows:

- **Section A, Introduction and Purpose of the IS/MND,** identifies the purpose and scope of the IS/MND.
- **Section B, Project Description,** describes the location, general environmental setting, project background, project components, and the characteristics of the proposed project’s construction and operational phases.
- **Section C, Environmental Checklist Form,** provides a checklist of environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project and a description of the possible threshold responses.
- **Section D, Evaluation of Environmental Impacts,** presents the environmental setting and impact analysis for each resource topic.
- **Section E, References,** identifies all printed references and individuals cited in this IS/MND.

II. Purpose of the IS/MND

The purpose of the Initial Study is to: (1) identify environmental impacts; (2) provide the lead agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or a negative declaration; (3) enable an applicant or lead agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is required to be prepared; (4) facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of the project; (5) document the factual basis of the finding in a negative declaration that a project would not have a significant environmental effect; (6) eliminate needless EIRs; (7) determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used for the project; and (8) assist in the preparation of an EIR, if required, by focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant, identifying the effects determined not to be significant, and explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant.

CEQA Objectives

CEQA seeks to accomplish the following five major objectives using the procedures indicated below:

- **Disclose Environmental Impacts:** The CEQA process is primarily designed to identify and disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental impacts of a
proposed project prior to its consideration and approval. This is accomplished by the preparation of the following types of CEQA documents:

- Initial Studies
- Negative Declarations
- Environmental Impact Reports

- Prevent or Reduce Environmental Damage: If potential adverse environmental impacts are identified, the CEQA process next attempts to identify ways to prevent or reduce these impacts by requiring consideration of feasible project alternatives or the adoption of mitigation measures for project impacts that cannot be avoided along with appropriate mitigation monitoring.

- Disclose Agency Decisions: The CEQA process provides for the full disclosure to the public of the reasons for agency (lead, responsible, trustee) approval of projects with significant environmental impacts using the following methods:
  - Findings
  - Statement of Overriding Consideration

- Promote Interagency Coordination: Lead, responsible, and trustee agencies assist each other in more thoroughly understanding the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposed project by incorporating one or more of the following into their CEQA processes:
  - Early consultation
  - Scoping meetings
  - Notice of Preparation (NOP)
  - State Clearinghouse review

- Encourage Public Participation: The CEQA process encourages and provides opportunities for public participation in the overall project planning process in one or more of the following CEQA processes:
  - Scoping meetings
  - Receipt of public notice
  - Response to comments
  - Legal enforcement procedures
  - Citizen access to the courts
CEQA Requirements for MNDs

Section 15063(d) of the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15000–15387 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]) identifies the following specific disclosure requirements for inclusion in an Initial Study:

- A description of the project including the location of the project;
- An identification of the environmental setting;
- An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries . . . ;
- A discussion of ways to mitigate significant effects identified, if any;
- An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and,
- The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.

III. Planning Context

Governing Body

The City of Fontana (City) is the lead agency under CEQA for the proposed project. The City has reviewed the proposed project and, on the basis of the whole record before it, has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the project, with mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, will have a significant effect on the environment. This IS/MND reflects the lead agency’s independent judgement and analysis.

General Plan

The City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035 (General Plan) is the current general plan in place, adopted on November 13, 2018. The General Plan aligns with State planning priorities as stated in California Government Code section 65041 and with the new General Plan Guidelines (GPG), though sometimes in slightly different language than used in the GPG. The General Plan covers a broad range of topics in sixteen chapters. These chapters or “elements” include a summary of existing conditions and current trends, the planning process, and goals, policies and actions for many different topic areas that will affect the physical and economic development of the city over the next twenty years. Because the Housing Element is required by State law to be updated more frequently than the General Plan, it is published as a separate document (most recently published in 2014 and scheduled to be updated in 2021).

General Plan Land Use Designations

The current general plan land use designation of the project site is Medium Density Residential (R-M) (5.1-12 dwelling units per acre [du/ac]), which is described as follows, according to Chapter 15, “Land Use, Zoning, and Urban Design” of the City’s General Plan:
Medium Density Residential: This land use category accommodates single-family detached housing up to 7.6 du/ac and single-family attached or multi-family housing up to 12 du/ac.

A General Plan Amendment is proposed as part of the project to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (R-M) to Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors (WMXU-1) (2.0 floor area ratio [FAR]), which is described as follows, according to Chapter 15, “Land Use, Zoning, and Urban Design” of the City’s General Plan:

Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors (WMXU-1): Medium-to high-density residential uses, retail and services, office, entertainment, education and civic uses.

Zoning

The current zoning designation of the project site is Specific Plan; specifically, the project site is located within the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan area (identified as Specific Plan #25 on the City’s Zoning Map).

IV. Initial Study Findings

Section C of this document contains the Environmental Checklist/Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed project pursuant to CEQA requirements. The Environmental Checklist/Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would result in no impacts or less than significant environmental effects under the issue areas of Aesthetics, Agriculture, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

The Environmental Checklist/Initial Study determined that the proposed project would result in less significant effects with mitigation incorporated to the following issue areas: Noise, Tribal Cultural Resources.

The Environmental Checklist/Initial Study determined that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the Lead Agency (City of Fontana), that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

V. Public Review and Processing of the IS/MND

The environmental documentation and supporting analysis are subject to a public review period. During this review, comments on the document relative to environmental issues should be addressed to the City. Following review of any comments received, the City will consider these comments as a part of the project’s environmental review and include them with the IS/MND documentation for consideration by the City.
SECTION B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

I. Project Summary

The project involves development of an approximately 25,000-square-foot (SF) medical building located at the northwest corner of Baseline Avenue and Sierra Avenue in the City of Fontana. The project site is located on three (3) parcels (APNs: 0240-111-03, -04, and -13), totaling approximately 2.06 adjusted gross acres that would be combined into a single parcel as part of project implementation. Additional components of the project include: General Plan Amendment (Medium Density Residential to Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors), Design Review (Site and Architectural Review), and a Conditional Use Permit for operating a medical facility (as required by the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan). The project is described in detail in Section B.IV., Proposed Improvements.

II. Project Location

The City of Fontana (City) is located in the southwestern portion of San Bernardino County. The City is bounded by the San Bernardino National Forest to the north, the City of Rialto to the east, the Jurupa Hills to the south, and unincorporated San Bernardino County and the Cities of Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario to the west. The City’s Sphere of Influence extends north to the San Bernardino National Forest and west to the Cities of Rancho Cucamonga and Ontario. Refer to Figure 1, Regional Location and Figure 2, Project Location.

Regional access to the site is available via State Route 210 (SR-210) at the Sierra Avenue exit, which is approximately one mile to the north of the site, and via Interstate 10 (I-10) at the Sierra Avenue exit, which is approximately 3.75 miles to the south of the site. Local access to the site is provided via Sierra Avenue and Baseline Avenue.

The project includes three parcels (APNs: 0240-111-03-0000, 0240-111-04-0000, 0240-111-13-0000) totaling approximately two acres, as outlined in Table 1, Project APN List.

Table 1: Project APN List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor's Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Gross Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0240-111-03-0000</td>
<td>16848 Baseline Avenue</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0240-111-04-0000</td>
<td>16840 Baseline Avenue</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0240-111-13-0000</td>
<td>16888 Baseline Avenue</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


III. Existing Site Conditions

Onsite Conditions

The project site consists of vacant land. The site’s natural vegetation has been largely removed. The site is unimproved and there are no existing structures onsite. The topography of the site is relatively flat. The elevation of the site is approximately 1,420 feet.
Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is bounded by residential development to the north and west, mortuary and residential uses to the east, and commercial uses and vacant land to the south.

IV. Proposed Improvements

Medical Building Development

The project involves development of an approximately 25,000 SF medical building on approximately 2.06 adjusted gross acres that would be combined into a single parcel as part of project implementation. The medical center has been designed with six (6) primary areas; reception, exam rooms, offices, conference/consultation rooms, nurses’ stations, and restrooms. The project would construct 125 parking spaces, one van loading space (12-foot by 19-foot), and a refuse and recycle collection enclosure. The building is proposed at a height of 18 feet (ft) with tower elements proposed at 24 ft. Refer to Figure 3, Conceptual Site Plan.

Site Access

Project site access is proposed as follows:

- **Sierra Avenue**: Vehicular access to the project via Sierra Avenue would be provided via driveway located at the northeastern corner of the project site.

- **Baseline Avenue**: Vehicular access to the project via Baseline Avenue would be provided via a driveway located at the southwestern corner of the project site.

- Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA): Separate driveway dedicated for use by emergency vehicles located on Baseline Avenue at the southwestern corner of the project site, west of the proposed driveway for vehicular access.

V. Project Construction and Phasing

The project is estimated to be constructed in one phase over approximately 6 months, beginning approximately spring of 2020 and ending approximately fall of 2020.
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SECTION C. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Arrowhead Regional Medical Center

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Fontana Planning Division 8353 Sierra Avenue Fontana, CA 92335

3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Jon Dille Associate Planner (909) 350-6681

4. Project Location: Northwest corner of Baseline Avenue and Sierra Avenue; (APNs: 0240-111-03-0000, 0240-111-04-0000, 0240-111-13-0000)

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address: Ms. Julie McHugh ATC Design Group 1282 Pacific Oaks Place, Suite C Escondido, CA 92029 jmchugh@atcdesigngroup.com

6. General Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential (R-M)

7. Specific Plan: Fontana Promenade Specific Plan

8. Zoning: Multi-Family Residential (MFR)

9. Description of Project:

Development of an approximately 25,000 SF medical building on approximately 2.06 acres; General Plan Amendment (Medium Density Residential to Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors); Design Review (Site and Architectural Review); and Conditional Use Permit.

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is bounded by residential development to the north and west, mortuary and residential uses to the east, and commercial uses and vacant land to the south.

11. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

Fontana Building & Safety Division: Site Plan review and approval, Grading Permits, Building Permits.
Fontana Planning Commission: General Plan Amendment approval, Design Review approval, Conditional Use Permit approval.

Fontana Engineering Division: Construction Permits, Sewer Connection Approval, Storm Drain Connection Approval


Fontana Water Company: Letter of authorization/consent for proposed improvements to provide water supply connection to new development.

Southern California Edison: Letter of authorization/consent for proposed improvements to provide electrical supply connection to new development.

12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?\(^1\)

The City has undertaken Native American Tribal consultation pursuant to the requirements of AB 52 and SB 18, as described herein; refer to Section XVIII of this IS/MND.

\(^1\) NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.
I. **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
- [ ] Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Energy
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [x] Tribal Cultural Resources
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Wildfire
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the project. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The project would not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.

- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact would be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.

- **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The project would have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered a significant effect on the environment, although measures or changes to the development’s physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.

- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project would have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.
II. Environmental Determination

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Signature

Date 12/19/20
# SECTION D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

## I. Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AESTHETICS:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</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 in 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>

**Discussion**

*a) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? Less Than Significant Impact.*

Fontana is located on the desert valley floor between the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and the Jurupa Hills to the south. The Conservation, Open Space, Parks, and Trails Chapter of the City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035 (General Plan) notes that panoramic scenic view corridors towards the mountains and views of the City from the mountains dominate the City’s visual landscape character. The project site is located in the southeast corner of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan (Specific Plan) and is surrounded by residential development to the north and west, mortuary and residential uses to the east, and commercial uses and vacant land to the south.

Although the General Plan does not identify specific scenic view corridors within the City, the project site is located in an urban area approximately five miles south of the San Gabriel Mountains and five miles north of the Jurupa Hills. Based on its location, as well as the presence of existing surrounding development, the project site is not located within the viewshed of scenic

---

2 City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035, November 13, 2018, Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Chapter.
vistas, and the project would not block views of or from these scenic resources. Therefore, impacts associated with scenic vistas would be less than significant.

b) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? No Impact.

According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highway Mapping System, the only officially designated state scenic highway in San Bernardino County is a 16-mile portion of State Route 38 from South Fork Campground to State Lane. This roadway segment is located approximately 35 miles northeast of the project site in the San Bernardino Mountains. Based on this distance, the intervening natural topography, and constructed structures, the project site is not located within the watershed of this officially designated state scenic highway. Additionally, according to the City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015–2035 Final Environmental Impact Report, there are no officially designated or eligible scenic highways within or adjacent to the City. Therefore, no impacts associated with both state scenic highways and local scenic corridors would occur.

c) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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 in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in an urbanized area in the southeast corner of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan was adopted in 2007 and amended in 2012. The project site is located within Planning Area 5 (PA-5) of the Specific Plan area, which is zoned as Multi-Family Residential (MFR) and planned to accommodate attached multi-family homes, with commercial land uses permitted as an alternative land use subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit. As discussed in the Specific Plan, the project proposes to develop PA-5 for commercial land use. The area south of the project site, on the opposite side of Baseline Avenue has also been designated as General Commercial on the City’s adopted General Plan Land Use Map.

