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PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

1. Project Title
   Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project
   Master Case No. (MCN) 19-131
   Design Review No. (DRP) 19-041
   Tentative Parcel Map No 20196

2. CEQA Lead Agency and Address
   City of Fontana
   8353 Sierra Avenue
   Fontana, CA 92335-3528

3. Contact and Phone Number
   Rina Leung, Associate Planner
   (909) 350-6566
   rleung@fontana.org

4. Project Applicant
   Magellan Value Partners, LLC
   1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2470
   Los Angeles, CA 90067

5. Project Location
   West side of Mango Avenue, east of Sierra Avenue
   and north of Sierra Lakes Parkway
   Fontana, CA 92336

6. Assessor's Parcel Numbers
   APNs: 1119-221-64 and 1119-221-68

7. Project Site General Plan Designation(s)
   I-L, Light Industrial

8. Project Site Zoning Designation(s)
   M-1, Light Industrial

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting
   Land uses surrounding the project site include industrial, retail/commercial shopping center, Sierra Lakes Specific Plan residential areas, and a landfill.

   North
   Light Industrial (I-L)
   Commercial and industrial land uses are located to the north.

   South
   Regional Mixed Use (RMU)
   Vacant parcels are located to the south and commercial land uses are located beyond Sierra Lakes Parkway.

   West
   Light Industrial (I-L)
   Sierra Lakes Specific Plan
   Residential Planned Community (R-PC)
10. Description of Project

The Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project would be a 115,100-square-foot warehouse facility located on 5.80 gross acres.

The proposed building would include a 6,000-square-foot office, a 4,000-square-foot office mezzanine and 105,100 square feet of warehouse space.

Onsite water, and storm drain utility improvements would be provided. Offsite improvements include water and sewer. In addition, the site would provide adequate ingress and egress, parking, and loading areas for passenger vehicles, tractor/trailer vehicles, and pedestrians. An underground StormTech® Chamber System for low-flow filtration provided on site for treatment of stormwater runoff.

The logistics/distribution center would have 19 truck dock bays, 90 automobile parking spaces and additional trailer parking spaces. Primary site ingress and egress would be provided via 40-foot-wide driveways along Mango Avenue in the project site’s northeast and southeast corners. Additionally, there would be a 31.5-foot-wide driveway to an existing easement for emergency vehicle ingress and egress along Sierra Avenue.

The site is currently vacant and has sparse ground vegetation.

11. Selected Agencies whose Approval is Required

City of Fontana
West Valley Water District
Southern California Gas Company
Southern California Edison Company

12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code

Letters were sent by the City (the lead agency) to ten local Native American tribes asking if they wished to participate in AB 52 consultation concerning the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project within the City of Fontana.
§ 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

letters were sent on March 2, 2020 and April 7, 2020 by certified mail.

The City received a reply from the Gabrieleno – Kizh Nation on March 17, 2020. Consultation between the City and the Gabrieleno-Kizh Nation was conducted on May 21, 2020. The City received a response from Donna Yocum of the San Fernando Band of Mission Indians indicating that all projects that disturb cultural resources are important to all tribal groups. Another response was received from Jessica Mauck of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on April 9, 2020 indicating that the project area is in their traditional territory but they have no concerns with the project. The last email response was received on April 14, 2020 from Jill McCormick of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation indicating that they had no concerns with the project. The remaining tribes did not reply to the City within the 30-day response period.

Detailed information regarding AB 52 consultation with the Native American tribes is provided in Section 4.18 of this Initial Study.

13. Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required

None.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Abbreviation</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>°F</td>
<td>degrees Fahrenheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Assembly Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 32</td>
<td>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 939</td>
<td>California Integrated Waste Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1327</td>
<td>California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSL</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE</td>
<td>area of potential effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>aboveground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTM</td>
<td>American Society for Testing and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Active Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgs</td>
<td>below ground surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAQS</td>
<td>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal/OSHA</td>
<td>California Division of Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalEEMod</td>
<td>California Emissions Estimator Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL FIRE</td>
<td>California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALGreen</td>
<td>California Green Building Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPCOA</td>
<td>California Air Pollution Control Officers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAOs</td>
<td>Cleanup and Abatement Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>California Building Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAA</td>
<td>California Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOs</td>
<td>Cease and Desist Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFW</td>
<td>California Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESA</td>
<td>California Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>California Geologic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>methane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>California Historic Resources Inventory System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIWMA</td>
<td>State of California Integrated Waste Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDDDB</td>
<td>California Natural Diversity Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>Community Noise Equivalent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRA</td>
<td>California Natural Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Abbreviation</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂e</td>
<td>carbon dioxide equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>California Residential Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRHR</td>
<td>California Register of Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA</td>
<td>A-weighted decibel scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIF</td>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>drainage management area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>California Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOSH</td>
<td>California Division of Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP</td>
<td>Design Review Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTSC</td>
<td>Department of Toxic Substances Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Environmental Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>floor area ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFPD</td>
<td>Fontana Fire Protection District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHSZ</td>
<td>Fire Hazard Severity Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMMP</td>
<td>Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPD</td>
<td>Fontana Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAP</td>
<td>CalFire Fire Resource and Assessment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUSD</td>
<td>Fontana Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>Fontana Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCD</td>
<td>gallons per capita per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWP</td>
<td>global warming potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWTS</td>
<td>groundwater treatment system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZNET</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFCs</td>
<td>hydrofluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>hertz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEUA</td>
<td>Inland Empire Utilities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Fire Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-L</td>
<td>Light Industrial General Plan Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS/MND</td>
<td>Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kWh</td>
<td>kilowatt hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lₙ₀</td>
<td>noise level that is exceeded 90% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lₑq</td>
<td>equivalent noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>light-emitting diode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHMP</td>
<td>Local Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Abbreviation</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LID</td>
<td>Low Impact Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>root mean square maximum noise level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Local Responsibility Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRP</td>
<td>Legally Responsible Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTs</td>
<td>Localized Significance Thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>Leaking Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>Light Industrial zoning designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Master Case No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLD</td>
<td>Most Likely Descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM(s)</td>
<td>mitigation measure(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMRP</td>
<td>Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>million metric tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMTCO$_{2e}$</td>
<td>million metric tons of CO2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRZ</td>
<td>Mineral Resource Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>municipal separate storm sewer systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWD</td>
<td>Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_2O$</td>
<td>nitrous oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHC</td>
<td>Native American Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCP</td>
<td>Natural Communities Conservation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>nitric oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO$_2$</td>
<td>nitrogen dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>Nitrogen oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPA</td>
<td>Native Plant Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_3$</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Governor’s Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCs</td>
<td>perfluorocarbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>fine particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>respirable particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Cologne</td>
<td>Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>peak particle velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDs</td>
<td>Permit Registration Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>potential responsible party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Abbreviation</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qyf5</td>
<td>Young Alluvial Fan Deposits, unit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC(s)</td>
<td>recognized environmental condition(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>root mean square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>Reactive organic gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Regional Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWQCB</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARWQCB</td>
<td>Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCIWMWP</td>
<td>San Bernardino Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>San Bernardino County Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAB</td>
<td>South Coast Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCIC</td>
<td>South Central Coastal Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF₆</td>
<td>sulfur hexafluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLF</td>
<td>Sacred Lands File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMARTS</td>
<td>Stormwater Multi-Application and Report Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMBMI</td>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>sulfur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCalGas</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPs</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>State Responsibility Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAs</td>
<td>source receptor areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSMP</td>
<td>Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVE</td>
<td>soil vapor extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>California State Water Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRCB</td>
<td>California State Water Resources Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCRs</td>
<td>tribal cultural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMP</td>
<td>Traffic Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMP</td>
<td>Urban Water Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>Vitrified Clay Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VdB</td>
<td>vibration decibels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHFHSZs</td>
<td>very high fire hazard severity zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAP</td>
<td>Worker Environmental Awareness Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQMP</td>
<td>Water Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym/Abbreviation</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOUS</td>
<td>water(s) of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVWD</td>
<td>West Valley Water District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Proposed Project

The City of Fontana (City) is processing a request to implement a series of discretionary actions that would ultimately allow for the development of the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse (hereby referred to as the “proposed project” or the “project”), located on Mango Avenue in Fontana, California (APNs: 1119-221-64 and 1119-221-68).

1.1.1 Project Components

The proposed project would construct a 115,100-square-foot warehouse facility, which would include a 6,000-square-foot office, a 4,000-square-foot office mezzanine and 105,100 square feet of warehouse space. The warehouse would have 20 dock doors, trailer stalls, and 90 automobile parking stalls. Refer to Section 3.0, Project Description, of this document for additional details.

1.1.2 Estimated Construction Schedule

Project construction is anticipated to begin in November 2020 and would be completed in June 2021.

1.2 Lead Agencies – Environmental Review Implementation

The City of Fontana is the Lead Agency for the proposed project. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its implementing regulations, the Lead Agency has the principal responsibility for implementing and approving a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

1.3 CEQA Overview

1.3.1 Purpose of CEQA

All discretionary projects within California are required to undergo environmental review under CEQA. A Project is defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15378 as the whole of the action having the potential to result in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change to the environment and is any of the following:

- An activity directly undertaken by any public agency including but not limited to public works construction and related activities clearing or grading of land, improvements to existing public structures, enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, and the adoption and amendment of local General Plans or elements.
- An activity undertaken by a person which is supported in whole or in part through public agency contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies.
- An activity involving the issuance to a person of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement for use by one or more public agencies.

CEQA Guidelines § 15002 lists the basic purposes of CEQA as follows:

1 Public Resources Code §§ 21000 - 21177 and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3.
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- Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

1.3.2 Authority to Mitigate under CEQA

CEQA establishes a duty for public agencies to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. Under CEQA Guidelines § 15041 a Lead Agency for a project has authority to require feasible changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment, consistent with applicable constitutional requirements such as the “nexus”2 and “rough proportionality”3 standards.

CEQA allows a Lead Agency to approve a project even though the project would cause a significant effect on the environment if the agency makes a fully informed and publicly disclosed decision that there is no feasible way to lessen or avoid the significant effect. In such cases, the Lead Agency must specifically identify expected benefits and other overriding considerations from the project that outweigh the policy of reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts of the project.

1.4 Purpose of Initial Study

The CEQA process begins with a public agency making a determination as to whether the project is subject to CEQA at all. If the project is exempt, the process does not need to proceed any farther. If the project is not exempt, the Lead Agency takes the second step and conducts an Initial Study to determine whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The purposes of an Initial Study as listed in § 15063(c) of the CEQA Guidelines are to:

- Provide the Lead Agency with information necessary to decide if an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration (ND), or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) should be prepared.
- Enable a Lead Agency to modify a project to mitigate adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a ND or MND.
- Assist in the preparation of an EIR, if required, by focusing the EIR on adverse effects determined to be significant, identifying the adverse effects determined not to be significant, explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant adverse effects would not be significant, and identifying whether a program EIR, or other process, can be used to analyze adverse environmental effects of the project.
- Facilitate an environmental assessment early during project design.
- Provide documentation in the ND or MND that a project would not have a significant effect on the environment.
- Eliminate unnecessary EIRs.

---

2 A nexus (i.e., connection) must be established between the mitigation measure and a legitimate governmental interest.
3 The mitigation measure must be “roughly proportional” to the impacts of the Project.
• Determine if a previously prepared EIR could be used for the Project.

In cases where no potentially significant impacts are identified, the Lead Agency may issue a ND, and no mitigation measures would be needed. Where potentially significant impacts are identified, the Lead Agency may determine that mitigation measures would adequately reduce these impacts to less than significant levels. The Lead Agency would then prepare an MND for the proposed project. If the Lead Agency determines that individual or cumulative effects of the proposed project would cause a significant adverse environmental effect that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels, then the Lead Agency would require an EIR to further analyze these impacts.

1.5 Review and Comment by Other Agencies

Other public agencies are provided the opportunity to review and comment on the IS/MND. Each of these agencies is described briefly below.

• A Responsible Agency (14 CCR § 15381) is a public agency, other than the Lead Agency, that has discretionary approval power over the Project, such as permit issuance or plan approval authority.
• A Trustee Agency 4 (14 CCR § 15386) is a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the State of California.
• Agencies with Jurisdiction by Law (14 CCR § 15366) are any public agencies who have authority (1) to grant a permit or other entitlement for use; (2) to provide funding for the project in question; or (3) to exercise authority over resources which may be affected by the project. Furthermore, a city or county will have jurisdiction by law with respect to a project when the city or county having primary jurisdiction over the area involved is: (1) the site of the project; (2) the area in which the major environmental effects will occur; and/or (3) the area in which reside those citizens most directly concerned by any such environmental effects.