To ensure that both current and future development within the City is designed and constructed to conform to the existing visual character and quality of the surrounding built environment, the City’s Zoning and Development Code and the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan include design standards related to building size, height, and setback, as well as landscaping, 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

---

5 City of Fontana, Fontana Promenade Specific Plan Amendment No. 1, April 24, 2012, p. 4-3.
6 City of Fontana General Plan Land Use Map, November 13, 2018.
compliance with all applicable provisions set forth by the Zoning and Development Code and the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan. 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 the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan, and promote the visual character and quality of the surrounding area. Therefore, impacts associated with the existing visual character and quality would be less than significant with project implementation.

**d) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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.**

Consistent with Section No. 30-184 (Light and Glare) of the City’s Zoning and Development Code, 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, long-term impacts associated with light and glare would be less than significant.

### II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**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.**

According to Section No. 30-609 of the City’s Zoning and Development Code, animal grazing, breeding, raising, or training (or similar activities) is permitted on property zoned for Open Space (OS-N or OS-R0) or Public Facilities (P-PF) with certain restrictions and requirements. The project site is located within the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan area within PA-5, which is currently zoned as Multi-Family Residential (MFR). The site’s current General Plan land use designation is Medium Density Residential (R-M). The nearest location that is zoned appropriately and has a current use which would enable agricultural purposes is at least 0.7 miles to the northwest.

As shown by the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, there is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is located 3.25 miles to the southwest from Grazing Land and 2.5 miles east of Unique Farmland. These lands and their associated uses would not be affected by the project. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and no impact would occur.

---

7 City of Fontana Municipal Code, Chapter 30, Article VIII, Section No. 30-609.
8 City of Fontana, Fontana Promenade Specific Plan Amendment No. 1, April 24, 2012, p. 3-5.
11 Distances measured via Google Earth Pro.
b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? No Impact.

As mentioned above, the proposed project site is located on land that is zoned as MFR in the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan. This zoning does not allow for agricultural uses. Furthermore, neither the project site nor any portion of the City of Fontana is under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.

c) Would the project 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.

Forest land is land that can naturally support 10 percent or more of native tree cover of any species and is land that allows for the management of one or more forest resource (e.g., timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality). Timberland is land that is not owned by the federal government and is not designated as experimental forest land that is capable of growing commercial species of trees to produce lumber and other forest products. Timberland zoned as “Timberland Production” is land that is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber and/or compatible uses. There is no forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production areas within the City of Fontana, including the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, and no impact would occur.

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

The project site is currently a vacant lot that does not contain any forest land, as defined above. Furthermore, the project site is not zoned for forest land. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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

While agricultural uses were prominent in the City’s past, agricultural practices have declined and are no longer a significant element of the local economy. Remaining undeveloped land considered suitable for farming purposes is planned for a variety of urbanized uses, according to the General Plan. The project site is located in the southeast corner of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan and is surrounded by residential development to the north and west, mortuary and residential uses to the east, and commercial uses and vacant land to the south. There is no

---

12 California Public Resources Code, Sec. 12220(g).
13 California Public Resources Code, Sec. 4526.
14 California Government Code, Sec. 51104(g).
farmland or forest land on or in the vicinity of the project site that could be converted to non-agricultural or non-forest land uses as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

III. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIR QUALITY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data prepared by Michael Baker International on September 25, 2019, provided as Appendix A of this IS/MND.

Discussion

a) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? Less Than Significant Impact.**

The City is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto mountains to the north and east and by the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction in the Basin, which has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both State and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Areas that meet ambient air quality standards are classified as attainment areas, while areas that do not meet these standards are classified as nonattainment areas. The air quality in the Basin does not meet the ambient air quality standards for ozone (O₃), PM₁₀, and PM₂.₅ and is therefore classified as a nonattainment area for these pollutants. The SCAQMD is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), to reduce emissions of the air pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.
In order to reduce emissions, SCAQMD adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (2016 AQMP) which establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving State and federal air quality standards. The 2016 AQMP is a regional and multi-agency effort including SCAQMD, California Air Resources Board (CARB), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The 2016 AQMP pollutant control strategies are based on the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG’s latest growth forecasts. SCAG’s latest growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans. The SCAQMD considers projects that are consistent with the 2016 AQMP, which is intended to bring the Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants, to also have less than significant cumulative impacts.

Criteria for determining consistency with the 2016 AQMP are defined by the following indicators:

**Criterion 1:**

With respect to the first criterion, SCAQMD methodologies require that an air quality analysis for a project include forecasts of project emissions in relation to contributing to air quality violations and delay of attainment.

a) Would the project result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations?

Since the consistency criteria identified under the first criterion pertains to pollutant concentrations, rather than to total regional emissions, an analysis of the project’s pollutant emissions relative to localized pollutant concentrations is used as the basis for evaluating project consistency. As discussed under Impact III.b), below, localized concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrous oxide (NOx), coarse particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5) would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations. Because reactive organic gases (ROGs) are not a criteria pollutant, there is no ambient standard or localized threshold for ROGs. Due to the role ROGs plays in ozone formation, it is classified as a precursor pollutant and only a regional emissions threshold has been established.

b) Would the project cause or contribute to new air quality violations?

As discussed below under Impact III.b), the proposed project would result in emissions below the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause or affect a violation of the ambient air quality standards.
c) Would the project delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP?

The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with regard to localized concentrations during project operations and construction. As such, the proposed project would not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or 2016 AQMP emissions reductions.

Criterion 2:

With respect to the second criterion for determining consistency with SCAQMD and SCAG air quality policies, it is important to recognize that air quality planning within the Basin focuses on attainment of ambient air quality standards at the earliest feasible date. Projections for achieving air quality goals are based on assumptions regarding population, housing, and growth trends. Thus, the SCAQMD's second criterion for determining project consistency focuses on whether or not the proposed project exceeds the assumptions utilized in preparing the forecasts presented in the 2016 AQMP. Determining whether or not a project exceeds the assumptions reflected in the 2016 AQMP involves the evaluation of the three criteria outlined below. The following discussion provides an analysis of each of these criteria.

a) Would the project be consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections utilized in the preparation of the AQMP?

A project is consistent with the 2016 AQMP in part if it is consistent with the population, housing, and employment assumptions that were used in the development of the 2016 AQMP. In the case of the 2016 AQMP, three sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions: General Plan, SCAG’s Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), and SCAG’s RTP/SCS. The RTP/SCS also provides socioeconomic forecast projections of regional population growth.

The project site is located within PA-5 of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan area. The project proposes to change the existing zoning and land use designation from Medium Density Residential (R-M) to Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors (WMXU-1). Approval of the Conditional Use Permit (No. 19-009) would allow the medical clinic to operate within the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan.

Because the project requires a land use and zone change, the project is considered inconsistent with growth forecasts in the 2016 AQMP. However, construction of a single medical office building in an area which the City had planned to build multi-family residential properties would result in less development intensity and as a result, release fewer air pollutants. Therefore, although the project would conflict with the existing zoning and land use designation, the impact would be less than significant.
b) Would the project implement all feasible air quality mitigation measures?

The proposed project would not require mitigation and would result in less than significant air quality impacts. Compliance with all feasible emission reduction measures identified by the SCAQMD would be required as identified under Impact III.b) and III.c). As such, the proposed project meets this AQMP consistency criterion.

In conclusion, the determination of 2016 AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of a project on air quality in the Basin. The proposed project would not result in a long-term impact on the region’s ability to meet State and federal air quality standards. Also, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the 2016 AQMP for control of fugitive dust. As discussed above, the proposed project’s long-term influence would also be consistent with the SCAQMD and SCAG’s goals and policies and is, therefore, considered consistent with the 2016 AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

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? Less Than Significant Impact.*

**Short-Term Construction Impacts**

The project involves construction activities associated with grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating applications. It is anticipated that the project would be constructed over approximately five and a half months. Exhaust emission factors for typical diesel-powered heavy equipment are based on the California Emissions Estimator Model version 2016.3.2 (CalEEMod) program defaults. Variables factored into estimating the total construction emissions include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on- or offsite. The analysis of daily construction emissions has been prepared utilizing CalEEMod; refer to Appendix A, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data*, for the CalEEMod outputs and results. *Table 2, Short-Term Construction Emissions*, presents the anticipated daily short-term construction emissions.

**Table 2: Short-Term Construction Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Thresholds</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 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: ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrous oxide; CO = carbon monoxide; SO2 = sulfur dioxide; PM10 = coarse particulate matter; PM2.5 = fine particulate matter

Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2.

2. Modeling assumptions include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 which requires: properly maintain mobile and other construction equipment; replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; water exposed surfaces three times daily; cover stock piles with tarps; water all haul roads twice daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

Construction activities are a source of fugitive dust emissions that may have a substantial, temporary impact on local air quality. In addition, fugitive dust may be a nuisance to those living and working in the project area. Fugitive dust emissions are associated with land clearing, ground excavation, cut-and-fill, and truck travel on unpaved roadways (including demolition as well as construction activities). Fugitive dust emissions vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, specific operations, and weather conditions. Fugitive dust from demolition, grading, and construction is expected to be short-term and would cease upon project completion. It should be noted that most of this material is inert silicates, rather than the complex organic particulates released from combustion sources, which are more harmful to health.

Dust (larger than 10 microns) generated by such activities usually becomes more of a local nuisance than a serious health problem. Of particular health concern is the amount of PM$_{10}$ (particulate matter smaller than 10 microns) generated as a part of fugitive dust emissions. PM$_{10}$ poses a serious health hazard alone or in combination with other pollutants. PM$_{2.5}$ is mostly produced by mechanical processes. These include automobile tire wear, industrial processes such as cutting and grinding, and re-suspension of particles from the ground or road surfaces by wind and human activities such as construction or agriculture. PM$_{2.5}$ is mostly derived from combustion sources, such as automobiles, trucks, and other vehicle exhaust, as well as from stationary sources. These particles are either directly emitted or are formed in the atmosphere from the combustion of gases such as NO$_X$ and sulfur oxides (SO$_X$) combining with ammonia. PM$_{2.5}$ components from material in the earth’s crust, such as dust, are also present, with the amount varying in different locations.

Construction activities would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which requires that excessive fugitive dust emissions be controlled by regular watering or other dust prevention measures. Adherence to SCAQMD 403 would greatly reduce PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations. It should be noted that these reductions were applied in CalEEMod. As depicted in Table 2, total PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds during construction. Thus, construction air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment and Worker Vehicle Exhaust

Exhaust emissions from construction activities include emissions associated with the transport of machinery and supplies to and from the project site, emissions produced on-site as the equipment is used, and emissions from trucks transporting materials to/from the site. As presented in Table 2, construction equipment and worker vehicle exhaust emissions would be below the established SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, air quality impacts from equipment and vehicle exhaust emission would be less than significant.

ROG Emissions

In addition to gaseous and particulate emissions, the application of asphalt and surface coatings creates ROG emissions, which are O$_3$ precursors. As required, all architectural coatings for the
proposed project structures would comply with SCAQMD Regulation XI, Rule 1113 – Architectural Coating. Rule 1113 provides specifications on painting practices as well as regulates the ROG content of paint. ROG emissions associated with the proposed project would be less than significant; refer to Table 2.

Asbestos

Asbestos is a term used for several types of naturally occurring fibrous minerals that are a human health hazard when airborne. The most common type of asbestos is chrysotile, but other types such as tremolite and actinolite are also found in California. Asbestos is classified as a known human carcinogen by State, federal, and international agencies and was identified as a toxic air contaminant by the CARB in 1986.

Asbestos can be released from serpentinite and ultramafic rocks when the rock is broken or crushed. At the point of release, the asbestos fibers may become airborne, causing air quality and human health hazards. These rocks have been commonly used for unpaved gravel roads, landscaping, fill projects, and other improvement projects in some localities. Asbestos may be released to the atmosphere due to vehicular traffic on unpaved roads, during grading for development projects, and at quarry operations. All of these activities may have the effect of releasing potentially harmful asbestos into the air. Natural weathering and erosion processes can act on asbestos-bearing rock and make it easier for asbestos fibers to become airborne if such rock is disturbed. According to the California Department of Conservation, serpentinite and ultramafic rocks are not known to occur within the project area. Thus, there would be no impact in this regard.

Total Daily Construction Emissions

In accordance with SCAQMD Guidelines, CalEEMod was utilized to model construction emissions for ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Adherence to SCAQMD Rules 403 (which require watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.) was taken into account in CalEEMod. As indicated in Table 2, impacts would be less than significant for all criteria pollutants during construction.16 Thus, total construction related air emissions would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

Mobile Source Emissions

Mobile sources are emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions. Depending upon the pollutant being discussed, the potential air quality impact may be of either regional or local concern. For example, ROG, NOx, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5 are all pollutants of regional concern (NOx and ROG react with sunlight to form O3 [photochemical smog], and wind

---

currents readily transport SOX, PM10, and PM2.5); however, CO tends to be a localized pollutant, dispersing rapidly at the source.

As part of the modeling program, CalEEMod estimates the number of daily vehicle trips based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th edition which calculates average trip rates based on land use. Because a project-specific trip generation study was not prepared for this project, the default estimates generated by CalEEMod were used in this analysis. CalEEMod has estimated that a 25,000 square foot medical office building would generate approximately 903 trips per day during weekdays, 224 trips on Saturdays, and 39 trips on Sundays. Table 3, Long-Term Operational Air Emissions, presents the anticipated mobile source emissions. As shown in Table 3, emissions generated by vehicle traffic associated with the project would not exceed established SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts from mobile source air emissions would be less than significant.

Table 3: Long-Term Operational Air Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>Pollutant (pounds/day)</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SOx</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Emissions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Emissions</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Daily Emissions²</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Emissions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Emissions</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Daily Emissions²</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2.
2. The numbers may be slightly off due to rounding.
Source: Refer to Appendix A, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data, for detailed model input/output data.

Area Source Emissions

Area source emissions would be generated from consumer products, architectural coating, and landscaping. As shown in Table 3, area source emissions from the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NOx, CO, SOx, PM10, or PM2.5.

Energy Source Emissions
Energy source emissions would be generated as a result of electricity and natural gas (non-hearth) usage associated with the proposed project. The primary use of electricity and natural gas by the project would be for space heating and cooling, water heating, ventilation, lighting, appliances, and electronics. As shown in Table 3, energy source emissions from the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NOX, CO, SOX, PM10, or PM2.5.

**Total Daily Operational Emissions**

As indicated in Table 3, operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, operational air quality impacts would be less than significant.

**Air Quality Health Impacts**

Adverse health effects induced by criteria pollutant emissions are highly dependent on a multitude of interconnected variables (e.g., cumulative concentrations, local meteorology and atmospheric conditions, and the number and character of exposed individuals [e.g., age, gender]). In particular, O3 precursors, VOCs, and NOX affect air quality on a regional scale. Health effects related to O3 are therefore the product of emissions generated by numerous sources throughout a region. Existing models have limited sensitivity to small changes in criteria pollutant concentrations, and, as such, translating project-generated criteria pollutants to specific health effects or additional days of nonattainment would produce meaningless results. In other words, the project’s less than significant increases in regional air pollution from criteria air pollutants would have nominal or negligible impacts on human health.

As noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae by the SCAQMD (April 6, 2015) for the Sierra Club vs. County of Fresno, the SCAQMD acknowledged it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to quantify health impacts of criteria pollutants for various reasons including modeling limitations as well as where in the atmosphere air pollutants interact and form. Further, as noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) (April 13, 2015) for the Sierra Club vs. County of Fresno, SJVAPCD has acknowledged that currently available modeling tools are not equipped to provide a meaningful analysis of the correlation between an individual development project’s air emissions and specific human health impacts.

The SCAQMD acknowledges that health effects quantification from O3, as an example is correlated with the increases in ambient level of O3 in the air (concentration) that an individual person breathes. SCAQMD’s Brief of Amicus Curiae states that it would take a large amount of additional emissions to cause a modeled increase in ambient O3 levels over the entire region. SCAQMD states that based on their own modeling in the SCAQMD’s 2012 Air Quality Management Plan, a reduction of 432 tons (864,000 pounds) per day of NOX and a reduction of 187 tons (374,000 pounds) per day of VOCs would reduce O3 levels at highest monitored site by only nine parts per billion. As such, SCAQMD concludes that it is not currently possible to accurately quantify O3-related health impacts caused by NOX or VOC emissions from relatively small projects (defined as projects with regional scope) due to photochemistry and regional model limitations. Thus, as the project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction
and operational air emissions, the project would have a less than significant impact for air quality health impacts.

c) \textbf{Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Less Than Significant Impact.}

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis.

The closest sensitive receptors are residences adjoining the project site to the north and west. In order to identify impacts to sensitive receptors, SCAQMD recommends addressing localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for construction and operations impacts (area sources only).

\textbf{Localized Significance Thresholds}

LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards’ Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (1-4). The SCAQMD provided the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (dated June 2003 [revised 2008]) for guidance. The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized air quality impacts. SCAQMD provides the LST screening lookup tables for one-, two-, and five-acre projects emitting CO, NOx, PM$_{2.5}$, or PM$_{10}$. The LST methodology and associated mass rates are not designed to evaluate localized impacts from mobile sources traveling over the roadways. SCAQMD recommends that any project that disturbs five acres or more per day should perform air quality dispersion modeling to assess impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. The project is located in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 34 (Central San Bernardino Valley).

\textbf{Short-Term Construction Impacts}

Based on the CalEEMod modeling for the project, the project is anticipated to disturb up to 8.25 acres during the grading phase. The grading phase would take approximately 22 days to complete. As such, the project would actively disturb approximately 0.4-acre per day (8.25 acres divided by 22 days). Therefore, the LST thresholds for one acre was utilized for the construction LST analysis.

The closest sensitive receptors are residences adjoining the project site to the north and west. This sensitive land use may be potentially affected by air pollutant emissions generated during on-site construction activities. LST thresholds are provided for distances to sensitive receptors of 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500 meters. As the nearest sensitive uses adjoin the project site to the north and west, the LST values for 25 meters (82 feet) were used.

\textit{Table 4, Localized Significance of Construction Emissions}, shows the localized construction-related emissions for NOx, CO, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ compared to the LSTs for SRA 34. It is noted that
the localized emissions presented in Table 4 are less than those in Table 2 because localized emissions include only on-site emissions (i.e., from construction equipment and fugitive dust), and do not include off-site emissions (i.e., from hauling activities). As shown in Table 4, the project’s localized construction emissions would not exceed the LSTs for SRA 34 with adherence to SCAQMD rules and requirements. Therefore, localized significance impacts from construction would be less than significant.

Table 4: Localized Significance of Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>NOx (pounds/day)</th>
<th>CO (pounds/day)</th>
<th>PM10 (pounds/day)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Construction</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Modeling assumptions include compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 which requires properly maintaining mobile and other construction equipment; replacing ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; watering exposed surfaces three times daily; covering stock piles with tarps; watering all haul roads twice daily; and limiting speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
- The Localized Significance Threshold was determined using Appendix C of the SCAQMD Final Localized Significant Threshold Methodology guidance document for pollutants NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. The Localized Significance Threshold was based on the anticipated daily acreage disturbance for construction (the thresholds for 1 acre was used), the distance to sensitive receptors (25 meters), and the source receptor area (SRA 34).
- Source: Refer to Appendix A, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data, for detailed model input/output data.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

According to SCAQMD localized significance threshold methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a proposed project if the project includes stationary sources or attracts mobile sources that may spend extended periods queuing and idling at the site (e.g., warehouse or transfer facilities). The proposed project does not include such uses. Thus, due to the lack of such emissions, no long-term localized significance threshold analysis is needed. Operational LST impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

Localized Air Quality Health Impacts

As evaluated above, the project’s air emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s LST thresholds. Therefore, the project would not exceed the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards for emissions of CO, NOx, PM10, or PM2.5. It should be noted that the ambient air quality standards are developed and represent levels at which the most susceptible persons (e.g., children and the elderly) are protected. In other words, the ambient air quality standards are purposefully set in a stringent manner to protect children, elderly, and those with existing respiratory problems. Thus, air quality health impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspot
CO emissions are a function of vehicle idling time, meteorological conditions, and traffic flow. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels (i.e., adversely affecting residents, school children, hospital patients, the elderly, etc.).

The Basin is designated as an attainment/maintenance area for the federal CO standards and an attainment area for State standards. There has been a decline in CO emissions even though vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on U.S. urban and rural roads have increased. Nationwide estimated anthropogenic CO emissions have decreased 68 percent between 1990 and 2014. In 2014, mobile sources accounted for 82 percent of the nation’s total anthropogenic CO emissions. Three major control programs have contributed to the reduced per-vehicle CO emissions: exhaust standards, cleaner burning fuels, and motor vehicle inspection/maintenance programs.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, a potential CO hotspot may occur at any location where the background CO concentration already exceeds 9.0 ppm, which is the 8-hour California ambient air quality standard. As previously discussed, the site is located in SRA 34 Central San Bernardino Valley. Communities within SRAs are expected to have similar climatology and ambient air pollutant concentrations. The monitoring station representative of SRA 34 is the Fontana-Arrow Highway Monitoring Station, which is located approximately 3.46 miles northeast of the site. The highest CO concentration at the Fontana-Arrow Highway Monitoring Station in 2019 was measured at 2.748 ppm on February 6, 2019. As such, the background CO concentration does not exceed 9.0 ppm and a CO hotspot would not occur. Therefore, CO hotspot impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors.

Construction activities associated with the project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. However, construction-related odors would be short term in nature and cease upon project completion. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the CCR, Title 13, sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, which minimizes the idling time of construction equipment either by shutting it off when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes. This would further reduce the detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. The project would also be required to comply with the SCAQMD Regulation XI, Rule 1113 – Architectural Coating, which would minimize odor impacts from ROG emissions during architectural coating. Any odor impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short-term and not substantial. As such, the project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.
IV. Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife or US 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>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located within a heavily developed area in the City, approximately 3 miles west southwest of the Lytle Creek Floodway, and is comprised of three parcels (APN 240-111-03, -04, and -13) that are all currently vacant. The project site is relatively flat, with on-site surface elevation ranging from approximately 1,420 to 1,423 feet above mean sea level (amsl), with a small mound in the southeast portion of the property.\(^{17}\)

These vacant parcels are located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sierra Avenue and Baseline Avenue and are comprised of heavily disturbed areas that have been previously subject to development. These parcels have had prior structures removed and currently contain some non-native and early successional weedy plant species are present. The site was found to contain Tujunga gravelly loamy sand.\(^ {18}\) Due to the lack of Delhi fine sands, the project site would not be suitable habitat for the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (DSF) and would not be able to support DSF.

Due to the developed nature of project site and its surroundings and the soil type of the project site, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur relative to candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? No Impact.

The project site primarily contains non-native and early successional weedy plant species. There are no identified sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations.\(^ {19, 20}\) Further, as established by the National Wetlands Inventory, riparian habitat is not present, and no sensitive natural communities were identified.\(^ {21}\) Therefore, no impact relative to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities would occur.

\(^{17}\) ATC Design Group, Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Percolation-Infiltration Study Proposed Arrowhead Regional Medical Center, 2019, p. 3.


\(^{19}\) City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035, November 13, 2018, Chapter 7: Conservation, Open Space, Parks, and Trails.


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 Impact.**

There are three key agencies that regulate activities within inland streams, wetlands, and riparian areas in California. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Regulatory Branch regulates discharge of dredge or fill materials into “waters of the United States” pursuant to Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Of the State agencies, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates discharges to surface waters pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regulates alterations to streambed and associated plant communities under Fish and Wildlife Code Sections 1600 et seq.

According to the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory database, no State or federally protected wetlands or drainage features are present on the project site. Therefore, no impact to jurisdictional waters would occur as a result of the proposed project.

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 Impact.**

Habitat linkages provide links between larger undeveloped habitat areas that are separated by development. Wildlife corridors are similar to linkages but provide specific opportunities for animals to disperse or migrate between areas. A corridor can be defined as a linear landscape feature of sufficient width to allow animal movement between two comparatively undisturbed habitat fragments. Adequate cover is essential for a corridor to function as a wildlife movement area. It is possible for a habitat corridor to be adequate for one species, but inadequate for others. Wildlife corridors are significant features for dispersal, seasonal migration, breeding, and foraging. Additionally, open space can provide a buffer against both human disturbance and natural fluctuations in resources.

Due to the extensive disturbance and developed nature of the project site and its surrounding land uses and development, the project site provides little opportunity for holding wildlife or serving as a travel route. This site is not located within a known wildlife corridor, therefore, no impact to animal travel patterns or migration routes are anticipated with project implementation.

e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? No Impact.**

The City of Fontana Public Services Department Tree Policy Manual addresses the protection of Heritage, Significant, and Specimen Trees, and the City’s Municipal Code Chapter 28 (Vegetation) addresses requirements for tree preservation and removal. There are no trees located on the project site. In addition, there are no other local policies or ordinances that apply to biological
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resources on the project site, as the site is previously disturbed and has been stripped of all native vegetation. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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 Impact.

The City has two Habitat Conservation Plans: one addresses the area of southern Fontana specifically for the DSF and the other addresses the area in northern Fontana. Neither of these plans are in the vicinity of the proposed project site and are therefore not applicable to the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan and no impact would occur.

V. Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting on December 5, 2019, provided as Appendix B of this IS/MND.

Discussion

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5? Less Than Significant Impact.

Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damage to, or demolition of, historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

During the field survey conducted as part of the Cultural Resources Assessment, no cultural resources were discovered, including prehistoric or historic archaeological sites or historic buildings, within the project boundaries. Furthermore, records search results combined with surface conditions failed to indicate sensitivity for buried cultural resources. As such, no additional cultural resources work or monitoring is necessary for proposed project activities. However, if any cultural resources are encountered before or during grading, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities and take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study.

In addition, the Community and Neighborhoods Chapter of the General Plan includes a list of known cultural and historical resources. However, none of these resources lie within or adjacent to the project area. Although the City contains many historic resources, these resources would not be affected by this project. The project site is currently vacant and there are no historical resources documented on the site. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

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

Archaeological resources are those that are listed, or eligible for listing, by the State Historical Resources Commission in the California Register of Historical Resources. Resources in local registers of historical resources and resources that a lead agency determines as historically significant are also considered historical and archaeological resources. Archaeological sites contain resources associated with former human activities, and may contain such resources as human skeletal remains, waste from tool manufacture, tool concentrations, and/or discoloration or accumulation of soil or food remains.

New construction associated with the project would occur in the entirety of the project parcel. The site is highly disturbed and based on historical aerial photographs, the site previously contained development that was removed in 2006. Because the only construction associated with this project would occur on a site that has been previously developed, it is unlikely that any archaeological resources would be discovered. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

There is no indication that any human burial sites exist on or near the project area. There is a possibility that future land alteration activities associated with any project to develop currently undeveloped land could uncover human remains, whether from prehistoric time periods or from

24 City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035, November 13, 2018, Chapter 4: Community and Neighborhoods, Exhibit 4.1: Historic Resources.
25 California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15064.5.
more recent time periods. There is also the potential that Native American remains or remains of someone who has been missing or known to be dead could be encountered.

In the event of a discovery of human remains during construction activities, contractors must comply with the provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, which requires that further excavation or disturbance of an area containing human remains cease until the County Coroner examines the remains and issues a report. If the Coroner finds evidence of Native American remains, they are required to contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours to verify Native American origin and facilitate recovery of the remains in accordance with appropriate Tribal customs. Compliance with this State law would prohibit future land development projects from indiscriminately destroying or damaging human remains or disturbing human burial sites. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact to human remains or human burial sites, and no mitigation is required.

VI. Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporared</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY:</td>
<td>Woulnd the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regulatory Setting

**California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24)**

The 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, commonly referred to as “Title 24,” became effective on January 1, 2017. In general, Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The standards require developers to install enhanced windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features that reduce energy consumption in homes and businesses.

**California Green Building Standards (CALGreen)**

The 2016 California Green Building Standards Code, commonly referred to as CALGreen, went into effect on January 1, 2017. CALGreen requires new buildings employ water efficiency and
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27 California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6.
28 California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11.
conservation, increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and incorporate electric vehicles charging infrastructure.

California Public Utilities Commission Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) prepared an Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan in 2011 with the goal of promoting energy efficiency and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Assembly Bill 1109, adopted in 2007, also serves as a framework for lighting efficiency. This bill requires the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to adopt minimum energy efficiency standards as a means to reduce average Statewide electrical energy consumption by not less than 50 percent from the 2007 levels for indoor residential lighting and not less than 25 percent from the 2007 levels for indoor commercial and outdoor lighting by 2018.

Discussion

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.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Project construction would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass.

Construction of the proposed project would involve on-site energy demand and consumption related to the use of gasoline and diesel fuel for construction worker vehicle trips, hauling and materials delivery truck trips, and operation of off-road construction equipment. In addition, diesel-fueled portable generators may be necessary to provide additional electricity demands for temporary on-site lighting, welding, and for supplying energy to areas of the sites where energy supply cannot be met via a hookup to the existing electricity grid. Project construction would not involve the use of natural gas appliances or equipment. Project construction methods would be typical of current construction practices and would not require the use of more energy intensive machinery or higher than normal volumes of trucks and worker vehicle trips.

Even during the most intense period of construction, due to the different types of construction activities (e.g., site preparation, grading, building construction), only portions of the project site would be disturbed at a time, with operation of construction equipment occurring at different locations on the project site rather than a single location. All construction equipment and operation thereof would be regulated per the In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation administered by the CARB. The In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation is intended to reduce emissions from in-use, off-road, heavy-duty diesel vehicles in California by imposing limits on idling, requiring all vehicles to be reported to CARB, restricting the addition of older vehicles into fleets, and requiring fleets to reduce emissions by retiring, replacing, or repowering older engines, or installing exhaust retrofits. As another benefit of these restrictions, off-road diesel-
powered vehicles would consume less fuel and combust fuel more efficiently. The project would also be subject to mandates on portable diesel generators and the California Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) strict on-road emissions standards for heavy-duty engines. These regulations contain strict air emissions standards that result in efficient engine fuel consumption rates (compared to previous standards) during operations. In addition, technological innovations and more stringent standards are being researched, such as multi-function equipment, hybrid equipment, or other design changes, which could help to reduce demand on oil and emissions associated with construction in California, over the next few years. As such, temporary energy use during construction of the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in peak or base demands on regional energy supplies or require additional capacity from local or regional energy supplies. As such, project construction activities would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Further, substantial reductions in energy inputs for construction materials can be achieved by selecting building materials composed of recycled materials that require substantially less energy to produce than non-recycled materials. The project-related incremental increase in the use of energy bound in construction materials such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes and manufactured or processed materials (e.g., lumber and gas) would not substantially increase demand for energy compared to overall local and regional demand for construction materials. It is reasonable to assume that production of building materials would employ all reasonable energy conservation practices in the interest of reducing costs. Construction impacts would less than significant.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts**

Following completion of the proposed project, Southern California Edison (SCE) would provide electricity and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) would provide natural gas to the project site. Energy use associated with operation of the proposed project would be the same as typical places of worship. The project does not include any unusual project characteristics or require special equipment that would be more energy intensive than typical uses. The project would include ENERGY STAR-rated appliances and energy efficient boilers and heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and water-efficient landscaping in compliance with the most current Title 24 energy efficiency standards. In addition to on-site energy use, the proposed project would result in transportation energy use associated with vehicle trips generated by parishioners as the travel to and from the project. With regard to transportation energy use, the proposed project would not have control over fuel consumption factors such as vehicle type(s), engine efficiency, vehicle miles traveled, etc. for parishioners. However, due to CARB’s increasing vehicle efficiency standards it is assumed the long-term transportation fuel consumption from parishioners would steadily decline over time and ensure that vehicle fuel consumption is not wasteful or inefficient.

The proposed project would be subject to all relevant provisions of the most recent update of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen Code. Compliance with these standards would ensure that the building energy use associated with the proposed project would
not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Operational impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

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

State and local plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency include CPUC’s Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, and CALGreen standards. Compliance with Title 24 and CALGreen standards would ensure the project incorporates energy-efficient windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, as well as water-efficient fixtures and electric vehicles charging infrastructure. Adherence to the CPUC’s energy requirements would ensure conformance with the State’s goal of promoting energy and lighting efficiency.

At the local level, Fontana’s Building and Safety Division enforces the applicable requirements of the Title 24 and CALGreen Code. On November 13, 2018, the City approved the General Plan Update 2015-2035. The General Plan Update included goals and policies that would promote energy conservation and efficiency. **Table 5, City of Fontana General Plan Consistency** discusses project consistency with relevant policies and actions in the General Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Project Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Fontana is an Inland Empire leader in energy-efficient energy development and retrofits.</td>
<td>Promote energy-efficient development in Fontana.</td>
<td>The project would comply with the most current version of the Title 24 and CalGreen code and would use water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings, outdoor potable water use in landscape areas, and would recycle and/or salvage for reused a minimum of 65% of the nonhazardous construction waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Green Building techniques are used in new development and retrofits.</td>
<td>Promote green building through guidelines, awards and nonfinancial incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Fontana, 2018 General Plan Sustainability and Resilience Element, November 2018.

Compliance with State and local energy efficiency requirements would ensure the project does not conflict with or obstruct any plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts in this regard.
### VII. Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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 direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Report of Geotechnical Investigation and Percolation-Infiltration Study* prepared by ATC Design Group on February 25, 2019, provided as Appendix C of this IS/MND.

The project site has a ground elevation of approximately 1,420 to 1,423 feet amsl and is located in an area that slopes gently to the south. The project site is generally flat with a small mound in the southeast portion of the property. The site survey that occurred as part of the *Geotechnical Investigation* noted that the mound is located at the southeastern quarter portion of the property where the proposed building would be located. The proposed building would be constructed at elevations similar to those currently existing at the site.

**Discussion**

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

Seismically induced ground rupture is defined as the physical displacement of surface deposits in response to an earthquake’s seismic waves. Ground rupture is most likely along active faults, and typically occurs during earthquakes of magnitude five or higher. Ground rupture only affects the area immediately adjacent to a fault.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Act’s main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones, known as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (typically 50 feet).

No known active or potentially active faults have been mapped within the project area and the area is not located in a Fault Rupture Hazard Zone as established by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The project site is located approximately 3.5 miles from the Cucamonga section of the Sierra Madre Fault Zone, and approximately 4.0 miles from the San Bernardino Valley section of the San Jacinto Fault Zone Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The project site is not located within a fault zone. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault and impacts would be less than significant.

---

a)ii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking? Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Seismic shaking activity and intensity is dependent on the distance from the fault and earthquake epicenter. The geologic structure of the entire Southern California area is dominated by the northwesterly-trending faults associated with the San Andreas Fault system. Faults such as the Whittier, San Jacinto, and San Andreas are all major faults in this system and are known to be active. The nearest fault to the project site is the Cucamonga section of the Sierra Madre Fault, located approximately 3.5 miles to the north.  

Development of the project would include construction of a new medical office building and the proposed project would be required to comply with seismic safety provisions of the California Building Code (CBC) (Title 24, Part 2 of the CCR). Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking and a less than significant impact would occur.

a)iii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? Less Than Significant Impact.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose, saturated, relatively cohesion-less soil deposits lose shear strength during strong ground motions. The factors controlling liquefaction are:

1) Seismic groundshaking of relatively loose, granular soils that are saturated or submerged can cause soils to liquefy and temporarily behave as a dense fluid. For liquefaction to occur, the following conditions have to occur: Intense seismic shaking;

2) Presence of loose granular soils prone to liquefaction; and

3) Saturation of soils due to shallow groundwater.

According to the City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), there are no areas of liquefaction susceptibility on or adjacent to the project site. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, no free ground water was found within 21.5 feet of the existing ground elevation and information obtained from wells surrounding the project site indicate that groundwater depths exceed a minimum of 100 feet. As such, the potential for liquefaction is not a significant concern at the site. However, to minimize potential damage to building structures caused by liquefaction, project construction would comply with the latest CBC standards, as required by the City Municipal Code Section 5-61. Implementation of CBC standards would include provisions for

---

31 City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, June 2017, Appendix E, Map 7, Geologic Hazard Overlays – Landslide & Liquefaction Susceptibility (South).
seismic building designs. Therefore, impacts associated with liquefaction would be less than significant.

**a)iv) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides? Less Than Significant Impact.**

A landslide is generally defined as the downward and outward movement of loosened rock or earth down a hillside or slope. Landslides can occur either very suddenly or slowly, and frequently accompany other natural hazards such as earthquakes, floods, or wildfires. Landslides can also be induced by the undercutting of slopes during construction, improper artificial compaction, or saturation from sprinkler systems or broken water pipes. According to the LHMP, there have been no reported historical occurrences of landslides in the City and landslides are not a major concern in the City.

According to Map 7, Geologic Hazard Overlays – Landslide & Liquefaction Susceptibility (South), in Appendix E of the LHMP, there are no areas of landslide susceptibility on the project site. There are areas of low-to-moderate landslide susceptibility located approximately 3.5 miles to the north of the project site within the San Gabriel Mountains. The elevation of the project site ranges from approximately 1,420 to 1,423 amsl. As such, the project site itself and the surrounding terrain are level and do not present hazards of landslides. Therefore, impacts relative to landslides would be less than significant.

**b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? Less Than Significant Impact.**

Soil erosion is defined as the detachment and movement of soil particles by the erosive forces of wind or water. The project proposes to develop a new medical building with associated parking and landscaping. Grading and construction of the project could expose large amounts of soil and could result in soil erosion if effective erosion control measures are not used. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control are required under National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for construction projects disturbing one acre or more in area are set forth in the General Construction Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ). Furthermore, the project’s land clearing, grading, and construction activities would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 403.2 regulating fugitive dust emissions, thus minimizing wind erosion from such ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate substantial soil erosion and impacts would be less than significant.
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.**

As discussed above, the project site is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to liquefaction or landslides. The *Geotechnical Investigation* identifies the proposed project area as not being located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed project, and potentially result in on-site or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Expansive soils are those that undergo volume changes as moisture content fluctuates; swelling substantially when wet or shrinking when dry. Soil expansion can damage structures by cracking foundations, causing settlement and distorting structural elements.