1.6 Impact Terminology

The following terminology is used to describe the level of significance of potential impacts:

• A finding of no impact is appropriate if the analysis concludes that the project would not affect the particular environmental threshold in any way.
• An impact is considered less than significant if the analysis concludes that the project would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment and requires no mitigation.
• An impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated if the analysis concludes that the project would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment with the inclusion of environmental commitments, or other enforceable measures, that would be adopted by the lead agency.
• An impact is considered potentially significant if the analysis concludes that the project could have a substantial adverse effect on the environment.

An EIR is required if an impact is identified as potentially significant.

4 The four Trustee Agencies in California listed in CEQA Guidelines § 15386 are California Department of Fish and Wildlife, State Lands Commission, State Department of Parks and Recreation, and University of California.
1.7 Organization of Initial Study

This IS/MND is organized to satisfy CEQA Guidelines § 15063(d), and includes the following sections:

- **Section 1.0 - Introduction**, which identifies the purpose and scope of the IS/MND.
- **Section 2.0 - Environmental Setting**, which describes location, existing site conditions, land uses, zoning designations, topography, and vegetation associated with the project site and surrounding area.
- **Section 3.0 - Project Description**, which provides an overview of the project, a description of the proposed development, project phasing during construction, and discretionary actions for the approval of the project.
- **Section 4.0 - Environmental Checklist**, which presents checklist responses for each resource topic to identify and assess impacts associated with the proposed project, and proposes mitigation measures, where needed, to render potential environmental impacts less than significant, where feasible.
- **Section 5.0 - References**, which includes a list of documents cited in the IS/MND.
- **Section 6.0 - List of Preparers**, which identifies the primary authors and technical experts that prepared the Initial Study.
- **Section 7.0 - Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program**, which identifies the mitigation measures for the proposed project, the responsible/monitoring party, the monitoring action, enforcement agency, monitoring agency, and monitoring phase.

Technical studies and other documents, which include supporting information or analyses used to prepare this IS/MND, are included in the following appendices:

- Appendix A  Project Plans and Drawings
- Appendix B  Preliminary Drainage Report
- Appendix C  Soils Report
- Appendix D  Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
- Appendix E  Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP)
- Appendix F  Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Assessment
- Appendix G  Biological Resources Assessment
- Appendix H  Cultural Resources Inventory
- Appendix I  Noise Assessment
- Appendix J  Trip Generation Memorandum

1.8 Findings from the Initial Study

1.8.1 No Impact or Impacts Considered Less than Significant

The project would have no impact or a less than significant impact on the following environmental categories listed from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Energy
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Wildfire

1.8.2 Impacts Considered Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures

Based on IS findings, the project would have a less than significant impact on the following environmental categories listed in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines when proposed mitigation measures are implemented.

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Transportation and Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 Project Location

The proposed project, Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse, is located at Mango Avenue in Fontana, California. The project site is on the north side of Sierra Lakes Parkway, between Sierra Avenue and Mango Avenue. Refer to Figure 2.1-1, which shows the project’s regional location. The property is bordered by a Les Schwab Tire Center and a carwash facility to the west and a County refuse disposal site to the east. See Figure 2.1-2, which shows the project’s location.

2.2 Project Setting

The project is comprised of two assessor’s parcels: (APNs 1119-221-64 and -68). The project site is approximately 5.8 gross acres. It is located in a light industrial area and is surrounded predominantly by parcels with similar light industrial uses. West of the project site, in the vicinity, is the Sierra Lakes Specific Plan. Residential uses are located beyond Sierra Avenue, to the west of the project site. There are no residential uses immediately adjacent to the project site. South of the project site, beyond the I-210 freeway, is the Walnut Village Specific Plan. Photographs depicting the project site are provided in Figure 2.2-2.

2.2.1 Land Use and Zoning

The land use designation and zoning of the project site and surrounding areas are listed in Table 2.2-1. The General Plan designation for the project site is Light Industrial (I-L) and the site’s zoning designation is Light Industrial (M-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>Light Industrial (I-L)</td>
<td>Light Industrial (M-1)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>(I-L)</td>
<td>(M-1)</td>
<td>Self-storage facility, manufacturing, dismantling, and warehousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Rialto Airport Specific Plan</td>
<td>Landfill (OS-L)</td>
<td>County Refuse Disposal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Light Industrial (I-L)</td>
<td>Light Industrial (M-1)</td>
<td>Les Schwab Tire Center and Carwash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Regional Mixed Use (RMU)</td>
<td>Regional Mixed Use (R-MU)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1-1
REGIONAL LOCATION
Figure 2.1-2
PROJECT LOCATION

Disclaimer: Representations on this map or illustration are intended only to indicate locations of project parameters reported in the legend. Project parameter information supplied by others (see layer credits) may not have been independently verified for accuracy by UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. This map or illustration should not be used for, and does not replace, final grading plans or other documents that should be professionally certified for development purposes.
Figure 2.2-2
PROJECT SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

PHOTO 1: View looking north of a storage warehouse.

PHOTO 2: View looking south of a commercial shopping center.

PHOTO 3: View looking east of the Mid-Valley landfill.

PHOTO 4: View looking west of Les Schwab Tire Center and single-family residences.
2.3 Existing Characteristics of the Site

2.3.1 Climate and Air Quality

The City of Fontana is characterized by a semi-arid Mediterranean climate that is the result of its location in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). (Stantec, 2018b p. 5.2-1). The SCAB is a 6,600-square-mile area basin that is usually quite moist near the land surface due to the influence of the marine layer it brings in. Other factors that influence the area’s climate and meteorology are the terrain and altitude. Fontana is positioned approximately 1,700 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) in its northern half and 1,000 feet AMSL in its southern half. Due to the City being in a valley, heavy early morning fog and low stratus clouds are often persistent. Yearly climate patterns are characterized by warm summers, mild winters, low levels of precipitation, and moderate humidity.

Air quality in Fontana generally fluctuates without a consistent seasonal pattern. Neighboring, high-polluting coastal cities largely influence the air quality in the City, and that coupled along with the climate trap air pollution in the valley. The SCAB is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains that trap air pollution at their bases. The SCAB fails to meet national ambient air quality standards for ozone and fine particulate matter, and is classified as a “nonattainment area” for those pollutants (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.2-10).

2.3.2 Geology and Soils

The City of Fontana generally lies within the northern and northwestern portion of the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province of Southern California, which is characterized by northwest-southeast trending faults, folds, and mountain ranges. Much of the region is underlain by terrace deposits, which are unconsolidated sediments (consisting of loose soil materials, such as sand and silt) left by streams on shore benches cut by the ocean faults (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.5-1).

Although there are no major active faults within the City boundaries, there are a number of faults that border the Lytle Creek alluvial basin, including the Chino, Cucamonga, San Andreas, and San Jacinto faults (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.5-3).

Soils in the area are characteristic of the Southern California interior alluvial basins and consist of alluvial deposits and floodplain soils. The City is underlain by Holocene and late Pleistocene alluvial deposits of the Lytle Creek alluvial fan. These deposits primarily consist of unconsolidated, gray, cobbly and bouldery alluvium (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.5-4).

2.3.3 Hydrology

The project site is currently undeveloped and therefore, water sheet flows across the site to the adjacent streets. As detailed in the City of Fontana General Plan Update 2015-2035 Draft Environmental Impact Report, the City is located within the lower Lytle Creek watershed, which forms the northwest portion of the Santa Ana River Watershed. This watershed drains the eastern portion of the San Gabriel Mountains. Daytime temperatures often exceed 100 degrees during the summer in the lower watershed, while temperatures are approximately 10-15 degrees cooler in the upper watershed. The lower portion of Lytle Creek flows through the cities of Fontana, Rialto, San Bernardino, and Colton, as well as a portion of the unincorporated area of San Bernardino County. The upper reaches of Lytle Creek are generally perennial; the lower section of Lytle Creek changes into an intermittent stream with a dry wash below Interstate 15 (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.8-1).
2.3.4 Biology

The project site is located in an urbanized area, which provides low habitat value for special-status plant and wildlife species. A detailed description of existing environmental setting for the project site and the surrounding area is provided in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources) of this Initial Study.

2.3.5 Public Services

The City is served by a full range of public services and utilities. Fire prevention, fire protection and emergency medical service (EMS) for the city of Fontana are provided by the Fontana Fire Protection Department (FFPD) through a contract with the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The City of Fontana Police Department (FPD) provides police and law enforcement services in the project area. The FPD has 306 full-time employees (188 sworn) and is comprised of four separate divisions: Office of the Chief of Police; Administrative Services; Field Services; and Special Operations. Recreational services within the city of Fontana are provided by the City's Department of Facilities and Parks, which maintains over 40 parks, sports facilities, and community centers. Library services within the city are provided by the San Bernardino County Library System, which has a total of 32 branch libraries. Within the city of Fontana, there are three libraries, including Fontana Lewis Library and Technology Center, the Summit Branch Library and the Kaiser Branch Library (City of Fontana, 2020h).

2.3.6 Utilities

The project site lies within the service area of the West Valley Water District (WVWD). WVWD receives its regional water supplies from the California State Water Project (SWP) and its local water supply from the Chino Sub basin (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-1 and 2-15).

Regional domestic wastewater treatment services are provided under the Regional Sewer Service Contract in which seven agencies currently contract with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA). These agencies include Fontana, Cucamonga Valley Water District, Montclair, Upland, Chino, Chino Hills and Ontario. Wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the Regional Water Recycling Plant #1 (IEUA, 202019).

Solid waste disposal services for Fontana are provided by Burrtec Waste Industries, a private company under franchise agreement with the City. Burrtec also operates the City's curbside recycling (including greenwaste recycling) program. Electrical service to the site is provided by Southern California Edison Company through a grid of transmission lines and related facilities. Natural gas is provided by Southern California Gas Company, which maintains a local system of transmission lines, distribution lines and supply regulation stations (City of Fontana, 2020b).

Sewer service for the project site is provided by the City of Fontana (City of Fontana, 2020b). Water service to the project site is provided by the West Valley Water District. Both the City and the San Bernardino County Flood Control District provide flood control facilities for Fontana. The Flood Control District agency is responsible for the construction of dams, containment basins, channels and storm drains to intercept and convey flood flows through and away from developed areas. The City implements construction and maintenance of local storm drains that feed into the County's area-wide system. (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10-3). Stormwater runoff generated on the project site under current conditions generally is carried by sheet flows off of the site and onto the adjacent streets.
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3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Project Background

The City of Fontana (City) is processing a request to implement a series of discretionary actions that would ultimately allow for the construction of a warehouse, fronting Mango Avenue, between Les Schwab Tire Center and Mid-Valley Landfill in the City of Fontana (APNs 1119-221-64 and -68).

The project application includes Master Case No. (MCN) 19-131, Design Review Project (DRP) No. 19-041 for site and architectural review of a 115,100-square-foot warehouse, and Tentative Parcel Map No. 20196 to combine two (2) parcels into one (1) parcel of approximately 5.8 gross acres. The project would also need grading and construction permits for onsite development. The City is the Lead Agency for the purposes of CEQA.

The entire 5.8-acre project site is currently undeveloped land. The project is located in an urban and developed portion of the city with industrial land uses to the north, commercial land uses to the south, public facility land uses to the east, and commercial and residential land uses to the west.

The City’s General Plan land use designation for the project site is I-L (Light Industrial), which allows light industrial uses having a floor area ratio (FAR) between 0.1 and 0.6 (Stantec et al., 2018a, pp 15.25-5.26). The City’s zoning designation for the project site is M-1 (Light Industrial). Light industrial land uses are intended to encourage employee-intensive uses, including business parks, research and development, technology centers, corporate and support office uses, cleaning industries, supporting retail uses, truck and equipment sales and related services. Warehouses that are designed in ways that limit offsite impacts are also permitted (Stantec et al., 2018a, pp. 15.25-5.26). As further discussed in Section 4.11, the proposed project would adhere to the purpose and design regulations of the land use and zoning designation of the project site.

3.2 Project Overview

The proposed project consists of the development of an approximately 115,100-square-foot warehouse on an approximately 5.8-acre site.

3.2.1 New Construction

The proposed project would construct a 115,100-square-foot warehouse, which would include a 6,000-square-foot office, a 4,000-square-foot office mezzanine and 105,100 square feet of warehouse space. The warehouse would have 19 dock doors, 4 trailer stalls, and 90 automobile parking stalls that would be comprised of six ADA parking stalls and 84 regular parking stalls. Figure 3.2-1 depicts the proposed project site plan. A complete set of project drawings including site plan, floor plans, elevations, conceptual landscaping and conceptual grading plan is included in Appendix A to this IS/MND. The building would be built to a maximum height of 44 feet. As shown in Figure 3.2-2, the proposed building would have primarily tilt-up concrete walls with glass panes for the office areas. Figures 3.2-3 and 3.2-4 depict additional drawings showing conceptual building elevation.

Energy-efficient features, including insulated and glazed windows and low E coating on windows, would be incorporated into building design to comply with the provisions of the California Green Building Code, Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations.
Figure 3.2-1
PROPOSED SITE PLAN
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Disclaimer: Illustration provided by HPA Architecture, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.
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Figure 3.2-2
CONCEPTUAL RENDERING OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Disclaimer: Illustration provided by HPA Architecture, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.

Source: HPA Architecture Inc. and MVP, April 14, 2020.
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Figure 3.2-3
CONCEPTUAL COLORED ELEVATIONS

Disclaimer: Illustration provided by HPA Architecture, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.

Figure 3.2-4
PROPOSED BUILDING ELEVATIONS

Disclaimer: Illustration provided by HPA Architecture, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.

Title 24, Part 11 requires new structures to incorporate a variety of mandatory features to promote green buildings as means to improve energy efficiency, reduce water demand, promote recycling, and other measures. The project would be designed and constructed in compliance with applicable City codes, including, but not limited to, the 2019 California Building Code, California Plumbing Code, California Mechanical Code, California Electrical Code, California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, and California Residential Codes.

3.2.2 Project Operations

At the time this Initial Study was prepared, the future tenant(s) of the proposed building were unknown. For the purpose of environmental analysis, the future uses onsite are assumed to be any of those uses permitted by the City of Fontana’s General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial (I-L), and the City's zoning designation for the project site of M-1 (Light Industrial).

Since the future tenant(s) are not yet known, the number of jobs generated by the proposed project is also unknown. Therefore, for the purpose of environmental analysis in this Initial Study, employment is estimated by using average employment density factors reported by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in its publication “Employment Density Study Report” (SCAG, 2001). This document states that for every acre of light industrial land use in San Bernardino County, the median number of jobs supported is 6.92 (SCAG, 2001, Table 8B). Therefore, the proposed project site’s 5.8 acres are expected to result in approximately 40 jobs for the operational phase of the project.

3.2.3 Site Access, Circulation and Parking

Primary site ingress and egress would be provided by 40-foot-wide driveways along the eastern edge of the project site along Mango Avenue. Additionally, there would be a 31.5-foot-wide driveway to an existing easement for emergency vehicle ingress and egress along Sierra Avenue. The proposed project would include 19 dock doors and provision of trailer stalls in compliance with the City’s requirements. There would be 90 automobile parking stalls that would consist of six ADA stalls and 84 regular parking stalls in the eastern, southeastern and southwestern portions of the project site. Circulation within the site would be along the 30-foot-wide fire lane that perimeters the entire project site.

3.2.4 Exterior Lighting

Lighting for the project would comply with the requirements of the City’s Municipal Code. Specifically, the project would be required to comply with City of Fontana Municipal Code § 30-508, Lighting and Glare, which states, “all lights shall be directed and/or shielded to prevent the light from adversely affecting adjacent residential or commercial properties. No structure or feature shall be permitted which creates adverse glare effects.”

The proposed project would include installation of exterior lighting fixtures, as necessary, for safety and security. LED exterior fixtures would be mounted on the wall of the building. Latest LED lighting fixtures with photosensors and motion sensors would be provided. Cut off shield would be provided as necessary to prevent light spillage beyond the project boundary. Parking lot lighting would also utilize LED technology. Photometric analysis would be conducted to ensure that the exterior lighting provided on site meets the minimum lighting levels required.
3.2.5 Landscaping

No trees or other plants are currently located within the boundary of the project site. New landscaping would include drought-resistant species including trees, tall shrubs, low shrubs and groundcovers. Additionally, water saving features including smart irrigation with drip system would also be installed on site. The majority of landscaping would occur along the perimeter of the project site, with a small number of trees, low shrubs, and groundcover located near the building entrance and around the building perimeter. The quantity, type, and purpose of trees, shrubs, and ground cover are summarized in **Table 3.2-1**. The conceptual landscaping plan for the project is provided in **Figure 3.2-5**, as well as **Appendix A** to this IS/MND.

### Table 3.2-1
**LANDSCAPE PLANTINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitalpa</td>
<td>Chitalpa tashkentensis</td>
<td>24-inch box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>field grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Pistache</td>
<td>Pistacia chinensis</td>
<td>24-inch box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Sumac</td>
<td>Rhus lancea</td>
<td>24-inch box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Box</td>
<td>Tristania conferta</td>
<td>15 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Boxwood</td>
<td>Buxus j. Green Beauty</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal Plum</td>
<td>Carissa macrocarpa ‘Tuttle’</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantana</td>
<td>Lantana sp.</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxleaf Privet</td>
<td>Lingustrum j. Texanum</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hawthorn</td>
<td>Rhaphiolepis i. ‘Clara’</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hawthorn</td>
<td>Rhaphiolepis i. ‘Springtime’</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Rosmarinus o. ‘ Tuscan Blue ’</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiny Xylosma</td>
<td>Xylosma congestum</td>
<td>5 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groundcover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougainvillaea</td>
<td>Bougainvillaea ‘La Jolla’</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnight Lily</td>
<td>Dietes bicolor</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Day Lily</td>
<td>Hemerocallis hybrida-Yellow</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple and White Lantana</td>
<td>Lantana montevidensis</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporum</td>
<td>Myoporum pacificum</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Jasmine</td>
<td>Trachelospermum jasminiodes</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall’s Honeysuckle</td>
<td>Lonicera j. ‘Halliana’</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporum</td>
<td>Myoporum parvifolium</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostrate Rosemary</td>
<td>Rosmarinus o. ‘Prostratus’</td>
<td>1 gallon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Hunter Landscape, Mango Ave. Project, Landscape Plan dated March 27, 2020.

3.2.6 Perimeter Fencing and Exterior Walls

The proposed project would construct a 10-foot-tall concrete tilt-up screen wall that would perimeter the southern central portion of the project site where the truck court is located. An eight-foot-tall wrought iron fence would perimeter the southern and western portion of the project site, a 5-foot-tall retaining wall would perimeter the northern boundary of the project site, and 8-foot-tall metal sliding gates would be provided along the three driveways.
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Additionally, trucks would enter through eight-foot-tall manually-operated tube steel gates with Knox-pad locks on the western and eastern side of the loading docks.

### 3.2.7 Utilities

To the maximum extent possible, utility connections would be provided from the closest/most efficient locations for the proposed building.

**Sanitary Sewer:** The project proposes offsite sewer improvements to connect the sewer lines from the project site to the existing sewer network in Mango Avenue. All sewer line sizes and connections are subject to review by the City. The project applicant will work with the City’s Public Works Department for necessary approvals and ensure compliance with applicable requirements.

**Domestic Water:** New water meters would be installed as required to meet the demands calculated by the plumber for the project and in compliance with the requirements of the City’s Public Works Department. The project would extend existing water mainlines from Mango Avenue to the easterly edge of the site. Water would be provided by the West Valley Water District.

**Dry Utilities:** Natural gas service would be provided to the project site by the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), electricity would be provided by Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and solid waste disposal would be provided by Burrtec (City of Fontana Utilities, 2020).

**Stormwater:** The natural terrain of this site drains in a southerly direction at a slope of 2-3%. There is an existing master plan storm drain line in Mango Avenue and the site is tailed to drain it. The onsite drainage surface flows into a network of storm drain systems onsite that includes ribbon gutter/swale/storm drain/grate inlet to the proposed underground StormTech© Chamber System for low-flow filtration. The runoff from larger storm events would be diverted at the proposed weir manhole and would continue to drain out at the outlet via the proposed storm drain at the southeast corner of the project site into the existing Mango Avenue master storm drain system. Due to the development being part of the masterplan drainage system and consistent with the City’s General Plan, and the fact that downstream facilities were sized in accordance with the proposed project, no detention is required. Onsite systems were analyzed to confirm that they can handle the 10-year storm event, per city requirements. In addition, the building pad and adjacent pads were taken into consideration and set a minimum of two feet above the inlet to protect against the 100-year storm event (Allard Engineering, 2019).

### 3.3 Construction Activities

#### 3.3.1 Onsite Construction

Construction activities would include earthwork, rebar, structural steel, concrete slab, concrete panels, truss placement, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, glazing, roofing, landscaping, hardscape consisting of asphalt concrete, fencing, associated site utilities, site drainage, and any associated offsite work that may be required. Construction phasing would include the following; earthwork, concrete slab, concrete panels, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, glazing, roofing, landscaping, hardscape consisting of AC and concrete, fencing, associated site utilities, site drainage, and any associated offsite work that may be required. There would be one phase of construction. Once earthwork commences, all of the various phases of construction would follow in sequence. For safety reasons, temporary barricades would be used to limit access to the site during project construction.
Safe access for construction workers would be maintained throughout construction. It is anticipated that approximately 75 to 100 workers would be onsite during the peak construction phases.

The type of construction equipment utilized during construction is anticipated to include:

- Tractors, loaders, backhoes, dozers, excavators, skip loaders, scrapers, concrete trucks, concrete pumps, concrete vibrators, laser screeds, and dump trucks for site preparation and rough grading.
- Cranes, forklifts, backhoes, skip loaders, trucking, compacting equipment, manlifts, welders, paving-skip loaders, grading equipment, trucking and rollers for building construction.
- Skip loaders, backhoes, trenchers and trucking for utility improvements.
- Bobcats, air compressors, forklifts, and delivery trucks for landscaping and irrigation.

Construction staging areas would be provided within the boundaries of the project site. Construction workers would park vehicles onsite and construction trucks and equipment would also be parked and stored onsite.

3.3.2 Offsite Improvements

The project would include the following offsite improvements:

- The two driveways along Mango Avenue would be constructed to service the project.
- Utility improvements will include both wet and dry; domestic and fire water, stormwater, sewer, electrical, gas, cable tv, communication, and possibly more.
- The stormwater overflow from the proposed underground StormTech Chamber System for low-flow filtration would discharge to a proposed sidewalk underdrain/curb core to Mango Avenue. The runoff from larger storm events would be diverted at the proposed weir manhole and would continue to drain out at the outlet via the proposed storm drain at the southeast corner of the project site into the existing Mango Avenue master storm drain system.

3.3.3 Construction Schedule

For the purpose of environmental analysis in this Initial Study, it is anticipated that project construction would begin around November 2020 and would last approximately six to eight months, ending around June 2021.

3.4 Standard Requirements and Conditions of Approval

The proposed project would be reviewed in detail by applicable City of Fontana departments and divisions that have the responsibility to review land use application compliance with City codes and regulations. City staff is also responsible for reviewing this IS/MND to ensure that it is technically accurate and is in full compliance with CEQA. The departments and divisions at the City of Fontana responsible for technical review include:
3.5 Discretionary and Ministerial Approvals

No general plan amendment or zone change would be required for the project. In order for the proposed project to be implemented, the Applicant would require Fontana Planning Commission approval of Design Review No. 19-041 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 20196.

Table 3.5-1, Ministerial Permits and Approvals, identifies the permits and approvals required from either the City, other public agencies and/or quasi-public agencies (utilities) subsequent to the approval of the aforementioned Design Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit or Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Fontana Building &amp; Safety Division</td>
<td>Site Plan review and approval, and Building Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Public Works Department</td>
<td>Approval for proposed offsite utility improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Water District</td>
<td>Letter of authorization/consent for proposed improvements to provide water supply connection to new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
<td>Letter of authorization/consent for proposed improvements to provide natural gas connection to new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison (SCE) Company</td>
<td>Letter of authorization/consent for proposed improvements to provide electrical connection to new development, and proposed improvements to the existing SCE Easement on the eastern property line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The checked topics below indicate that a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Required" are likely with project implementation. In the following pages, these impacts will be identified.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forest 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
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Rina Leung, Associate Planner                  City of Fontana
Printed Name
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

(1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

(2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

(3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

(4) “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to less than significant level.

(5) Earlier analyses may be use where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an affect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (See Section 15063(c)(3)(D) of the CEQA Guidelines. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   (a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where the earlier analysis available for review.

   (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

(6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
(7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

(8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

(9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

(a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

(b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
4.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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 on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A “visual environment” includes the built environment (development patterns, buildings, parking areas, and circulation elements) and natural environment features such as hills, vegetation, rock outcroppings, drainage pathways, and soils.

Views are characterized by visual quality, viewer groups and sensitivity, duration, and visual resources.

- **Visual quality** refers to the general aesthetic quality of a view, such as vividness, intactness, and unity.

- **Viewer groups** identify who is most likely to experience the view.

- **High-sensitivity land uses** include residences, schools, playgrounds, religious institutions, and passive outdoor spaces such as parks, playgrounds, and recreation areas.

- **Duration** of a view is the amount of time that a particular view can be seen by a specific viewer group.

- **Visual resources** refer to unique views, and views identified in local plans, from scenic highways, or of specific unique structures or landscape features.
SECTION 4.1 - AESTHETICS

a) Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact

Scenic vistas generally include extensive panoramic views of natural features, unusual terrain, or unique urban or historic features, for which the field of view can be wide and extend into the distance, and focal views that focus on a particular object, scene or feature of interest.