According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) web soil survey, surface soils within the project site have been mapped as Tujunga gravelly loamy sand (0 to 9 percent slopes), which is considered to have a low shrink-swell potential. Therefore, with the project’s adherence to CBC design considerations, impacts relative to expansive soils would be less than significant.

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.**

The project site is currently vacant and does not use a septic system or alternative wastewater disposal system. The proposed project would connect to the existing sewer system operated by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA). Septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be used. No impact would occur.

f) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? Less Than Significant Impact.**

According to the Cultural Resources section of the City’s General Plan Update EIR, the City is almost entirely built out and development consists of infill, the chance of exposing hidden cultural resources is remote. Additionally, the existing and proposed General Plan Update policies provide an ongoing program to ensure proper identification, evaluation, and recovery and/or protection of potentially important historical, archaeological, and paleontological resources that may be disturbed during future development activities. Existing State law requires immediate County Coroner notification upon discovery of human remains and also notification of affected Native American tribes if the remains are suspected to be of Native American origin. Surrounding
jurisdictions are subject to similar regulations, including coroner notification upon discovery of human remains. Long-term development throughout Fontana has low potential to impact subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological remains. Furthermore, the site had been previously developed with a private school and two single-family dwelling units in 1980 that has since been demolished, leaving the entire project site in a disturbed state. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources as a result of project implementation would be less than significant.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data prepared by Michael Baker International on September 25, 2019, provided as Appendix A of this IS/MND.

Global Climate Change

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per year. Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit over the next century. Methane (CH₄) is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The impact of human activities on global climate change is apparent in the observational record. Air trapped by ice has been extracted from core samples taken from polar ice sheets to determine the global atmospheric variation of CO₂, CH₄, and nitrous oxide (N₂O) from before the start of industrialization (approximately 1750), to over 650,000 years ago. For that period, it was found that CO₂ concentrations ranged from 180 to 300 parts per million. For the period from approximately 1750 to the present, global CO₂ concentrations increased from a pre-industrialization period concentration of 280 to 379 parts per million in 2005, with the 2005 value far exceeding the upper end of the pre-industrial period range.

Regulations and Significance Criteria

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) developed several emission trajectories of GHGs needed to stabilize global temperatures and climate change impacts. It concluded that a stabilization of GHGs at 400 to 450 parts per million CO$_2$ equivalent (CO$_2$eq)$^{35}$ concentration is required to keep global mean warming below two degrees Celsius, which in turn is assumed to be necessary to avoid significant levels of climate change.

Executive Order S-3-05 was issued in June 2005, which established the following GHG emission reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Additionally, issued in April 2015, Executive Order B-30-15 requires statewide GHG emissions to be reduced 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) requires that the CARB determine what the statewide GHG emissions level was in 1990, and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to that level, to be achieved by 2020. CARB has approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 million metric tons (MT) of CO$_2$eq (MTCO$_2$eq).

Due to the nature of global climate change, it is not anticipated that any single development project would have a substantial effect on global climate change. In actuality, GHG emissions from the proposed project would combine with emissions emitted across California, the United States, and the world to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.

Discussion

a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? Less Than Significant Impact.*

Refer to the discussion under **Impact VIII.b)** below. Project-related GHG emissions are included in *Table 6, Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. This impact would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? Less Than Significant Impact.*

The City has not adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing impacts related to GHG emissions. Similarly, the SCAQMD, CARB, or any other state or regional agency have not yet adopted a numerical significance threshold for assessing GHG emissions that is applicable to the project. Since there is no applicable adopted or accepted numerical threshold of significance for GHG emissions, the methodology for evaluating the project’s impacts related to GHG emissions focuses on its consistency with Statewide, regional, and local plans adopted for the purpose of reducing and/or mitigating GHG emissions. This evaluation of consistency with such plans is the

---

$^{35}$ Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO$_2$eq) – A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.
sole basis for determining the significance of the project’s GHG-related impacts on the environment.

For informational purposes, the analysis also calculates the amount of GHG emissions that would be attributable to the project using the recommended CalEEMod program. The primary purpose of quantifying the project’s GHG emissions is to satisfy State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a), which calls for a good-faith effort to describe and calculate emissions. The estimated emissions inventory is also used to determine if there would be a reduction in the project’s incremental contribution of GHG emissions as a result of compliance with regulations and requirements adopted to implement plans for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. However, the significance of the project’s GHG emissions impacts is not based on the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project.

**Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases**

The proposed project would result in direct and indirect emissions of CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄, and would not result in other GHGs that would facilitate a meaningful analysis. Therefore, this analysis focuses on these three forms of GHG emissions. Direct project-related GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities, area sources, and mobile sources, while indirect sources include emissions from electricity consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. Operational GHG estimations are based on energy emissions from natural gas usage and automobile emissions. Because a project-specific trip generation study was not prepared for this project, estimates generated by CalEEMod using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th edition were used in this analysis. **Table 6, Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions**, presents the estimated CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ emissions of the proposed project. CalEEMod outputs are contained within Appendix A. In accordance with the SCAQMD guidance, projected GHGs from construction have been quantified and amortized over 30 years, which is the number of years considered to represent the life of the project. The amortized construction emissions are added to the annual average operational emissions. As shown in **Table 6**, the total amount of proposed project-related GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources would total 1,122.97 MTCO₂eq per year.
Table 6: Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>Total Metric Tons of CO₂eq³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metric Tons/year¹</td>
<td>Metric Tons/year¹</td>
<td>Metric Tons of CO₂eq²</td>
<td>Metric Tons/year¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (amortized over 30 years)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source</td>
<td>877.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Emissions²</td>
<td>882.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>86.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>80.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demand</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Emissions³</td>
<td>155.09</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>83.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project-Related Emissions³</td>
<td>1,122.97 MTCO₂e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₂ = methane; N₂O = nitrogen oxide
1. Emissions calculated using the CalEEMod version 2016.3.2.
3. Totals may be slightly off due to rounding.
Refer to Appendix A, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data, for detailed model input/output data.

Consistency with Applicable GHG Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The City has a Climate Action Plan that is in draft form. Since the City’s Climate Action Plan has not been approved, the project’s consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan and 2016-2040 RTP/SCS will be analyzed.

2017 Scoping Plan

The goal to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (Executive Order S-3-05) was codified by the Legislature as the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32). In 2008, CARB approved a Scoping Plan as required by AB 32. The Scoping Plan has a range of GHG reduction actions which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an AB 32 implementation fee to fund the program. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan) identifies additional GHG reduction measures necessary to achieve the 2030 target. These measures build upon those identified in the First Update to the Scoping Plan (2013). Although a number of these measures are currently established as policies and measures, some measures have not yet been formally proposed or adopted. It is expected that these measures or similar actions to reduce GHG emissions will be adopted as required to achieve Statewide GHG emissions targets.
**Table 7, Project Consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan**, provides an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category to determine how the project would be consistent with or exceed reduction actions/strategies outlined in the 2017 Scoping Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 350</th>
<th>Project Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieve a 50 percent RPS by 2030, with a doubling of energy efficiency savings by 2030.</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not be an electrical provider or delay the goals of SB 350. Furthermore, the project would utilize electricity from SCE which would be required to comply with SB 350. As the project would use the electricity from SCE, the project would be in compliance with SB 350.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) | |
| Increase stringency of carbon fuel standards; reduce the carbon intensity of fuels by 18 percent by 2030, which is up from 10 percent in 2020. | Consistent. Motor vehicles driven by the proposed project's employees and visitors would be required to use LCFS compliant fuels, thus the project would be in compliance with this goal. |

| Mobile Source Strategy (Cleaner Technology and Fuels Scenario) | |
| Maintain existing GHG standards of light and heavy-duty vehicles while adding an addition 4.2 million ZEVs on the road. Increase the number of ZEV buses, delivery trucks, or other trucks. | Consistent. The project would not include any light or heavy-duty truck trips. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Nonresidential Mandatory Measure 5.106.5.2 Designated parking for clean air vehicles and Mandatory Measure 5.106.5.3 Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging. As such, the project would not conflict with the goals of the Mobile Source Strategy. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Freight Action Plan</th>
<th>Project Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the freight system efficiency and maximize the use of near zero emission vehicles and equipment powered by renewable energy. Deploy over 100,000 zero-emission trucks and equipment by 2030.</td>
<td>Not Applicable. The project would not include any freight systems. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Sustainable Freight Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Short-Lived Climate Pollutant (SLCP) Reduction Strategy | |
| Reduce the GHG emissions of methane and hydrofluorocarbons by 40 percent below the 2013 levels by 2030. Furthermore, reduce the emissions of black carbon by 50 percent below the 2013 levels by the year 2030. | Consistent. The project does not involve sources that would emit large amounts of methane. Furthermore, the project would comply with all CARB and SCAQMD hydrofluorocarbon regulations. As such, the project would not conflict with the SLCP reduction strategy. |

| SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategies | |
| Increase the stringency of the 2035 GHG emission per capita reduction target for MPOs. | Consistent. The project would be consistent with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and would not conflict with the goals of SB 375. |

| Post-2020 Cap and Trade Programs | |
| The Cap-and-Trade Program will reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from major sources (covered entities) by setting a firm cap on Statewide GHG emissions while employing market mechanisms to cost-effectively achieve the emission-reduction goals. | Not Applicable. The project would not be a gross emitter of CO2eq emissions (25,000 metric tons per year), and thus would be exempt from the Cap and Trade program. The project would not conflict with this goal. |

2016-2040 RTP/SCS

The 2016–2040 RTP/SCS is expected to help California reach its GHG reduction goals, with reductions in per capita transportation emissions of 9 percent by 2020 and 13 percent by 2035. Furthermore, although there are no per capita GHG emission reduction targets for passenger vehicles set by CARB for 2040, the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS GHG emission reduction trajectory shows that more aggressive GHG emission reductions are projected for 2040. The 2016–2040 RTP/SCS would result in an estimated 8 percent decrease in per capita passenger vehicle GHG emissions by 2020, 18 percent decrease in per capita passenger vehicle GHG emissions by 2035, and 21 percent decrease in per capita passenger vehicle GHG emissions by 2040. By meeting and exceeding the SB 375 targets for 2020 and 2035, as well as achieving an approximately 21 percent decrease in per capita passenger vehicle GHG emissions by 2040 (an additional 3 percent reduction in the five years between 2035 [18 percent] and 2040 [21 percent]), the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS is expected to fulfill and exceed its portion of SB 375 compliance with respect to meeting the State’s GHG emission reduction goals.

At the regional level, the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS is an applicable plan adopted for the purpose of reducing GHGs. In order to assess the project’s potential to conflict with the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, this section also analyzes the project’s land use assumptions for consistency with those utilized by SCAG’s SCS. Generally, projects are considered consistent with the provisions and general policies of applicable City and regional land use plans and regulations, such as SCAG's RTP/SCS, if they are compatible with the general intent of the plans and would not preclude the attainment of their primary goals. Table 8, Project Consistency with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, demonstrates the project’s consistency with applicable actions and strategies set forth in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