The project site is located in an area of Fontana that is characterized by flat topography and urban development. The City of Fontana is located on a desert valley floor between the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and the Jurupa Hills to the south (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.1-1). Dominant natural visual resources in the project area comprise scenic vistas from public thoroughfares and open spaces in the vicinity of the project to distant San Gabriel Mountains and foothills of the Jurupa Mountains.

In general, existing views in the project vicinity include views of the distant Jurupa Mountains to the south and distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. The Jurupa Mountains are approximately seven miles south of the project site and the San Gabriel Mountains are located approximately three miles north of the project site (Google Earth Pro, 2020). However, views of the Jurupa and San Bernardino Mountains would not be significantly impacted because of the far distance from the project site and the intervening buildings and trees surrounding the project site that partially block views of the mountains.

The project site is currently a vacant piece of land. The project proposes the construction of a 115,100-square-foot industrial warehouse, which would include an office mezzanine comprising 6,000 square feet of office space and a second office of 4,000 square feet. The industrial warehouse would have 20 dock doors, trailer parking stalls and automobile parking spaces. The proposed building would have a maximum height of 44 feet. The proposed building would have primarily tilt-up concrete walls with variations of white and grey colors, blue glass panes for the office mezzanine area, a ten-foot screening wall at the truck court area, and an eight-foot fence, steel gates and ornamental landscaping on the perimeter of the project site. The project site is adjacent to industrial/commercial land uses to north, south, east and west. The proposed new building would be consistent with the general character of the surrounding neighborhood in terms of architectural style, density, height, bulk, and setback. As mentioned above, there are intervening buildings and trees that block the view of the mountains. The proposed development would not obstruct views of distant mountains and hills for motorists traveling along nearby roadways. Therefore, the project would have no impact on scenic vistas.

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

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provides information regarding officially designated or eligible state scenic highways, designated as part of the California Scenic Highway Program. According to Caltrans, there are no officially designated scenic highways within or adjacent to the project area, and no roadways near the project site are currently eligible for scenic
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highway designation (Caltrans, 2015), as shown in Figure 4.1-1, Scenic Highways. The closest official state scenic highway, State Route 2 (SR-2), is approximately 20 miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, due to the distance between the project site and nearest state scenic highway, the project would have no impacts on trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

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 urban setting characterized by industrial, commercial and residential land uses. As further detailed in Section 4.11, the project would not conflict with policies under the current light industrial General Plan land use (I-L) or zoning designation (M-1). Table 4.1-1 below provides the applicable policies from the City of Fontana General Plan that pertain to aesthetics, along with a description of how the proposed project would be in compliance.

Table 4.1-1
PROJECT COMPLIANCE WITH CITY OF FONTANA GENERAL PLAN POLICIES REGARDING SCENIC QUALITY AND AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Element</th>
<th>Project Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conservation, Open Space, Parks and Trails Element. Goal 3: Fontana has a healthy, drought-resistant urban forest. Policies:  
• Support tree conservation and planting that enhances shade and drought resistance.  
• Expand Fontana’s tree canopy. | The proposed project would be developed on a vacant piece of land that does not have any trees. The proposed project would install drought resistant trees and would expand the city's tree canopy compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with this policy. |

Land Use Element. Goal 7: Public and private development meets high design standards.

| Policies:  
• Support high-quality development in design standards and in land use decisions. | The proposed project would construct a high-quality development with tilt-up concrete walls, blue glazed glass and ornamental landscaping that would complement the surrounding commercial/industrial land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with this policy. |

Source: Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.1-8 and 5.1-14

As analyzed above, the proposed project would adhere to applicable aesthetic and scenic quality regulations and policies mandated by the City of Fontana General Plan. Currently the project site is vacant and views from surrounding developments include views of vacant barren land and backside
of a landfill. The proposed project would add a well-designed aesthetically pleasing building and landscaping on the site and therefore have a positive effect on the visual character of the site when compared to existing conditions. Additionally, the proposed project would adhere to Article VII, Industrial Zoning Districts in the city’s Municipal Code, which would ensure that building height, setbacks, building design, parking stalls and screening would be within required threshold levels (City of Fontana Municipal Code, 2020). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**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**

The project site is located in an urban area, which is characterized by low to medium nighttime ambient light levels. Street lights, traffic on local streets and exterior lighting in nearby developments are the primary sources of light that contribute to the ambient light levels in the project area. The project is generally surrounded by commercial and industrial in all directions; however, the project site is also adjacent to residential land uses approximately 0.10 mile west of the project site (Google Earth Pro, 2020).

The project proposes new exterior lighting throughout the site, including parking lot lighting. Installation of exterior lighting on the building exterior, as well as proposed parking lot lighting would be necessary for safety and nighttime visibility throughout the project site. The new project lighting would be visible from the surrounding area. Therefore, the project’s proposed exterior lighting is expected to contribute to ambient nighttime illumination in the project vicinity. However, the proposed project would comply with the City of Fontana Municipal Code § 30-260, Lighting and Glare, which states, “all lights shall be directed and/or shielded to prevent the light from adversely affecting adjacent residential or commercial properties. No structure or feature shall be permitted which creates adverse glare effects” (City of Fontana Municipal Code, 2020). Additionally, the building would include tilt-up concrete walls with different shades of gray and white, blue glazed glass, and a concrete wall a metal gate that would perimeter the project site. None of the materials proposed would have a mirror finish or would be highly reflective. Refer to Appendix A of this document, which provides the proposed project plans.

Adherence to applicable City Municipal Codes would ensure that new sources of light or glare would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, impacts from a new source of substantial light or glare would be less than significant.
### 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) 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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Codes § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code § 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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**

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (FMMMP) was established in 1982 by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) in order to identify critical agricultural farmlands and track if and how the lands are converted and used for other things. The proposed project is located in an area that FMMMP deems as “Urban and Built-up Land,” which means it is land that has a building density of at least one building to 1.5 acres of land and is primarily used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, or other non-agricultural business (DOC, 2016). Refer to **Figure 4.2-1**. Therefore, the project would not convert farmland for non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.
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b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact

The Williamson Act, also known as the California Conservation Act of 1956, allows local governments to work with private landowners by negotiating an agreement to tax these landowners at lower rates if they restrict specific pieces of land to agricultural or open space use. According to San Bernardino County’s Williamson Act Contract Map, the proposed project is shown as being on land identified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” and does not contain any land under the specific jurisdiction of the Williamson Act (Department of Conservation, 2020a). The City of Fontana’s General Plan for 2015-2030 identifies the proposed project area as “I-L,” which means it is for Light Industrial uses (City of Fontana, 2019a). Currently, no agricultural operations are in the vicinity of the site (Google Earth Pro, 2020). Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agriculture uses or any Williamson Act contracts. No impacts would occur.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Codes § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code § 51104(g))?

No Impact

The proposed project is located in a highly-urbanized setting and is zoned as “M-1,” indicating that it is Light Industrial (City of Fontana, 2019b). The definitions given by PRC § 42526 regarding timberland, by PRC § 12220(g) for forest land, or by California Government Code § 51104(g) for timberland zoned for production do not apply to this type of zoning because forest and timberland do not exist there. Being in a highly-urbanized area, the project would have no impact on either existing forestry or timberland zoning, nor would it cause their rezoning. No impacts 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 is not within a forest area and is located on land specified as “I-L,” Light Industrial (City of Fontana, 2019a). The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land because construction and other related activities would happen specifically on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss and/or conversion of forest land. No impacts 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

The proposed project is located on land zoned as “M-1,” which allows Light Industrial uses. It is also surrounded by land with the same zoning. Therefore, the project does not 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 impacts would occur.
4.3 Air Quality

Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |  |  | X | 
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? |  |  | X | 
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  |  | X | 
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)? |  |  | X | 

4.3.1 Pollutants of Concern

Criteria pollutants are air pollutants for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and ambient air quality standards have been established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and/or the California Air Resources Board (ARB). The criteria air pollutants of concern are nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)), carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)), particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\) and PM\(_{2.5}\)), sulfur dioxide (SO\(_2\)), lead (Pb), and ozone (O\(_3\)), and their precursors, such as reactive organic gases (ROG), which are ozone precursors. Since the proposed project would not generate appreciable SO\(_2\) or Pb emissions,\(^5\) it is not necessary for the analysis to include those two pollutants. Presented below is a description of the air pollutants of concern and their known health effects.

**Nitrogen oxides** (NO\(_X\)) serve as integral participants in the process of photochemical smog production and are precursors for certain particulate compounds that are formed in the atmosphere. The two major forms of NO\(_X\) are nitric oxide (NO) and NO\(_2\). NO is a colorless, odorless gas formed from atmospheric nitrogen and oxygen when combustion takes place under high temperature and/or high pressure. NO\(_2\) is a reddish-brown pungent gas formed by the combination of NO and oxygen. NO\(_2\) is an acute respiratory irritant and eye irritant and increases susceptibility to respiratory pathogens. A third form of NO\(_X\), nitrous oxide (N\(_2\)O), is a greenhouse gas (GHG) (USEPA, 2011).

**Carbon monoxide** (CO) is a colorless, odorless non-reactive pollutant produced by incomplete combustion of carbon substances (e.g., gasoline or diesel fuel). The primary adverse health effect associated with CO is its binding with hemoglobin in red blood cells, which decreases the ability of these cells to transport oxygen throughout the body. Prolonged exposure can cause headaches, drowsiness, or loss of equilibrium; high concentrations are lethal (USEPA, 2010).

\(^5\) Sulfur dioxide emissions will be below 0.041 pound per day during construction and operations.
Particulate matter (PM) consists of finely divided solids or liquids, such as soot, dust, aerosols, fumes, and mists. Two forms of fine particulate matter are now regulated. Respirable particles, or PM$_{10}$, include that portion of the particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers (i.e., 10 one-millionths of a meter or 0.0004 inch) or less. Fine particles, or PM$_{2.5}$, have an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers (i.e., 2.5 one-millionths of a meter or 0.0001 inch) or less. Particulate discharge into the atmosphere results primarily from industrial, agricultural, construction, and transportation activities. However, wind action on the arid landscape also contributes substantially to the local particulate loading. Fossil fuel combustion accounts for a sizable portion of PM$_{2.5}$. In addition, particulate matter forms in the atmosphere through reactions of NO$_X$ and other compounds (such as ammonia) to form inorganic nitrates and sulfates. Both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ may adversely affect the human respiratory system, especially in those people who are naturally sensitive or susceptible to breathing problems (USEPA, 2019f).

Reactive organic gases (ROG) are compounds comprised primarily of atoms of hydrogen and carbon that have high photochemical reactivity. The major source of ROG is the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels in internal combustion engines. Other sources of ROG include the evaporative emissions associated with the use of paints and solvents, the application of asphalt paving and the use of household consumer products. Some ROG species are listed toxic air contaminants, which have been shown to cause adverse health effects; however, most adverse effects on human health are not caused directly by ROG, but rather by reactions of ROG to form other criteria pollutants such as ozone. ROG are also transformed into organic aerosols in the atmosphere, contributing to higher levels of fine particulate matter and lower visibility. The term “ROG” is used by the ARB for air quality analysis and is defined essentially the same as the federal term “volatile organic compound” (VOC).

Ozone (O$_3$) is a secondary pollutant produced through a series of photochemical reactions involving ROG and NO$_X$. Ozone creation requires ROG and NO$_X$ to be available for approximately three hours in a stable atmosphere with strong sunlight. Because of the long reaction time, peak ozone concentrations frequently occur downwind of the sites where the precursor pollutants are emitted. Thus, O$_3$ is considered a regional, rather than a local, pollutant. The health effects of O$_3$ include eye and respiratory irritation, reduction of resistance to lung infection and possible aggravation of pulmonary conditions in persons with lung disease. Ozone is also damaging to vegetation and untreated rubber (USEPA, 2020).

4.3.2 Climate/Meteorology

The project site will be located wholly within the South Coast Air Basin SCAB, which includes all of Orange County, as well as the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. The distinctive climate of the SCAB is determined by its terrain and geographical location. The SCAB is in a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean in the southwest quadrant with high mountains forming the remainder of the perimeter. The general region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific. Thus, the climate is mild, tempered by cool sea breezes. This usually mild climatological pattern is interrupted infrequently by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana winds (SCAQMD, 1993).

---

6 Emissions of organic gases are typically reported only as aggregate organics, either as VOC or as ROG. These terms are meant to reflect what specific compounds have been included or excluded from the aggregate estimate. Although EPA defines VOC to exclude both methane and ethane, and the ARB defines ROG to exclude only methane, in practice it is assumed that VOC and ROG are essentially synonymous.
The annual average temperature varies little throughout the 6,600-square-mile SCAB, ranging from the low 60s to the high 80s. However, with a less pronounced oceanic influence, the inland portion shows greater variability in the annual minimum and maximum temperatures (SCAQMD, 1993). The mean annual high and low temperatures in the project area—as determined from the nearest weather station in the City of San Bernardino,7 (Western Regional Climate Center, 2020) which has a period of record from 1893 to 2004—are 79.9 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) and 48.2°F, respectively. The overall climate is a mild Mediterranean, with average monthly maximum temperatures exceeding 96°F in the summer and dipping to 38.5°F in the winter.

In contrast to a steady pattern of temperature, rainfall is seasonally and annually highly variable. The total average annual precipitation is 16.12 inches, of which 81 percent occurs between November and March.

4.3.3 Local Air Quality

Table 4.3-1 shows the area designation status of the SCAB for each criteria pollutant for both the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS).

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has divided the SCAB into source receptor areas (SRAs), based on similar meteorological and topographical features. The proposed project site is in SCAQMD’s Central San Bernardino Valley (SRA 34), which is served by the Fontana-Arrow Monitoring Station, located about 4.3 miles southwest of the proposed project site, at 14360 Arrow Route, in Fontana (SCAQMD, 2020). Criteria pollutants monitored at the Fontana-Arrow Monitoring Station include ozone, PM_{10}, PM_{2.5}, and NO_{2}. This station ceased monitoring CO in 2012 and CO has not been monitored in the SCAB since 2012. The ambient air quality data in the proposed project vicinity as recorded at the Fontana-Arrow Monitoring Station from 2016 to 2018 and the applicable state standards are shown in Table 4.3-2.

---

7 Data for San Bernardino Fire Station #226. Accessed May 2020. A closer weather station was available up until 1984. The San Bernardino station represents more current data.
### Table 4.3-1
**FEDERAL AND STATE ATTAINMENT STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutants</th>
<th>Federal Classification</th>
<th>State Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Nonattainment (Extreme)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Maintenance (Serious)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Nonattainment (Moderate)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Maintenance (Serious)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide (H₂S)</td>
<td>No Federal Standards</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** ARB, 2020a; USEPA, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d, 2019e.

### Table 4.3-2
**AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Pollutant</th>
<th>Standard/Exceedance</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Max. 1-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max. 8-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days &gt; Federal 8-hour Std. of 0.070 ppm</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days &gt; California 1-hour Std. of 0.09 ppm</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days &gt; California 8-hour Std. of 0.070 ppm</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>Max. 1-hour Concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days &gt; California 1-hour Std. of 0.070 ppm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Max. 24-hour Concentration micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³)</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est. # Days &gt; Fed. 24-hour Std. of 150 µg/m³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Max. 24-hour Concentration (µg/m³)</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Days &gt; Fed. 24-hour Std. of 35 µg/m³ State Annual Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** ARB, 2020b.

ND - There was insufficient (or no) data available to determine the value.
4.3.4 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)

The SCAQMD is required to produce plans to show how air quality will be improved in the region. The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) requires that these plans be updated triennially to incorporate the most recent available technical information. A multi-level partnership of governmental agencies at the federal, state, regional, and local levels implements the programs contained in these plans. Agencies involved include the EPA, ARB, local governments, SCAG, and SCAQMD. The SCAQMD and the SCAG are responsible for formulating and implementing the AQMP for the SCAB. The SCAQMD updates its Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) every three years.

The 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD, 2017b) was adopted by the SCAQMD Board on March 3, 2017, and on March 10, 2017 was submitted to the ARB (SCAQMD, 2017a) to become part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)\(^8\) (SCAQMD, 2017a). It focuses largely on reducing NO\(_x\) emissions as a means of attaining the 1979 1-hour ozone standard by 2022, the 1997 8-hour ozone standard by 2023, and the 2008 8-hour standard by 2031 (SCAQMD, 2017b). The AQMP prescribes a variety of current and proposed new control measures, including a request to the EPA for increased regulation of mobile source emissions. The NO\(_x\) control measures will also help the SCAB attain the 24-hour standard for PM\(_{2.5}\).

4.3.5 Sensitive Receptors

Some people, such as individuals with respiratory illnesses or impaired lung function because of other illnesses, persons over 65 years of age, and children under 14, are particularly sensitive to certain pollutants. Facilities and structures where these sensitive people live or spend considerable amounts of time are known as sensitive receptors. For the purposes of a CEQA analysis, the SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a receptor such as a residence, hospital, or convalescent facility where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours (Chico and Koizumi, 2008, p. 3-2). Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition of sensitive receptor, because employees typically are present for shorter periods of time, such as eight hours. Therefore, applying a 24-hour standard for PM\(_{10}\) is appropriate not only because the averaging period for the state standard is 24 hours, but because the sensitive receptor would be present at the location for the full 24 hours.

4.3.6 Response to Checklist Questions

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

**Less than Significant Impact**

The SCAQMD (2019) has developed criteria in the form of emissions thresholds for determining whether emissions from a project are regionally significant. They are useful for estimating whether a project is likely to result in a violation of the NAAQS and/or whether the project is in conformity with plans to achieve attainment. SCAQMD’s significance thresholds for criteria pollutant emissions during construction activities and project operation are summarized in Table 4.3-3. A project is

---

\(^8\) The State Implementation Plan (SIP) is a collection of local and regional plans, regulations, and rules for attaining ambient air quality standards. It is periodically submitted to the USEPA for approval.
considered to have a regional air quality impact if emissions from its construction and/or operational activities exceed the corresponding SCAQMD significance thresholds.

### Table 4.3-3
SCAQMD EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS FOR SIGNIFICANT REGIONAL IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Mass Daily Thresholds (Pounds/Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NO(_x))</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM(_{10}))</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM(_{2.5}))</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Oxides (SO(_x))</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAQMD (2019).

**Air Quality Methodology**

Estimated criteria pollutant emissions from the project’s onsite and offsite project activities were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2. CalEEMod (CAPCOA, 2017) is a planning tool for estimating emissions related to land use projects. Model-predicted project emissions are compared with applicable thresholds to assess regional air quality impacts. As some construction plans have not been finalized, CalEEMod defaults were used for construction offroad equipment and onroad construction trips and vehicle miles traveled. The only modifications to CalEEMod defaults were the construction schedule provided by the client and the operational fleet mix, daily trip rates, and trip lengths. The operational trip values are from a trip generation memorandum prepared for this project (Sarsour, 2020a and 2020b). The trip distances were assumed to be those from the project site to the Port of Long Beach. It was also assumed that the construction contractor would comply with all SCAQMD rules that apply to construction activity. For example, SCAQMD Rule 403 requires various control measures to reduce the generation and transmission offsite of dust from operation of construction equipment.

For the purpose of this analysis, construction activities for the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project are anticipated to last nine months and would begin in early November 2020 and end in late July 2021. There would be five construction phases:

- Grading.

---

9 CalEEMod default values for trip lengths were 16.60 miles for home-work or commercial-work; 8.40 miles for home-shopping or commercial-commercial; and 6.90 miles for home-office or commercial-nonwork. See Appendix F.

10 Both CalEEMod and the trip generation memorandum estimated an average daily trip (ADT) rate of 200. The memorandum also calculated a passenger car equivalent ADT of 262. (See Appendix J.) For a “worst case,” the 262 ADT value was used for the air quality and greenhouse gas emissions calculations.

11 The average distance between the project and the two nearest major ports (Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach) is about 70 miles. For a “worst case,” this length was used for all types of vehicles and trips in the operational phase.

12 Rule 403 applies to fugitive dust emissions. All projects in the SCAQMD are required to implement dust control measures such as regularly wetting disturbed soils.
- Site Preparation.
- Building Construction.
- Utility Improvements.
- Architectural Coating.

There would be no overlap of construction activities among any of the phases. Table 4.3-4 shows the project schedule used for the air quality, GHG emissions (Section 4.8) and noise (Section 4.13) analyses.

### Table 4.3-4
CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>November 1, 2020</td>
<td>November 9, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>November 10, 2020</td>
<td>November 12, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>November 13, 2020</td>
<td>July 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>July 2, 2021</td>
<td>July 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>July 16, 2021</td>
<td>July 29, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dusts, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. Mobile sources (such as diesel-fueled equipment onsite and traveling to and from the project site) would primarily generate NO\textsubscript{X} emissions. The amount of emissions generated daily would vary, depending on the amount and types of construction activities occurring at the same time.

**Regional Short-Term Air Quality Effects**

Project construction activities would generate short-term air quality impacts. Construction emissions can be distinguished as either onsite or offsite. Onsite air pollutant emissions consist principally of exhaust emissions from offroad heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as fugitive particulate matter from earth working and material handling operations. Offsite emissions result from workers commuting to and from the job site, as well as from trucks hauling materials to the site and construction debris for disposal.

As shown in Table 4.3-5, construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds. Therefore, the project's short-term regional air quality impacts would be less than significant.

### Table 4.3-5
MAXIMUM DAILY REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activity</th>
<th>Maximum Emissions (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Emissions, 2020</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Emissions, 2021</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Long-Term Air Quality Effects

The primary source of operational emissions would be vehicle exhaust emissions generated from project-induced vehicle trips, known as “mobile source emissions.” Other emissions, identified as “energy source emissions,” would be generated from energy consumption for water, space heating, and cooking equipment, while “area source emissions,” would be generated from structural maintenance and landscaping activities, and use of consumer products.

As seen in Table 4.3-6, for each criteria pollutant, operational emissions would be below the pollutant’s SCAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, operational criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant.

Table 4.3-6
MAXIMUM DAILY PROJECT OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Source</th>
<th>Pollutant (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source Emissions</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Source Emissions</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Source Emissions</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operational Emissions</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Significance Thresholds</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant? (Yes or No)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated by OB-1 Air Analyses with CalEEMod (Version 2016.3.2) (CAPCOA, 2017).

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

Since the SCAB is currently in nonattainment for ozone and PM2.5, related projects may exceed an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance. The SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of construction and/or operational emissions from multiple development projects nor provides methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess the cumulative emissions generated by multiple cumulative projects. Instead, the District recommends that a project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project-specific impacts. Furthermore, the SCAQMD states that
if an individual development project generates less-than-significant construction or operational emissions impacts, then the development project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.

As discussed above, the mass daily construction and operational emissions generated by the project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD’s significance thresholds. Also, as discussed below, localized emissions generated by the project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). Therefore, the project would not contribute a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for the pollutants which the Basin is in nonattainment. Thus, cumulative air quality impacts associated with the project would be less than significant.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less than Significant Impact**

**Localized Short-Term Air Quality Effects from Construction Activity**

Construction of the proposed project would generate short-term and intermittent emissions. Following SCAQMD guidance (Chico and Koizumi, 2008), only onsite construction emissions were considered in the localized significance analysis. The residences to the west of the project site, across Sierra Avenue are the nearest sensitive receptors, about 580 feet (177 meters) away. Localized significance thresholds for projects in SRA 34 were obtained from tables in Appendix C of the SCAQMD’s *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (Chico and Koizumi, 2008). Table 4.3-7 shows the results of the localized significance analysis for the proposed project.

The localized significance analysis determined that the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearest Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Maximum Onsite Emissions (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum daily emissions</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SCAQMD LST for 5 acres @ 177 meters</em></td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (Yes or No)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3-7 RESULTS OF LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE ANALYSIS

Screening Health Risk Assessment

A formal health risk assessment for a slightly larger warehouse project in Fontana (Rogozen and Paitimusa, 2019) concluded that the maximum individual cancer risk from exposure to diesel
particulate matter was less than the SCAQMD CEQA significance threshold of 10 in a million in all parts of the modeling domain (i.e. onsite and in the surrounding neighborhood). In light of that finding, the long-term cancer risk for the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project would also be less than significant.

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

Odors can cause a variety of responses. The impact of an odor results from interacting factors such as frequency (how often), intensity (strength), duration (in time), offensiveness (unpleasantness), location, and sensory perception.

The SCAQMD recommends that odor impacts be addressed in a qualitative manner (citation). Such an analysis shall determine whether the project would result in excessive nuisance odors, as defined under the California Code of Regulations and § 41700 of the California Health and Safety Code, and thus would constitute a public nuisance related to air quality.

Land uses typically considered associated with odors include wastewater treatment facilities, waste disposal facilities, or agricultural operations. The proposed project is not a land use typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. It would involve the use of diesel construction equipment and diesel trucks during construction and diesel trucks during operation. However, the project area has a predominance of industrial land uses and therefore emissions from trucks are common throughout the project vicinity. In addition, project-generated emissions would rapidly disperse in the atmosphere and would not be noticeable to the nearby public. Therefore, the project would not generate a significant odor impact during construction or operation.
### 4.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant 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>X</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>X</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>X</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 nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 Methodology

Matthew Sutton, an UltraSystems biologist, researched readily available information, including relevant literature, databases, agency websites, various previously completed reports and management plans, GIS data, maps, aerial imagery from public domain sources, and in-house records to identify the following: 1) habitats, special-status plant and wildlife species, jurisdictional waters, critical habitats, and wildlife corridors that may occur in and near the project site; and 2) local or regional plans, policies, and regulations that may apply to the project. The following data sources were accessed by UltraSystems for synthesis of data within this Initial Study.