Table 8: Project Consistency with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions and Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Project Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the use of range-limited battery electric and other alternative fueled vehicles through policies and programs, such as, but not limited to, neighborhood-oriented development, complete streets, and Electric (and other alternative fuel) Vehicle Supply Equipment in public parking lots.</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions, Councils of Government (COGs), SCAG, County Transportation Commission (CTCs)</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the City or SCAG’s ability to encourage the use of alternatively-fueled vehicles through various policies and programs. Specifically, the project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Nonresidential Mandatory Measure 5.106.5.2 Designated parking for clean air vehicles and 5.106.5.3, Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with the region’s public health professionals to enhance how SCAG addresses public health issues in its regional planning, programming, and project development activities.</td>
<td>SCAG, State, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the City, SCAG, or the State’s ability to collaborate with the region’s public health professionals regarding the integration of public health issues in regional planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support projects, programs, and policies that support active and healthy community environments that encourage safe walking, bicycling, and physical activity by children,</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions, SCAG</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would include opportunities for healthy, physical activities for its patrons, including walking paths, landscaped an open space areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions and Strategies</td>
<td>Responsible Party(ies)</td>
<td>Project Consistency Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including, but not limited to development of complete streets, school siting policies, joint use agreements, and bicycle and pedestrian safety education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support projects, programs, policies and regulations that encourage the development of complete communities, which includes a diversity of housing choices and educational opportunities, jobs for a variety of skills and education, recreation and culture, and a full-range of shopping, entertainment and services all within a relatively short distance.</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions, SCAG</td>
<td>Consistent. As the project proposes the development of a new medical center, the project would provide increased educational and job opportunities when compared to the existing vacant lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Network Actions and Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions and Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Project Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate with stakeholders, particularly county transportation commissions and the California Department of Transportation, to identify new funding sources and/or increased funding levels for the preservation and maintenance of the existing transportation network.</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Not Applicable. This action/strategy is not directly applicable to the proposed project. However, the project would not impair the ability of SCAG, CTCs, or the City to cooperate with stakeholders to identify new funding sources and/or increase funding levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore and implement innovative strategies and projects that enhance mobility and air quality, including those that increase the walkability of communities and accessibility to transit via non-auto modes, including walking, bicycling, and neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) or other alternative fueled vehicles.</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. Per CALGreen, the project would be required to provide electric vehicle (EV) charging spaces. Therefore, the project would serve to reduce vehicle trips that generate GHG emissions, thereby contributing to a reduction in air pollutant and GHG emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with local jurisdictions to provide a network of local community circulators that serve new Transit Oriented Development (TOD), High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), and neighborhood commercial centers providing an incentive for residents and employees to make trips on transit.</td>
<td>SCAG, CTCs, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the ability of SCAG, CTCs, or the City to provide such a network of local community circulators that serve new TOD, HQTAs, and neighborhood commercial centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop first-mile/last-mile strategies on a local level to provide an incentive for making trips by transit, bicycling, walking, or neighborhood electric vehicle or other ZEV options.</td>
<td>CTCs, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the CTCs or the City’s ability to develop first-mile/last-mile strategies. In support of this action/strategy, the project would provide EV parking on-site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Actions and Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions and Strategies</th>
<th>Responsible Party(ies)</th>
<th>Project Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support work-based programs that encourage emission reduction strategies and incentivize active transportation commuting or ride-share modes.</td>
<td>SCAG, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. As previously discussed, the project would reduce GHG emissions by complying with the 2019 Title 24 requirements, installing water efficient irrigation systems and landscapes, and incorporating water reducing features and fixtures into the buildings per CALGreen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the development of telecommuting programs by employers through review and revision of policies that may discourage alternative work options.</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions, CTCs</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the CTCs or City’s ability to encourage the development of telecommuting programs by employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions and Strategies</td>
<td>Responsible Party(ies)</td>
<td>Project Consistency Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize active transportation and alternative fueled vehicle projects as part of complying with the Complete Streets Act (AB 1358).</td>
<td>State, SCAG, Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the CTCs or City's ability to develop infrastructure plans and education programs to promote active transportation options and other alternative fueled vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Management (TSM) Actions and Strategies</td>
<td>SCAG, Local Jurisdictions, State</td>
<td>Consistent. The project would not impair the ability of the State, SCAG, or City to work with relevant transportation authorities to increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system. Moreover, all proposed footpaths and roadways to be constructed would be designed to conform to City requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, April 2016.

**Plan Consistency Conclusion**

In summary, the plan consistency analysis provided above demonstrates that the project complies with the plans, policies, regulations, and GHG reduction actions стратегии outlined in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and the 2017 Scoping Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGs. Furthermore, because the project is consistent and does not conflict with these plans, policies, and regulations, the project’s incremental increase in GHG emissions as described above would not result in a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, project-specific impacts with regard to consistency with climate changes programs and policies would be less than significant.

**IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
</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>
</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>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**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.**

The project proposes the construction of a medical office building that would provide ongoing professional medical services to visiting patients. Due to the nature of the proposed use, the project would involve the routine transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., medical waste); however, as with any medical services use, the project would be subject to conformance with local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to the handling and disposal of such materials. Conformance with such regulations would ensure that project impacts remain less than significant.

**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.**

Project construction would involve limited use of toxic or hazardous substances that are typical for construction-related activities (e.g., oil, fuel for vehicles and construction equipment,
hydraulic fluids, solvents); nevertheless, there is the possibility of accidental release (e.g., spilling of hydraulic fluid or diesel fuel from construction equipment maintenance). Such incidents are expected to involve small volumes and low concentrations and the contractor is required to employ standard cleanup and safety procedures to minimize the potential for public exposure from accidental releases of such substances into the environment.

During project operations, limited amounts of toxic or hazardous substances are also expected to be used for routine maintenance that are typical of commercial land uses (e.g., paints, cleaning products, hydraulic fluid or diesel fuel, pesticides/herbicides in landscaping); however, the use of substantial amounts of such substances are not anticipated. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of any such hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the anticipated small volume and/or low concentration of hazardous materials. Use of these substances is expected to be in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the handling, storage, and disposal of toxic and/or hazardous substances to protect human health and safety and to maintain a low risk of exposure to the general public relative to accidental releases of such substances. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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.**

There is one school located within 0.25-mile of the project site; specifically, Mango Elementary School at 7450 Mango Avenue is located approximately 1,130 feet to the southeast of the project site. Hazardous materials associated with the proposed project’s construction and operation are expected to be small in volume and low in concentration. Additionally, the use of these hazardous materials is expected to be in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the handling, storage, and disposal of toxic and/or hazardous substances. Conformance with these regulations would ensure that project impacts remain less than significant to nearby schools.

d)  **Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? No Impact.**

The project site is not included on a hazardous site list compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. For reference, based on data from EnviroStor and GeoTracker, the nearest permitted underground storage tank is located 300 feet to southeast of the project site at an ARCO AM/PM. The nearest Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site is located at 7980 North Sierra Avenue, approximately 4,500 feet south of the project site. Cleanup of this LUST site was completed in 1993. Therefore, no impacts relative to hazardous materials sites would result with project implementation.

---

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? No Impact.

The closest airports to the project site are Ontario International Airport, located approximately 9 miles to the southwest of the project site, and San Bernardino International Airport, located approximately 11 miles to the east of the project site. The site is not located within an airport land use plan, within 2 miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and the project would not result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area. No impact would occur.

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

As discussed under Impact VII.a)iii), the City has adopted a LHMP in order to prepare for emergency evacuations and respond to all types of hazards. The project is located at the intersection of Sierra Avenue and Baseline Avenue, both of which are local truck routes and can accommodate a large amount of traffic during an emergency.

During project construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the City. In addition, the proposed project has been designed with two separate ingress/egress points, one on Sierra Avenue and the other on Baseline Avenue, as well as an EVA driveway dedicated for use by emergency vehicles on Baseline Avenue. On-site circulation has also been designed to allow for maneuvering of emergency vehicles (e.g., fire trucks) and to allow for emergency access to the building. The nearest fire station is the San Bernardino County Fire Station 78, located one mile to the northwest of the project site. The project does not include any land uses or off-site improvements that would impair implementation or physically interfere with the adopted emergency response plan. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located in the central portion of the City within an urbanized area. However, the property directly south of the project site is vacant and contains disturbed vegetation. Although the nearby vacant lot has a greater potential for wildfire risk than the surrounding developed lands, the project would not expose workers to a significant risk from wildland fires. The City's LHMP includes a map of fire severity zones for Fontana which identifies areas of very high, high, and moderate fire severity. The majority of the fire hazards are located along the northern and southern borders of the City. The project site is in an area identified as urban, unzoned on Figure 4-6, Wildfire Hazard Severity Zones Map, of the LHMP.37 Due to on-site and surrounding area conditions, the potential for the project to expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires is considered less than significant.

---

37 City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, June 2017, Figure 4-6: Wildfire Hazard Severity Zones Map.
X. Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan prepared by ATC Design Group in September 2019, provided as Appendix D of this IS/MND.
Discussion

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.

The California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Section 13000 ["Water Quality"] et seq., of the California Water Code), and the federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1972 (also referred to as the Clean Water Act) require comprehensive water quality control plans be developed for all waters within the State of California. The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed project would involve clearing, soil stockpiling, grading, paving, utility installation, and landscaping activities, which would result in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction of the project in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

To minimize water quality impacts during construction, construction activities would be required to comply with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) consistent with the General Permit for Stormwater Discharge Associated with Construction Activity (Construction Activity General Permit). To obtain coverage, the Project Applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent prior to construction activities and develop and implement a SWPPP and monitoring plan.

The SWPPP identifies erosion-control and sediment-control BMPs that would meet or exceed measures required by the Construction Activity General Permit to control potential construction-related pollutants. Erosion-control BMPs are designed to prevent erosion, whereas sediment controls are designed to trap sediment once it has been mobilized. These requirements would ensure that potential project impacts related to soil erosion, siltation, and sedimentation remain less than significant and avoid violation to any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

The project would result in an increase of impervious surface which would increase stormwater runoff, however, this runoff would be captured and conveyed to the storm drain system through a curb/gutter. The project would be required to implement a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), pursuant to the requirements of the City’s NPDES permit. The WQMP is a post-construction management program that ensures the on-going protection of the watershed basin by requiring structural and programmatic controls. The WQMP identifies structural controls (including a contained, onsite wastewater treatment plant) and programmatic controls to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat storm water runoff flows before they are discharged from the site. Mandatory compliance with the WQMP would ensure that the
project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation.

The WQMP would identify structural and programmatic controls, as well as BMPs to minimize, prevent, and/or otherwise appropriately treat stormwater runoff flows before they are discharged. Mandatory compliance with the WQMP BMPs would ensure that the project does not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during long-term operation. Therefore, water quality impacts associated with long-term operation of the project would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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.**

Water is provided to the City and its Sphere of Influence (SOI) primarily by three agencies: the Fontana Water Company (FWC), Cucamonga County Water District (CVWD) and the West San Bernardino County Water District (WSBCWD). FWC provides water to the majority of the City and its SOI, covering approximately 52 square miles with 38 wells, 17 storage reservoirs, and 3.5 million feet of water distribution mains ranging up to 36 inches in diameter.\(^{38}\)

The proposed project would be served with potable water by the FWC. In the 2015 UWMP, December 2017 update, the UWMP has identified a “reasonably available volume” of water of 53,711 acre feet (AF), which exceeds the forecasted demand of 53,562 AF through the year 2040. As such, the General Plan EIR made a determination that no significant impacts to water supply would occur through the City’s planning horizon.\(^{39}\) As such, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies. In addition, according to the Geotechnical Investigation that was prepared for the project, no free ground water was found within 21.5 feet of the existing ground elevation and information obtained from wells surrounding the project site indicate that groundwater depths exceed a minimum of 100 feet.

Furthermore, although the project would result in additional impervious surfaces on-site, the project would construct gutters to direct runoff to storm drains. Accordingly, the proposed project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

There are no natural drainage courses located on-site and the site is relatively flat. Because the proposed project would involve the exposure of large areas of soil during the duration of project

---


construction, the appropriate soil erosion and control techniques would be employed in conformance to the Construction BMP Handbook.

The proposed project would include the development of a storm drainage system consistent with City requirements and California Storm Water Quality Association (CASQA) New Development BMP Handbook SD-13 to convey stormwater runoff to the mainline storm drain system. Stormwater management practices as required under City of Fontana Municipal Code, Section 28-111.5 would further reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the proposed on-site detention/infiltration basin would limit the release of storm water from the site, thereby minimizing the potential for flooding to occur onsite or off-site. Due to the site’s storm drain system design and the implementation of the BMPs, impacts would be less than significant.

c)ii) 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 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.

The project site does not include any streams or rivers which could be altered by the proposed project. In addition, the proposed on-site detention/infiltration basin would limit the release of stormwater from the site, thereby minimizing the potential for flooding to occur on-site or off-site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c)iii) 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 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.

Refer to Impact X.a) above. On-site stormwater runoff associated with the project would be engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and an on-site infiltration to dispose of stormwater. Additionally, with required adherence to a SWPPP and WQMP as discussed above, the proposed project would not be a substantial source of polluted runoff. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

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

The project site is relatively flat. The proposed project would include the development of a storm drainage system consistent with City requirements to convey stormwater runoff to the mainline storm drain system. Stormwater management practices as required under City of Fontana Municipal Code, Section 28-111.5 would further reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the proposed on-site catch basin would limit the release of stormwater from
the site, thereby minimizing the potential for impediment or redirect flood flows. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project site is located over 60 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Given the distance from the coast, the potential for the project site to be inundated by a tsunami is negligible. No steep slopes are located in the project vicinity; therefore, the risk of mudflow is also negligible. In addition, the project is not located within a flood hazard area as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).40 Therefore, no associated impacts relative to the risk of pollutant release due to inundation are anticipated to occur.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to Impact X.a) above. Although the project would result in additional impervious surfaces on-site, the project would collect stormwater runoff public street improvements and proposed storm drains. Accordingly, the proposed project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

---

40 City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, June 2017, Figure 4-1: Flood Hazard Map.
XI. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE AND PLANNING:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

**a) Would the project physically divide an established community? No Impact.**

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. As discussed previously in Impacts I.c) and II.a), the proposed project would construct a medical center on a vacant lot located in the southeast corner of PA-5 of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan area. The project is consistent with surrounding land uses and would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**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.**

As discussed above, the proposed project seeks to develop PA-5 of the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan for commercial use, as envisioned in the Specific Plan. In order to develop the site as a medical center, the project would require the approval of the following:

- General Plan Amendment No. 19-003. The project must submit a proposal to change the General Plan land use map from Medium Density (R-M) to Walkable Mixed-Use Downtown and Corridors (WMXU-1).