- United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-Minute Topographic Map Quadrangle and current aerial imagery (USGS, 1996).
- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), provided by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (CDFW, 2018).
- Information, Planning and Conservation (IPaC), provided by the USFWS (USFWS, 2020b).
- Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, 8th Edition, provided by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS, 2020).
- National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), provided by the USFWS (USFWS, 2020e).
- National Hydrography Dataset, provided by the USGS (USGS, 2020).
- Critical Habitat Portal, provided by the USFWS (USFWS, 2020d).
- eBird online database of bird distribution and abundance, provided by Cornell Lab of Ornithology (eBird, 2017).
- EPA Waters GeoViewer, provided by USEPA (USEPA, 2020b).

Plant and wildlife species protected by federal agencies, state agencies, and nonprofit resource organizations, such as the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), are collectively referred to as “special-status species”. When plant and animal species that are federally or state listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species are discussed as a subcategory of special-status species they are referred to as “listed species”. When plant and animal species are protected by an agency but not a “listed species” and are discussed as a subcategory of special-status species they are referred to as “sensitive species”. Some of these plant and wildlife species are afforded special legal or management protection because they are limited in population size, and typically have a limited geographic range and/or habitat.

---

13 Avian species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are not considered “special-status species.”
Aerial imagery from the above-mentioned sources was overlaid with geospatial data by utilizing Geographic Information System (GIS) software (ArcGIS 10.1) to identify documented observations of the following biological or environmental components within the project vicinity:

1. Previously recorded observations within the project vicinity and geographic range of special-status species and potentially suitable habitats;
2. Special-status vegetation communities;
3. Protected management lands;
4. Proposed and final critical habitats;
5. Wetlands, waters of the State (WOS), and waters of the United States (WOUS); and

An analysis was then made to plan either the avoidance of or to minimize project impacts to any of those biological resources. A Biological Study Area (BSA) was defined for the project and includes the project site and a 500-foot buffer zone around its perimeter (refer to Figure 4.4-1).

Michael Tuma, an UltraSystems biologist, conducted a field evaluation for existing biological resources of the biological study area (BSA) on April 19, 2020. In this survey Mr. Tuma documented habitat types, potential threats to ecosystem health and plant and wildlife species in the BSA.

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, 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 with Mitigation Incorporated**

The project site is located in a highly-urbanized area that is surrounded by residential and commercial properties, which provides low habitat value for special-status plant and wildlife species (including species listed by state or federal agencies as “candidate” or “sensitive” species).

**Vegetation Reconnaissance Survey Results**

The reconnaissance-level biological survey conducted on April 19, 2020 determined that approximately 6.09 acres\(^{14}\) of the project site are disturbed with non-native grassland surrounded by developed lands and heavily modified, non-natural landscapes. The project site consists of SoC Soboba gravelly loamy sand; there is a small patch of Tujunga gravelly loamy sand in the southwestern portion of the BSA (USDA 2020). There are also piles of concrete slabs within that

---

\(^{14}\) Total gross area of the project site is 6.09 acres (or 265,314 square feet). The project site includes two parcels: Parcel 1 is APN #1119-221-64 and Parcel 2 is APN #1119-221-68. There is dedication required on Mango Avenue: 4,457 square feet for Parcel 1 and 4,456 square feet for parcel 2, for a total of 8,913 square feet of dedication. After subtracting the area required for dedication, the net area of Parcel 1 is 130,311 square feet and the net area of Parcel 2 is 126,090 square feet. Therefore, the total net project site area is 5.8 acres.
project site which could serve as habitat for certain wildlife species such as snakes, rodents and burrowing owls.

The portion of the planted, terraced slope of the landfill immediately east of the project site and within the BSA supports a young Riversidean upland coastal scrub community with relatively low diversity of species. Because this community was planted, it likely does not contain listed or sensitive plant species. The four land cover types identified within the BSA during the survey are described below (refer to Figure 4.4-1).

List of Land Cover Types

**Bromus diandrus – Avena spp. Semi-Natural Alliance:** This alliance of non-native annual grasslands and forb lands is composed of cool-season, annual grasses mostly introduced from Europe. They are invasive in disturbed areas throughout much of California. The composition varies widely, with many alien annual species present, including *Avena barbata*, *Avena fatua*, *Brassica* spp., *Bromus diandrus*, *Bromus hordeaceus*, *Bromus madritensis*, and others. The composition of this alliance is largely determined by amount of disturbance, winter temperatures and precipitation, light intensity, litter thickness, and microtopography. The percentage of exotic alien species is often directly related to disturbance history with heavy disturbance correlating with heavy exotic invasion. Annual grasses are supremely adapted to the Mediterranean climate of California; many species evolved under similar conditions in southern Europe and northern Africa. Plants germinate during winter rains and complete their life cycles by the beginning of the summer drought. Seeds often remain viable for many years. Within the BSA, this vegetation community makes up approximately 9.43 acres.

**Artemisia californica – Eriogonum fasciculatum Shrubland Alliance (Restoration Area):** The Mid-Valley Landfill, located east of the project site and situated within the eastern portion of the BSA, features a terraced, west-facing hillside that has been planted with *Artemisia californica – Eriogonum fasciculatum* Shrubland Alliance (Sawyer et al. 2009) species. The stand appeared relatively young, as most shrubs were small, and there were little differences in structure of the stand (i.e., the plants were of similar size and the stand lacked layer complexity). Lack of access to this portion of the BSA prevented the biologist from identifying other species that had been planted. Typical *Artemisia californica – Eriogonum fasciculatum* Shrubland Alliance supports a diversity of other species, including California buckwheat, laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), brittlebush (*Encelia farinosa*), deerweed, lemonade berry (*Rhus integrifolia*), sugarbush (*Rhus ovata*), and several sages (*Salvia mellifera*, *Salvia apiana*), among others (Holland, 1986; Sawyer et al., 2009). Within the BSA, this vegetation community makes up approximately 11.42 acres.

**Developed Lands:** Developed lands are non-vegetated features within the BSA that describe areas occupied by manmade structures, paving and other impermeable surfaces that cannot support vegetation. Onsite developed lands consist of paved streets, paved access roads, parking lots, driveways, sidewalks, shipping containers, and other permanent structures. These developed areas provide virtually no habitat for wildlife species. Landscaping (ornamental trees, shrubs, turf, etc.) associated with the developed lands are also included within this category. These developed areas provide virtually no habitat for wildlife species; however, birds could use the ornamental trees for foraging and nesting. Developed lands and ornamental vegetation does not have a global or state rank and is not considered a sensitive plant community. Within the BSA, this vegetation community makes up approximately 27.55 acres.
**Disturbed Lands:** The disturbed land cover type is characterized by areas lacking vegetation due to anthropogenic land uses. They provide little to no habitat value for wildlife. Disturbed habitats observed within the BSA do not fit any classification described in A Manual of California Vegetation Second Edition (Sawyer et al., 2009) or Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Communities of California (Holland, 1986). Disturbed habitats are not considered a sensitive plant community. Within the BSA, disturbed habitats make up approximately 2.34 acres which consist of gravel lots adjacent to the project site.

**Plants**

The following plant species were found during the biological survey on April 19, 2020, in two land cover types that contained naturally occurring plant species or restored native habitat:

- The dominant non-native plant species observed within the Bromus diandrus – Avena spp. Semi-Natural Alliance in the BSA were ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), moderate rating @ Cal-IPC and wild oats (*Avena* spp.), moderate rating @ Cal-IPC. Other characteristic non-native species included red brome (*Bromus madritensis*), high rating @ Cal-IPC, castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), limited rating @ Cal-IPC, black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), moderate rating @ Cal-IPC, prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), and smooth sow thistle (*Sonchus oleraceus*). A number of native plants characteristic of disturbed areas were also present, including annual sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), telegraph weed *Heterotheca grandiflora*, western ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya*), and Canadian horseweed (*Conyza canadensis*). Several other native species, including fiddleneck (*Amsinckia* spp.), cudweed (*Pseudognaphalium* spp.), deerweed (*Acmispon glaber*), and California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) that were present suggest elements of Riversidean upland scrub that likely dominated the area prior to its development. Despite the presence of native species, the non-native grassland is dominated by non-native vegetation.

- The *Artemisia californica* – *Eriogonum fasciculatum* Shrubland Alliance had dominant species that included California sage brush (*Artemisia californica*) and California brittlebush (*Encelia californica*). Other plant species could not be identified due to lack of access to the landfill.

One other non-native plant species, Redstem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*) Geraniaceae (Limited rating @ Cal-IPC), was observed during the biological survey. Redstem filaree and wild oats were common in vegetated areas throughout the BSA.

Based on a literature review and query from publicly available databases\(^\text{15}\) (CDFW, 2020a; CNPS, 2020a; USFWS, 2020a,b) for reported occurrences, within a five-mile radius of the project site, a total of ten special-status plant species, three listed and seven sensitive, were identified. All of the species identified in the CNPS rare plant search that either occurred in the CNDDB search or were not relevant to the habitat conditions within the BSA. Special-status plants were not observed within the project site, nor are they expected to occur due to lack of suitable habitat, and/or the site is outside of the known elevation, and/or general distribution of the target species. The ten special-status plant species are:

\(^{15}\) Databases include California Natural Diversity Database, USFWS’ Information, Planning, and Conservation, CNPS’ Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, 8th Edition, Previous studies and reports within the project site and project vicinity were reviewed to gain a sense of the existing conditions at the time the studies were conducted.
species are presented in Table 4.4-1 (refer to Figure 4.4-2) with both the taxonomic (scientific) name, common name, status and general habitat of each plant species.

Although the loamy sand soil substrates within the BSA potentially support some of the reported special-status plant species, these substrates have been recently tilled and therefore do not provide suitable habitat for any of these species. Therefore, none of the reported species that occur in sandy loam substrates are expected to occur within the BSA.

All of the species reported in literature review were evaluated as to their occurrence potential based on habitat, elevational and geographic range and the project site disturbances (Calflora, 2020; CDFW, 2020; CDFW, 2018; CDFW, 2016a; CNPS, 2020a; Jepson, 2020; USDA, 2020; USFWS, 2020a,b). The following two special-status and sensitive wildlife species were determined not to have a potential to occur within the BSA because the BSA lacks suitable habitat to support these species and the BSA is outside of the geographic and elevational range of these species (see Table 4.4-1 for listing status description):

- Palmer's mariposa lily (Calochortus palmeri var. palmeri) 1B.2
- salt marsh bird's-beak (Chloropyron maritimum ssp. maritimum) FE, SE, 1B.2

Please see Table 4.4-1, below, for a list of the 10 special-status plant species (3 listed and 7 sensitive) resulting from a literature review and query, within a 5-mile radius of the project site. None of these 10 plant species are expected to occur onsite; therefore, mitigation is not necessary.
### Table 4.4-1
**PLANT LITERATURE REVIEW RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Endangered, Threatened, Candidate and State Rare Plants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants with official status under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), and/or the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA). A species may have other sensitive designations in addition to their federal or state listing.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arenaria paludicola</em></td>
<td>marsh sandwort</td>
<td>FE, SE,</td>
<td>Found on saturated, acidic bog soils, freshwater marshes and swamps, bogs and fens.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dodecahema leptoceras</em></td>
<td>slender-horned spineflower</td>
<td>FE, SE,</td>
<td>Found on sandy soil of alluvium in flood plains and in washes. Associated with alluvial fan sage scrub.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eriastrum densifolium ssp. sanctorum</em></td>
<td>Santa Ana River woollystar</td>
<td>FE, SE,</td>
<td>Found only within open washes and early-successional alluvial fan scrub on open slopes above main watercourses on fluvial deposits where flooding and scouring occur at a frequency intervals of &lt; 50 years.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensitive Plants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ambrosia monogyra</em></td>
<td>singlewhorl burrobrush</td>
<td>CRPR: 2B.2</td>
<td>Found in chaparral and Sonoran Desert scrub in sandy soils, desert washes and ravines.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are occurrences within two miles of the BSA but there is no suitable habitat (sandy wash) onsite. Additionally, this species is a conspicuous perennial shrub, and it most likely would have been observed during the field survey conducted within the BSA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 4.4 - Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Calochortus plummerae</em></td>
<td>Plummer’s mariposa lily</td>
<td>CRPR: 4.2</td>
<td>Found in openings in chaparral, cismontane woodlands, coastal scrub, valley and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foothill grasslands, and lower montane coniferous forests. It is found on dry,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Although there is disturbed grassland community onsite, there is no suitable habitat in the BSA due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rocky slopes and soils and brushy areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>to heavy soil disturbances of the substrates (sandy, rocky soils).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Centromadia pungens ssp.</td>
<td>smooth tarplant</td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td>Occurs in a variety of alkaline soils within chenopod scrub, meadows and</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>laevis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seeps, playas, riparian woodlands, and valley and foothill grasslands. It is</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=<em>Hemizonia pungens ssp.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also found on disturbed places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>laevis</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chorizanthe parryi var.</td>
<td>Parry’s spineflower</td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in sandy or rocky soils and openings in coastal scrub, chaparral,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>parryi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cismontane woodlands, and valley and foothill grasslands. Often it is</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are occurrences within two miles of the BSA and but there is no suitable habitat in the BSA due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with alluvial conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>to heavy soil disturbances of the substrates (sandy, rocky soils; grassland community).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horkelia cuneata var.</td>
<td>mesa horkelia</td>
<td>CRPR: 1B.1</td>
<td>Found in sandy or gravelly sites of maritime chaparral, coastal scrub,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>puberula</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and cismontane woodlands.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=<em>Horkelia cuneata ssp.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>puberula</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lycium parishii</em></td>
<td>Parish’s desert-thorn</td>
<td>CRPR: 1A</td>
<td>Found in coastal scrub and Sonoran Desert scrub, typically associated with</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>washes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are occurrences within two miles of the BSA; however, no suitable habitat (coastal scrub,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>washes) onsite. Additionally, this species is a conspicuous perennial shrub and it most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would have been observed during the field survey conducted within the BSA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malacothamnus parishii (=Aster greatae)</td>
<td>Parish’s bushmallow</td>
<td>CRPR: 1A</td>
<td>Found in chaparral and coastal scrub habitats.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable habitat in the BSA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
- The BSA contains approximate elevations of 1,560 to 1,570 feet above mean sea level (amsl).

**Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listing Codes:** The ESA is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The USFWS has primary responsibility for terrestrial and freshwater organisms, while the responsibilities of NMFS are mainly marine wildlife such as whales and anadromous fish such as salmon. For the purposes of the ESA, Congress defined species to include subspecies, varieties, and, for vertebrates, distinct population segments. The official federal listing of Endangered and Threatened plants is published in 50 CFR §17.12.

- **FE = federally listed as endangered:** any species of plant or animal that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range.

**California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and California Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) Listing Codes:** The CESA and NPPA are administered by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The official listing of Plants of California Declared to Be Endangered, Threatened or Rare is contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §670.2. Species, subspecies and varieties of California native plants are declared to be endangered, threatened as defined by §2062 and §2067 of the Fish and Game Code or rare as defined by §1901 of the Fish and Game Code.

- **SE = state-listed as endangered:** "endangered species" means a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, or disease (Fish and Game Code §2062).

**California Rare Plant Ranks (Formerly known as CNPS Lists):** The CNPS is a statewide, nonprofit organization that maintains, with CDFW, an Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California. In the spring of 2011, CNPS and CDFW officially changed the name "CNPS List" or "CNPS Ranks" to "California Rare Plant Rank" (or CRPR). This was done to reduce confusion over the fact that CNPS and CDFW jointly manage the Rare Plant Status Review Groups and the rank assignments are the product of a collaborative effort and not solely a CNPS assignment.

- **CRPR 1B = California Rare Plant Rank 1B - plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere:** plants with a CRPR of 1B are rare throughout their range with the majority of them endemic to California. Most of the plants that are ranked 1B have declined significantly over the last century. All of the plants constituting CRPR 1B meet the definitions of §2062 and §2067 (CESA) of the Fish and Game Code, and are eligible for state listing. It is mandatory that they be fully considered during preparation of environmental documents relating to CEQA.
### SECTION 4.4 - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 2B</td>
<td>California Rare Plant Rank 2B</td>
<td>plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>except for being common beyond the boundaries of California, plants with a CRPR of 2B would have been ranked 1B. From the federal perspective, plants common in other states or countries are not eligible for consideration under the provisions of the ESA. All of the plants constituting CRPR 2B meet the definitions of §2062 and §2067 (CESA) of the Fish and Game Code, and are eligible for state listing. It is mandatory that they be fully considered during preparation of environmental documents relating to CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPR 4</td>
<td>California Rare Plant Rank 4</td>
<td>plants of limited distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The plants in this category are of limited distribution or infrequent throughout a broader area in California. While CNPS and CDFW cannot call these plants &quot;rare&quot; from a statewide perspective, they are uncommon enough that their status should be monitored regularly. Should the degree of endangerment or rarity of a CRPR 4 plant change, CNPS and CDFW will transfer it to a more appropriate rank. Some of the plants constituting CRPR 4 meet the definitions of § 2062 and § 2067 (CESA) of the Fish and Game Code, and few, if any, are eligible for state listing. Nevertheless, many of them are significant locally, and CNPS strongly recommends that CRPR 4 plants be evaluated for consideration during preparation of environmental documents relating to CEQA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Threat Ranks:** The CNPS Threat Rank is an extension added onto the California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) (as a decimal code) and designates the level of threats by a 1 to 3 ranking with 1 being the most threatened and 3 being the least threatened. A Threat Rank is present for all CRPR 1B’s, 2B’s, 4’s, and the majority of CRPR 3’s. CRPR 4 plants are seldom assigned a Threat Rank of .1, as they generally have large enough populations to not have significant threats to their continued existence in California. However, certain conditions exist to make the plant a species of concern and hence be assigned a CRPR. In addition, all CRPR 1A and 2A (presumed extirpated in California), and some CRPR 3 (need more information) plants, which lack threat information, do not have a Threat Rank extension.

- **.1** = seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)
- **.2** = moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat)
- **.3** = not very threatened in California (<20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known)
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Wildlife

During the April 19, 2020 biological survey, nine wildlife species were observed. Neither terrestrial wildlife nor their sign (including burrows) were observed in the proposed project site during the biological survey. Eight bird species, seven of which are native to California, were observed visually, by vocalization, or by their sign. The native bird species include Red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) Accipitridae, American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*) Falconidae, Mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) Columbidae, Common raven (*Corvus corax*) Corvidae, Lesser goldfinch (*Spinus psaltria*) Fringillidae, Mexican house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*) Fringillidae, and Western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*) Icteridae. The one non-native bird species observed on the site was House sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) Passeridae. Additionally, one mammal species, Botta’s pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) Geomyidae, was recorded within the project site. None of these observed bird species have been designated as special status by federal or state agencies; special-status wildlife (including avian) species were not observed within the project nor are they expected to occur due to lack of suitable habitat, and/or the site is outside of the known elevation, and/or general distribution of the target species.

No nests were observed during the April 19, 2020 biological survey. However, trees in adjacent properties within the typical 200 to 500-foot buffer zone\(^{16}\) were not surveyed. Offsite trees could provide suitable future or current nesting sites, including nesting sites for passerine species such as the ones observed during the biological survey. Birds that nest on the ground, such as killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) may also utilize the unvegetated areas within the project site for nesting.

Migratory birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code, which render it unlawful to take migratory birds, and their nests, eggs, and young. California defines “take” as “to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill.” California courts have held that take includes incidental take and is not limited to hunting and fishing and other activities that are specifically intended to kill protected fish and wildlife. Over 600 species of migratory birds live in or migrate through California (CDFW 2018).

Based on a literature review and query from publicly available databases (CDFW 2020a,b, eBird 2017, USFWS 2020a,b) for reported occurrences within a five-mile radius of the project site, 23 special-status wildlife species, 8 listed and 15 sensitive, were reported as recent occurrences (≤ 20 years), or documented within 5 miles of the BSA, or recognized as occurring based on previous surveys or knowledge of the area. Of those 23 species, 3 listed and 9 sensitive wildlife species were determined to have a potential to occur within the project BSA as represented in Table 4.4-2 (refer to Figure 4.4-3, CNDDB Wildlife Species and Habitats Map).

All of the special-status species reported in the literature review were evaluated as to their potential to occur in the BSA based on habitat, geographic and elevational range and site conditions (CDFW, 2020, 2018, 2016b; eBird, 2017; Sibley, 2000; USFWS, 2020a,b,c; Zeiner et al., 1988-1990). Due to several biological and physical disturbances within the BSA, it was determined that there is a lack of suitable habitat conditions to support 11 of the 23 special-status wildlife species identified in the five-mile radius database query. First, some species for which the suitable habitat type may occur in the BSA, or for which the BSA overlaps with the appropriate elevation range and species range, were excluded because level of human activity in the surrounding areas generates more noise than ambient conditions and represents a threat level to most species. Second, there is high cover of

---

\(^{16}\) Generally nesting bird surveys encompass a 200-foot buffer zone for passerine species, a 300-foot buffer zone for special-status species, and a 500-foot buffer zone for raptor species.
non-native weedy species (e.g., wild oats and redstem filaree) that germinate and grow early in the growing season and may preclude the establishment of several later emerging native plant species. Many of the wildlife species require native vegetation for their foraging and nesting requirements. Third, habitat fragmentation from development reduces the size of habitat patches containing contiguous stands of native vegetation. Thus, certain species would not have sufficient foraging habitat or cover for nesting or shelter requirements. Fourth, the BSA lacks complex vegetation communities. In general, more complex natural communities with more vegetation layers and more plant species provide higher value wildlife habitat than less complex vegetation communities. More complex communities contain more niches for wildlife and usually support more animal species than less complex communities. For all of the abovementioned reasons, the following eleven special-status and sensitive wildlife species from the respective wildlife types were determined not to occur within the BSA and will not be discussed further (see Table 4.4-2 for listing status description):

Invertebrates
- Delhi sands flower-loving fly (Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis) FE

Amphibians
- arroyo toad (Anaxyrus californicus) SSC

Reptiles
- southern California legless lizard (Anniella stebbinsi) SSC
- southern rubber boa (Charina umbratica) ST

Birds
- southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus) FE, SE
- least Bell’s vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus) FE, SE

Mammals
- San Bernardino kangaroo rat (Dipodomys merriami parvus) FE, SC, SSC
- western yellow bat (Lasiurus xanthinus) SSC, WBWG: H
- San Diego desert woodrat (Neotoma lepida intermedia) SSC
- pocketed free-tailed bat (Nyctinomops femorosaccus) SSC, WBWG: M
- Los Angeles pocket mouse (Perognathus longimembris brevinasus) SSC

Based on an assessment of the wildlife species generated by the literature review and query from publicly available databases\(^\text{17}\) for reported occurrences within a 5-mile radius of the project site, only one sensitive wildlife species, burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia) SSC, BCC, was determined to have a moderate potential to occur on the project site. The burrowing owl is a small, crepuscular (active at dusk and dawn), ground-inhabiting owl that is found largely throughout the southern United States. Its overall length is about seven to ten inches. Coloring is sandy brown on its head, back and upper wings, with noticeable white spotting on its back and upper wings (Sibley, 2000). Adults are barred on their breast, while juveniles are buffy with a white collar. The brown and white mottling helps to provide camouflage in their dry habitats. Burrowing owls have yellow eyes, long legs, a short tail, with relatively long, narrow wings and a flat, round head (Sibley, 2000). Their long legs help them to see over grasses and short vegetation and aid them in catching their prey.

\(^\text{17}\) Databases include California Natural Diversity Database and USFWS’ Information, Planning, and Conservation, (IPaC). Previous studies and reports within the project site and project vicinity were reviewed to gain a sense of the existing conditions at the time the studies were conducted.
Nest and roost burrows of the burrowing owl in California are most commonly those excavated by California ground squirrels (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), but they may use American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), and fox dens or holes (CDFG, 2012). If the ground is soft enough with a hard overlay, some burrowing owls may dig their own burrows, but they generally prefer to enlarge and adapt existing mammal burrows. The species is also known also use the small holes of round-tailed ground squirrels (*Citellus tereticaudus*) and Botta’s pocket gophers (*Thomomys bottae*) (Shuford and Gardali, 2008). Where burrows are scarce, man-made structures, such as culverts, piles of concrete, rubble, or debris, pipes, asphalt, artificial nest boxes, and openings beneath cement or asphalt pavement also are used as nest sites (CDFG, 2012). Both natural and artificial burrows provide protection, shelter, and nest sites.

Considering that there are piles of concrete slabs on the project site, there is a potential for burrowing owl individuals to utilize these structures for burrowing and nesting purposes. There is a potential that rodents, a preferred prey source, would forage in the non-native annual grassland onsite. Due to the onsite presence of burrowing structures and prey sources, there is a moderate potential for this species to occur. With the implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-7**, the project operations and construction impacts to this species would be less than significant.