- Design Review No. 19-011. The project is required to submit plans to the City to determine that the project meets the City’s design guidelines.

- Conditional Use Permit No. 19-009. The project will require the approval of a Conditional Use Permit to operate a medical center within the Fontana Promenade Specific Plan.

The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan, Fontana Promenade Specific Plan and Fontana Municipal Code. Furthermore, the project-level review of the project includes a site design review to ensure compliance with site-specific development standards, as outlined in the Fontana Municipal Code and other applicable ordinances. Following the approval of the
above actions, the proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation, and a less than significant impact would occur.

XII. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>

Discussion

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?  Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Chapter of the General Plan, the most significant mineral resources in the City are sand and gravel deposits in the alluvial fan that extends southward from the base of the San Gabriel foothills.41 The California Department of Conservation identified the project area as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2), which indicates the presence of significant mineral deposits (in this instance, the minerals are sand and gravel).42 Also, no known deposits of precious gemstones, ores, or unique or rare minerals have been identified within the city limits.

Historical uses of the project site have not included mineral extraction, nor does the project site currently support mineral extraction. In addition, the project does not propose any mineral extraction activities. The project proposes the construction for a new medical facility with no planned mining operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the state, and a less than significant impact would occur.

---

41 City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035, November 13, 2018, Chapter 7: Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails.
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? Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site has not been identified as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan.\textsuperscript{43} Furthermore, there are no mineral resource recovery sites on or near the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site, and a less than significant impact would occur.

XIII. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE: Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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 the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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>

**Fundamentals of Sound and Environmental Noise**

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves in a compressible medium such as air and is characterized by both its amplitude and frequency (or pitch). The human ear does not hear all frequencies equally. In particular, the ear de-emphasizes low and very high frequencies. To better approximate the sensitivity of human hearing, the A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) has been developed. Decibels are based on the logarithmic scale. The logarithmic scale compresses the wide range in sound pressure levels to a more usable range of numbers in a manner similar to the Richter scale used to measure earthquakes. In terms of human response to noise, a sound 10 dBA higher than another is perceived to be twice as loud and 20 dBA higher is perceived to be four times as loud, and so forth. Everyday sounds normally range from 30 dBA (very quiet) to 100
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dBA (very loud). On this scale, the human range of hearing extends from approximately 3 dBA to around 140 dBA.

Noise is generally defined as unwanted or excessive sound, which can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing; therefore, a logarithmic scale, known as the decibel scale (dB), is used to quantify sound intensity. Noise can be generated by a number of sources, including mobile sources such as automobiles, trucks, and airplanes, and stationary sources such as construction sites, machinery, and industrial operations. Noise generated by mobile sources typically attenuates (is reduced) at a rate between 3 dBA and 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance. The rate depends on the ground surface and the number or type of objects between the noise source and the receiver. Hard and flat surfaces, such as concrete or asphalt, have an attenuation rate of 3 dBA per doubling of distance. Soft surfaces, such as uneven or vegetated terrain, have an attenuation rate of about 4.5 dBA per doubling of distance. Noise generated by stationary sources typically attenuates at a rate between 6 dBA and about 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance.

There are several metrics used to characterize community noise exposure, which fluctuate constantly over time. One such metric, the equivalent sound level (Leq), represents a constant sound that, over the specified period, has the same sound energy as the time-varying sound. Noise exposure over a longer period is often evaluated based on the Day-Night Sound Level (Ldn). This is a measure of 24-hour noise levels that incorporates a 10 dBA penalty for sounds occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The penalty is intended to reflect the increased human sensitivity to noises occurring during nighttime hours, particularly at times when people are sleeping and there are lower ambient noise conditions. Typical Ldn noise levels for light and medium density residential areas range from 55 dBA to 65 dBA.

**Fundamentals of Environmental Groundborne Vibration**

Sources of earth-borne vibrations include natural phenomena (earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides, etc.) or man-made causes (explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment, etc.). Vibration sources may be continuous (e.g., factory machinery) or transient (e.g., explosions). Ground vibration consists of rapidly fluctuating motions or waves with an average motion of zero. Several different methods are typically used to quantify vibration amplitude. One is the peak particle velocity (PPV); another is the root mean square (RMS) velocity. The PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration wave. The RMS velocity is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal. The PPV and RMS vibration velocity amplitudes are used to evaluate human response to vibration.

Ground vibration can be a concern in instances where buildings shake and substantial rumblings occur. However, it is unusual for vibration from typical urban sources such as buses and heavy trucks to be perceptible. Common sources for groundborne vibration are planes, trains, and construction activities such as earth-moving which requires the use of heavy-duty earth moving equipment. For the purposes of this analysis, a PPV descriptor with units of inches per second is used to evaluate construction-generated vibration for building damage and human complaints.
Discussion

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? Less Than Significant Impact.

Short-Term Construction Noise

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels as a result of the project would predominantly be associated with construction activities. Construction activities would occur over approximately five and a half months and would include the following phases: grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Project construction would require concrete/industrial saws, crawler tractors, excavators, other construction equipment, rough terrain forklifts, rubber-tired dozers and loaders, signal boards, skid steer loaders, and tractors/loaders/backhoes during demolition; graders, rubber tired dozers, tractors/loaders/backhoes during grading; concrete/industrial saws, signal boards, skid steer loaders, during building construction; cement and mortar mixers, pavers, paving equipment, rollers, signal boards, during paving; and lastly air compressors during architectural coatings. Typical noise levels generated by construction equipment are shown in Table 9, Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment.

Table 9: Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Acoustical Use Factor</th>
<th>$L_{max}$ at 15 Feet (dBA)</th>
<th>$L_{max}$ at 50 Feet (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer Truck</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklift</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial Equipment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: dBA = A-weighted decibels; $L_{max}$ = Maximum Sound Level
Acoustical Use Factor (percent): Estimates the fraction of time each piece of construction equipment is operating at full power (i.e., its loudest condition) during a construction operation.

As shown in Table 9, construction-generated noise levels would range from 87 dBA to 95 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor approximately 15 feet away. It should be noted that the noise levels identified in Table 9 are maximum sound levels ($L_{max}$), which are the highest individual sound occurring at an individual time period. Operating cycles for these types of construction
equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings. Other primary sources of acoustical disturbance would be due to random incidents, which would last less than one minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts). Additionally, construction would occur across the entire project site and would not be localized to this sensitive receptor distance. Further, the City of Fontana Code of Ordinances does not have specific construction noise limits. Pursuant to the City of Fontana Code of Ordinances, all construction activities would comply with construction time limitations 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 cases of emergency. Therefore, noise impacts from short-term construction activities would be less than significant following compliance with the City’s allowable construction hours.

**Long-Term Operational Noise**

**Off-Site Mobile Noise**

Development of the proposed project would result in some additional traffic on adjacent roadways, thereby potentially increasing vehicular noise in the vicinity of existing and proposed land uses. The most prominent source of mobile traffic noise in the project vicinity is along Sierra Avenue and Baseline Avenue. As part of the air quality analysis, the CalEEMod program estimated the number of new trips per day the project would generate based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th edition. CalEEMod estimated that a 25,000 square foot medical office building would generate approximately 903 trips per day on weekdays, 224 trips on Saturdays, and 39 trips on Sundays.

According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), a doubling of traffic (100 percent increase) on a roadway would result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise levels (3 dBA). According to Exhibit 9.5 in the Community, Mobility, and Circulation Chapter of the General Plan, an average of 10,001 to 20,000 motorists travel along Baseline Avenue every day and 20,001 to 30,000 travel along Sierra Avenue everyday within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the addition of 903 new trips would increase traffic by 9 percent at most. As such, the project-related increase in traffic volume along neighboring streets would be nominal compared to existing traffic and would not result in a perceptible increase in traffic noise level (less than 100 percent). Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**Stationary Noise**

The project proposes to construct a 25,000 square foot medical building and associated parking. Stationary noise sources associated with the project would include the operation of mechanical equipment and parking lot activities.

---
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Mechanical Equipment

HVAC units would be installed on the roof of the proposed building. Typically, mechanical equipment noise is 55 dBA at 50 feet from the source. The HVAC units are not shown on the site plans, however, assuming that the unit is mounted on the roof of the building, the closest potential distance between on-site HVAC units and the nearest sensitive receptor (multi-family residences to the north of the proposed medical building), would be approximately 100 feet. At this distance, HVAC noise levels would approximately 49 dBA assuming no attenuation from intervening structures, walls, sound propagation, etc. Therefore, HVAC noise levels would not exceed the City’s residential noise standards of 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). A less than significant impact would occur this regard.

Parking Lot Noise

The proposed project would include the construction of 129 parking spaces along the northern and western portions of the project site. Based on the site plan, the nearest parking spaces are approximately 25 feet from a sensitive receptor. Estimates of the maximum noise levels associated with the parking lot activities attributed to the project are presented in Table 10, Typical Noise Levels Generated by Parking Lots.

Table 10: Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Parking Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Source</th>
<th>Maximum Noise Levels at 25 Feet from Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car door slamming</td>
<td>67 dBA $L_{eq}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car starting</td>
<td>66 dBA $L_{eq}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car idling</td>
<td>59 dBA $L_{eq}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: dBA = A-weighted decibels; $L_{eq}$ = Equivalent Sound Level

As shown in Table 10, parking lot activities can result in noise levels up to 67 dBA at a distance of 25 feet. It is noted that parking lot noise are instantaneous noise levels compared to noise standards in the CNEL scale, which are averaged over time. As a result, actual noise levels over time resulting from parking lot activities would be far lower than what is identified in Table 10. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed parking lot are approximately 25 feet to the north and west of the proposed parking spaces. However, a block wall will separate the parking lot from the sensitive receptors and would decrease noise levels by approximately 5 to 8 dBA. At this distance, parking lot noise would vary from 54 to 62 dBA, which would be below the City’s noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL. Therefore, parking lot noise associated with the proposed project site would not exceed the City’s noise standards. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.
b) **Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

Operation of the project would not generate substantial levels of vibration due to the lack of vibration-generating sources and therefore is not analyzed below. Conversely, project construction would have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. Operation of some heavy-duty construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings located in the vicinity of the construction site often varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and construction characteristics of the receiver building(s). The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Groundborne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that damage structures.

The Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Manual identifies various vibration damage criteria for different building classes. This evaluation uses the Caltrans architectural damage criterion for continuous vibrations at older residential structures of 0.3 inch-per-second PPV. Further, as the nearest receptors to project construction are residents, the criterion for human annoyance of 0.2 inch-per-second PPV is utilized. The types of construction vibration impact include human annoyance and building damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Typical vibration produced by construction equipment is detailed in **Table 11, Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Approximate peak particle velocity at 15 feet (inches/second)</th>
<th>Approximate peak particle velocity at 25 feet (inches/second)</th>
<th>Approximate peak particle velocity at 50 feet (inches/second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large bulldozer</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bulldozer</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Roller</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Calculated using the following formula:
   \[
   PPV_{app} = PPV_{ref} \times \left(\frac{25}{D}\right)^{0.5}
   \]
   where: \(PPV\) (equip) = the peak particle velocity in in/sec of the equipment adjusted for the distance
   \(PPV\) (ref) = the reference vibration level in in/sec from Table 7-4 of the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.
   \(D\) = the distance from the equipment to the receiver


Ground-borne vibration decreases rapidly with distance. As indicated in **Table 11**, based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) data, vibration velocities from typical heavy construction
equipment operations that would be used during project construction range from 0.001 to 0.074 inch-per-second PPV at 50 feet from the source of activity. The nearest structures are located approximately 15 feet to the north and to the west of the proposed parking lot. At this distance, project construction vibration would range from 0.007 to 0.452 inch-per-second PPV. Vibration velocities from vibratory roller operations would be 0.452 inch-per-second PPV and would exceed the Caltrans significance threshold for building damage. Therefore, groundborne vibration generated from vibratory roller operations would be considered potentially significant. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would require the use of a static (non-vibratory) roller, as an alternative to vibratory rollers, within 30 feet of the residential structures on the project site. Additionally, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 construction vibration would not cause excessive human annoyance as the highest groundborne vibration nearest sensitive receptors (i.e. 0.161 inch-per-second PPV) would not exceed the 0.2 inch-per-second PPV human annoyance criteria. Thus, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

Mitigation Measures

NOI-1  Prior to the initiation of construction, the Applicant shall prepare a paving control plan to ensure that the paving process does not result in damage to the residential structures to the north and west of the proposed parking lot. The paving control plan shall be subject to the City of Fontana Building and Safety Department’s approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. To reduce groundborne vibration levels, the paving control plan shall stipulate that static (non-vibratory) rollers shall be used as an alternative to vibratory rollers within 30 feet of the residential structures.

c)  For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 impact.

The closest airport to the project site is Ontario International Airport, located approximately 9 miles to the southwest of the site. There are no private airstrips within the project vicinity. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no impact relative to excessive noise levels from airports would occur.
XIV. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned 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>

Discussion

a) Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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 Impact.

The proposed project would construct a new medical facility on a vacant site. There are no existing residential structures on the project site, nor are any residential structures proposed, and therefore the project would not displace housing or people. No growth or development beyond what was assumed in the General Plan would occur. No impacts would occur.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? No Impact.

The proposed project site is currently undeveloped/vacant. Because the project involves the development of a new medical facility that would be constructed on a vacant site, the project does not have potential to displace any housing. Therefore, the project would not displace any housing as a result of project implementation, nor would it displace substantial numbers of people requiring the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur in this regard.
XV. Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>i) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a)i) **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 fire protection? Less Than Significant Impact.**

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection services in the project vicinity. However, the project would be developed in accordance with applicable city, county, and state regulations, codes, and policies pertaining to fire hazard reduction and protection. The new medical facility would be equipped with emergency sprinkler systems and fire detectors. Water lines with fire-sufficient flows supplied by FWC would be connected to fire hydrants placed in accordance with Fontana Fire Protection District (FFPD) standards. The project applicant is also required to pay Development Impact Fees for fire to mitigate impacts.

Fire protection and emergency response services for the project area are provided by the FFPD, which is part of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The FFPD currently operates six fire stations. The nearest fire stations to the project site are Fire Station No. 78 located at 7110 Citrus Avenue, approximately 1.2 miles to the northwest, and Fire Station No. 71 located at 16980 Arrow Boulevard, approximately 1.6 miles to the south. Based on the proximity of the project site to existing FFPD facilities and the fact that the project site is already within the FFPD’s service area, the proposed project would not affect response times or service ratios, alter or increase
the demand for fire protection services, or require the construction of additional fire facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

a)ii) *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 police protection? Less Than Significant Impact.*

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for police protection services in the project vicinity. Police protection for the project area is provided by the Fontana Police Department (FPD). The FPD operates out of its headquarters located at 17005 Upland Avenue, approximately 1.5 miles to the south of the project site. Similar to fire protection services, the project site is already located within FPD’s service area. Because the proposed project is intended to serve the existing population and would not generate any new residents, the proposed project would not affect response times or service ratios, alter or increase the demand for law enforcement services, or require the construction of additional police facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

a)iii) *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 schools? No Impact.*

The proposed project does not include residential housing and would not increase the student population of the area. In addition, future population growth is accounted for in the General Plan since the project would be consistent with the land use and zoning designations. As such, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools in the project area, and no impact would occur.

a)iv) *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 parks? No Impact.*

The proposed project does not include residential housing and therefore, would not increase the population in the project area. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant increase in the demand for park space. As such, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks in the project area, and no impact would occur.
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 other public facilities? No Impact.

Other public facilities in the area such as health care, production, commercial, retail, residential, etc., would not be adversely impacted because the proposed project is not anticipated to add substantial population growth that would require the use of public facilities. In addition, the project consists of a new medical facility which would serve the existing population within the project vicinity. As such, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public facilities in the project area, and no impact would occur.

XVI. Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</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>

Discussion

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? No Impact.

The demand for parks is determined by changes in housing and population. In this case, the project consists of a new medical facility and no new residents or housing would be introduced to the area. The project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth or increase demand on parks and recreational resources. Therefore, the project would not result in the increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park and no impact would occur.
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 Impact.

The project does not include recreational facilities or require the expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, no impact would occur.

XVII. Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

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

The City of Fontana has determined that a project-specific traffic analysis is not warranted for the proposed project. However, as part of the air quality modeling program used to conduct the project’s air quality analysis, default trip generation estimates were developed for the project (based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th edition which calculates average trip rates based on land use). It is estimated that a 25,000 square foot medical office building would generate approximately 903 trips per day during weekdays, 224 trips on Saturdays, and 39 trips on Sundays. These estimates are considered to be nominal in terms of additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed project, and it is not expected that a conflict with circulation policies would result with project implementation.

In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with any applicable traffic and circulation regulations set forth by the City. With adherence to any relevant circulation regulations, the project would have a less than significant impact on circulation policies.
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? Less Than Significant Impact.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 contains several subdivisions. In brief, these Guidelines provide that transportation impacts of projects are, in general, best measured by evaluating the project’s VMT. Methodologies for evaluating such impacts are already in use for most land use projects, as well as many transit and active transportation projects. Methods for evaluating VMT for roadway capacity projects continue to evolve, however, and so these Guidelines recognize a lead agency's discretion to analyze such projects, provided such analysis is consistent with CEQA and applicable planning requirements.

Section 15064.3(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts states the following:

(1) Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

According to the SCAG High Quality Transit Corridor (HQTC) mapping website, the proposed project site is located within an area designated as a HQTC.45 In addition, as discussed in Impact XVII.a) above, based on trip generation estimates, the proposed project would generate nominal trips, with approximately 903 trips per day during weekdays, 224 trips on Saturdays, and 39 trips on Sundays. As such, the project does not meet the City’s requirements for the preparation of a Traffic Impact Analysis. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant transportation impact and a traffic impact analysis is not warranted.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? No Impact.

The design features of the proposed project do not incorporate any hazardous or incompatible features. The internal traffic circulation on the project site would not include sharp turns, and the drive aisles/fire lanes within the project site have been designed to be both efficient and safe for vehicular traffic. Additionally, the project would not be an incompatible use, nor would it be hazardous due to its design. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

The project is located at the intersection of Sierra Avenue and Baseline Avenue, both of which are local truck routes and can accommodate a large amount of traffic during an emergency. During project construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the City. In addition, the proposed project has been

designed with two separate ingress/egress points, one on Sierra Avenue and the other on Baseline Avenue, as well as an EVA driveway dedicated for use by emergency vehicles on Baseline Avenue. On-site circulation has also been designed to allow for maneuvering of emergency vehicles (e.g., fire trucks) and to allow for emergency access to the building. The nearest fire station is the San Bernardino County Fire Station 78, located one mile to the northwest of the project site. The project does not include any land uses or off-site improvements that would result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE:</strong></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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), or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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>

Discussion

a)i) 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 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)?

a)ii) 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 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.

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

The project site does not contain any historic resources. In March 2019, the City initiated tribal consultation with interested California Native American tribes consistent with AB 52. The City requested consultation from the following tribes: the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (San Manuel), the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and the Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation reviewed the cultural resources report and requested consultation. The City responded to the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation with a request for a date and time for the consultation for AB 52 and received no response from the tribe. The balance of the consulted tribes did not respond to the consultation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 below would reduce potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

TCR-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a qualified vertebrate paleontologist shall review the project-specific geotechnical report data, with particular regard to the specific location and depth of earthmoving activities and the rock unit(s) being encountered, for the purpose of assessing the potential for fossil remains being encountered by earthmoving activities. If the paleontologist determines that previously undisturbed strata with potential for containing fossil remains would be encountered by earthmoving activities, Mitigation Measure TCR-2 below shall be implemented. If no such potential for fossil remains is identified, no further mitigation is required.

TCR-2 Earthmoving activities shall be monitored by a paleontological monitor only in those areas of the site where they would disturb Pleistocene formations. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting freshly exposed rock and debris for larger fossil remains and periodically dry test screening a small (25 pound) sample of rock and debris with a 20-mesh box screen for smaller vertebrate fossil remains. Monitoring of grading below 5 feet in depth shall be initially conducted on a full-time basis. However, if too few or no fossil remains are uncovered by earthmoving
activities in areas underlain by a particular rock unit and with the approval of the project applicant and the City Planning Division, paleontological monitoring may be reduced or eliminated, generally, to half or quarter time or suspended once 50 percent of earthmoving activities in the area underlain by the rock unit has been completed. Alternatively, if sufficient fossil remains are uncovered by earthmoving activities and with the approval of the project applicant and the City Planning Division, monitoring may be increased in areas underlain by the fossil-bearing rock unit, at least in the immediate vicinity of the fossil locale.

The San Bernardino County Museum, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Western Science Center, San Diego Natural History Museum, or Riverside Municipal Museum shall be the designated museum repository for any vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant fossil remains and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data that might be recovered from the project site.

**XIX. Utilities and Service Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</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>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

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.

Utilities necessary for the proposed project site are as follows:

- Electricity – SCE
- Water – FWC
- Sewer – City of Fontana
- Storm Drain – City of Fontana
- Cable – Charter Communications
- Telephone – AT&T
- Natural Gas – SoCalGas Company

Water

The proposed project would require water for employees, patients, visitors and for irrigation of landscaped areas. Water for the project would be provided by the FWC and would connect to the existing water main. Therefore, the expansion of off-site water facilities would not be required to serve the proposed project.

Wastewater Treatment

The IEUA provides wastewater treatment service throughout the City. The IEUA currently operates four regional wastewater treatment facilities: Regional Plant (RP-) 1, RP-4, RP-5, and Carbon Canyon Wastewater Reclamation Facility (CCWRF). The City is located within the RP-1 service area. According to the IEUA’s most recent Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), RP-1 has a rated, permitted treatment capacity of 44 million gallons per day, and is currently treating an average of 28 million gallons per day, or only 65 percent of its capacity.46

The proposed 25,000 square foot medical office building is estimated to generate 7,500 gallons of wastewater per day, based on the wastewater generation rates by each class of land use, 47

---

would equate to roughly 0.05 percent of RP-1’s additional 16 million gallons of surplus capacity, representing a nominal increase in the amount of wastewater treated daily by the wastewater treatment plant. Therefore, impacts associated with wastewater treatment requirements and capacity would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications**

The project site is located within a developed area of the City and is situated within close proximity to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. Thus, substantial expansion of such off-site utilities would not be required to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

**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.**

According to the 2015 UWMP, FWC has sufficient water supplies to serve the project. As discussed above, water for the project would be provided by the FWC. Based on land use, the CalEEMod emission model calculated that the project would require 3.3 million gallons of water per year (2.74 million gallons for indoor use and 0.56 million gallons for outdoor landscaping); refer to Appendix A.

According to the 2015 UWMP, domestic water supplies are reliant on groundwater from the Chino Groundwater Basin, the Rialto Groundwater Basin, the Lytle Basin, and the No Man’s Land Basin. FWC also relies on surface water sourced from Lytle Creek. FWC is anticipated to have 40,140 AF of water supply by 2020. The project would require 3.3 million gallons of water, which converts to 10.12 AF (1 million gallons = 3.068 AF). Based on the project’s usage rate, the project would consume 0.02 percent of FWC’s water supply. As such, a less than significant impact would occur.

**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.**

As discussed under **Impact XIX.a)**, there are sufficient wastewater treatment facilities and capacity to service the project. Because the City’s wastewater provider has sufficient wastewater treatment capacity, it is anticipated that a less than significant impact would occur.

**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.**

Implementation of the project is anticipated to generate additional waste during the temporary, short-term construction phase, as well as the operational phase, however, it would not be expected to result in inadequate landfill capacity. Solid waste service for the City is provided by the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill located in the northern portion of the City. According to
CalRecycle, the landfill has a maximum throughput of 7,500 tons per day. This landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of approximately 101.3 million cubic yards, and the landfill has a remaining capacity of approximately 67.52 million cubic yards. The landfill has an expected operational life through 2033 with the potential for vertical, or downward expansion. As such, the proposed project’s solid waste disposal needs are anticipated to be met by the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill.48 The project not generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards and a less than significant impact would occur.

e) **Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? No Impact.**

As discussed under Impact XIX.d), the project would generate waste during the construction phase, as well as the operational phase, but it would not be expected to result in inadequate landfill capacity. The proposed project would be required to adhere to City ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, no impacts related to federal, State, or local regulations are anticipated with project implementation.

### XX. Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILDFIRE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>❌</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>
<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>
<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>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

a) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) Fire and Resource Assessment Program, the project site is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area (SRA).49 The nearest SRAs are located 3.5 miles to the northeast and northwest of the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site is located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), classified as LRA Unzoned.50 The project site is serviced by the FFPD and the nearest fire station, Fire Station 78, is located approximately 1 mile to the northwest of the project site. Therefore, development of the project would not impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. A less than significant would occur.

b) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to Impact XX.a), above. The project site is not located in or near a SRA; the nearest SRAs are located 3.5 miles to the northeast and northwest of the project site. In addition, the project site does not contain lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

c) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to Impact XX.a), above. The project site is not located in or near a SRA and does not contain lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The proposed project would include construction of a medical office building and associated parking. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not increase the risk of fire. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

d) If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to Impact XX.a), above. The project site is not located in or near a SRA and does not contain lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The project would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; 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>

Discussion

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or
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