Based on an assessment of a literature review and query from publicly available databases for reported occurrences within a 5-mile radius of the project site, twelve special-status wildlife species were determined to have a potential to occur. The 12 special-status wildlife species are presented in Table 4.4-2 (Refer to Figure 4.4-3) with the taxonomic (scientific) name, common name, listing status, habitat description, habitat presence, and a rationale for the determination of its occurrence potential in the BSA.

---

18 Databases include California Natural Diversity Database, USFWS’ Information, Planning, and Conservation, Previous studies and reports within the project site and project vicinity were reviewed to gain a sense of the existing conditions at the time the studies were conducted.
## Table 4.4-2
WILDLIFE LITERATURE REVIEW RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate Wildlife:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife with official status under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). A species may have other sensitive designations in addition to their federal or state listing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Invertebrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bombus crotchii</em></td>
<td>Crotch bumble bee</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>Found in open grassland and scrub habitats.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence. Species was recorded in the immediate vicinity, but the BSA supports only marginally suitable habitat in the non-native grassland community. This habitat over much of the BSA may be too dense and disturbed for their occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gymnogyps californianus</em></td>
<td>California condor</td>
<td>FE, SE, fully protected</td>
<td>Permanent resident of the semi-arid, pine or chaparral covered rugged mountain ranges. They roost on cliffs and in large trees and snags. Nests on cliffs and less often in large trees.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence. Though there are occurrences known within two miles, the BSA does not contain suitable breeding habitat and only supports marginal foraging habitat. The Riversidean upland sage scrub community on the slopes of the landfill is a young stand with no layer complexity. Likely to occur only as a transient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polioptila californica</em></td>
<td>coastal California gnatcatcher</td>
<td>FT, SSC</td>
<td>Small, non-migratory, permanent resident of coastal sage scrub habitat</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Low potential for occurrence. Though there are occurrences known within two miles, the BSA does not contain suitable breeding habitat and only supports marginal foraging habitat. The Riversidean upland sage scrub community on the slopes of the landfill is a young stand with no layer complexity. Likely to occur only as a transient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sensitive Wildlife:

These animals have no official status under the ESA and/or the CESA; however, they are designated as sensitive or locally important by federal agencies, state agencies, and/or local conservation agencies and organizations.

#### Sensitive Reptiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Arizona elegans occidentalis</em></td>
<td>California glossy snake</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Occur in all ecological zones, from the coast to the mountain foothills. It occurs in a variety of habitats including light shrubby to barren desert, sagebrush flats, grassland, chaparral-covered slopes, and woodlands, preferring open areas; these habitats include a substrate that is often sandy or loamy suitable for burrowing</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri</em> (=San Diegan whiptail)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Found in a variety of ecosystems, primarily hot and dry open areas with sparse foliage such as deserts, chaparral and semiarid. Also found in woodland and riparian areas. The western whiptail can be found in open, often rocky areas with little vegetation or sunny microhabitats within shrub or grassland associations. The ground may be firm soil, sandy, or rocky.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scientific Name: Phrynosoma blainvillii

**Common Name:** Blainville's horned lizard (=coast horned lizard)

**Status:** SSC

**General Habitat:** Found in a wide variety of vegetation types including coastal sage scrub, annual grassland, chaparral, oak woodland, riparian woodland and coniferous forest. In inland areas, this species is restricted to areas with pockets of open microhabitat, created by disturbance (e.g., floods, fire, roads, grazed areas, fire breaks). The key elements of such habitats are loose, fine soils with a high sand fraction; an abundance of native ants or other insects.

**Habitat (Present, Absent):** Present

**Potential for Occurrence in the BSA:** Low potential for occurrence. The BSA supports only marginal habitat for this species. Soils are likely too cobbly. The non-native grassland is too dense for this species. The Riversidean upland coastal scrub planting on the slope of the Mid-Valley Landfill is a young stand with low diversity of species and vertical structure. Dominant shrubs were dense, small, and uniformly distributed, providing a thick ground cover with few intra-shrub openings. Due to level of historic and recent disturbances in the region, it is highly unlikely that this species could recolonize the slopes of the landfill.

### Sensitive Birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Habitat (Present, Absent)</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athene cunicularia</td>
<td>burrowing owl</td>
<td>SSC, BCC Season of Concern: burrowing sites and some wintering sites</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Moderate potential for occurrence. Species was recorded in the immediate vicinity (cite) and the BSA supports moderately suitable habitat (non-native grassland community). The cobbly nature of the soils in this habitat provides marginal burrowing opportunities and California ground squirrels were absent from the BSA. However, valley pocket gopher burrows and a pile of concrete debris on the western side of the project site may provide potential burrowing opportunities for dispersing burrowing owls. Transients may use the site between September and February when local, post-fledging owls and non-local, short-distance migrant owls disperse from nest areas to wintering sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 4.4 - BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Artemisiospiza belli belli</em> (=<em>Amphispiza belli belli</em>)</td>
<td>Bell's sage sparrow</td>
<td>WL, BCC</td>
<td>Breeds in dry chaparral and coastal sage scrub along the coastal lowlands, inland valleys, and in the lower foothills of local mountains. In transmontane California, it occupies sagebrush, alkali desert scrub, desert scrub, and similar habitats.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensitive Mammals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Eumops perotis californicus</em></td>
<td>western mastiff bat</td>
<td>SSC, WBWG:H</td>
<td>Found in a variety of habitats, such as semi-arid to arid habitats, including conifer and deciduous woodlands, coastal scrub, annual and perennial grasslands, palm oases, chaparral, desert scrub, and urban, but the species’ distribution may be geomorphically determined, occurring primarily where there are significant rock features offering suitable roosting habitat. A cliff dwelling species, Western mastiff bats can also be found in similar crevices in large boulders and buildings. Western mastiff bats prefer deep crevices</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaetodipus fallax fallax</td>
<td>northwestern San Diego pocket mouse</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>A common resident of sandy herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or coarse gravel. It inhabits coastal sage scrub, sage scrub/grassland ecotones, and chaparral communities. In western Riverside County, the San Diego pocket mouse also commonly is found in disturbed grassland and open sage scrub vegetation with sandy-loam to loam soils.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaetodipus fallax pallidus</td>
<td>pallid San Diego pocket mouse</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Common resident of sandy herbaceous areas, usually in association with rocks or coarse gravel in southwestern California. Occurs mainly in arid coastal and desert border areas. Habitats of the San Diego pocket mouse include coastal scrub, chamise-redshank chaparral, mixed chaparral, sagebrush, desert wash, desert scrub, desert succulent shrub,</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 4.4 - Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>General Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence in the BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lepus californicus bennettii</em></td>
<td>San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>A habitat generalist occurring in open areas or semi-open country, typically in grasslands, agricultural fields or sparse coastal scrub. It primarily is found in arid regions supporting shortgrass habitats.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes*
- The BSA contains approximate elevations of 1,560 to 1,570 feet above mean sea level (amsl).
- The BSA comprises disturbed, developed, non-native grassland and coastal sage scrub land types.
- **Low** = the BSA contains suitable habitat and is within the species’ distribution; however, there is a low probability of occurrence due to lack of optimal foraging and/or nesting habitat.
- **Moderate** = the BSA contains suitable habitat and is within the species’ distribution and there is a reasonable likelihood of occurrence due to the presence of favorable foraging and/or nesting habitat.

**Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Listing Codes:**
- The ESA is administered by the USFWS and NMFS. The USFWS has primary responsibility for terrestrial and freshwater organisms, while the responsibilities of NMFS are mainly marine wildlife such as whales and anadromous fish such as salmon. For the purposes of the ESA, Congress defined species to include subspecies, varieties, and, for vertebrates, distinct population segments. The official federal listing of Endangered and Threatened animals is published in 50 CFR §17.11.
  - **FE** = federal listed as endangered: any species of plant or animal that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their range.
  - **FT** = federal listed as threatened: any species of plant or animal that is considered likely to become endangered throughout all or a significant portion of its range within the foreseeable future.

**California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Listing Codes:**
- The CESA is administered by CDFW. The official listing of Animals of California Declared To Be Endangered or Threatened is contained in the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §670.5. Species and subspecies of California native animals are declared to be endangered or threatened as defined by §§2062 and 2067 of the Fish and Game Code.
  - **SE** = state-listed as endangered: "endangered species" means a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes, including loss of habitat, change in habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, or disease (Fish and Game Code § 2062).
  - **SCE** = state candidate for listing as endangered: a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that the Fish and Game Commission has formally noticed published in the California Regulatory Notice Register as being under review by CDFW for addition to the list of endangered species.
The observation of each species becomes more apparent. The matrix should also provide a means to prioritize and focus population monitoring, research, conservation actions, and the efficient use of limited funding and resources currently devoted to bats.

**California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Designations:**
For some wildlife species, the CNDDB is only concerned with specific portions of the life history, such as roosts, rookeries, or nesting colonies. For many species of birds, the primary emphasis is on the breeding population in California. For some species which do not breed in California but winter here, emphasis is on wintering range.

The species of special concern (SSC) designation thus may include a comment regarding the specific protection provided such as nesting or wintering

- **SSC = species of special concern:** a species of special concern is a species, subspecies, or distinct population of an animal (fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal) native to California that currently satisfies one or more of the following (not necessarily mutually exclusive) criteria: is extirpated from the state or, in the case of birds, in its primary seasonal or breeding role; is listed as federally-, but not state-, threatened or endangered; meets the state definition of threatened or endangered, but has not formally been listed; is experiencing, or formerly experienced, serious (noncyclical) population declines or range retractions (not reversed) that, if continued or resumed, could qualify it for state threatened or endangered status; has naturally small populations exhibiting high susceptibility to risk from any factor(s), that if realized, could lead to declines that would qualify it for state threatened or endangered status.

- **FP = Fully protected:** fully protected animal species may not be taken or possessed at any time and no licenses or permits may be issued for their take except for collecting these species for necessary scientific research and relocation of the bird species for the protection of livestock. Lists were created for fish (Fish and Game Code § 5515), amphibians and reptiles (Fish and Game Code § 5050), birds (Fish and Game Code § 3511) and mammals (Fish and Game Code § 4700).

- **WL = watch list:** this list includes birds identified in the California Bird Species of Special Concern (Shuford and Gardali, 2008) report and are not on the current CDFW species of special concern list, but were on previous lists and they have not been state-listed under CESA; were previously state or federally listed and now are on neither list; or are on the list of fully protected species.

**United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Designations:**

- **BCC = bird of conservation concern:** a bird of conservation concern is listed in the USFWS’ 2008 Birds of Conservation Concern report. The report identifies species, subspecies, and populations of all migratory and non-migratory bird species (beyond those already designated as federally threatened or endangered) that, without additional conservation actions, are likely to become candidates for listing under the ESA. While all of the bird species included in the report is priorities for conservation action, the list makes no finding with regard to whether they warrant consideration for ESA listing.

**Western Bat Working Group (WBWG) Priority Matrix:** The Western Bat Species Regional Priority Matrix is a product of the Western Bat Working Group Workshop held in Reno, Nevada, February 9-13, 1998. The matrix is intended to provide states, provinces, federal land management agencies, interested organizations and individuals a better understanding of the overall status of a given bat species throughout its western North American range. Subsequently, the importance of a single region or multiple regions to the viability and conservation of each species becomes more apparent. The matrix should also provide a means to prioritize and focus population monitoring, research, conservation actions, and the efficient use of limited funding and resources currently devoted to bats.

- **H = High** 'high' designation represents those species considered the highest priority for funding, planning, and conservation actions. These species are imperiled or are at high risk of imperilment.

- **M = Medium** 'medium' designation indicates a level of concern that should warrant closer evaluation, more research, and conservation actions of both the species and possible threats. A lack of meaningful information is a major obstacle in adequately assessing these species' status and should be considered a threat.
Figure 4.4-3
CNDDB WILDLIFE SPECIES MAP
If construction occurs during the nesting season, indirect impacts on migratory birds could occur from increased noise, vibration, and dust during construction. This could adversely affect the breeding behavior of some birds, and lead to the loss (take) of eggs and chicks, or nest abandonment. Without the following mitigation measures, the project would have a potentially significant impact.

Project Improvement Measures

PIM-1: Project Limits and Designated Work Areas

- To avoid impacts on common native and special-status wildlife, the project proponent shall implement the following measures prior to project construction and commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal.

- The project boundary shall be set at the minimum size to accomplish necessary work, resulting in minimal impacts on sensitive biological resources.

- Specifications for the project boundary, limits of grading, project related parking, storage areas, laydown sites, and equipment storage areas shall be mapped and clearly marked in the field with temporary fencing, signs, stakes, flags, rope, cord, or other appropriate markers. All markers shall be maintained by the contractor until the completion of activities in that area. No vegetation shall be removed outside of the marked areas and no construction debris, equipment, or soils shall be placed outside of the marked areas.

- To minimize disturbance, the construction/laydown activities, parking, staging, storage, spoil management, and equipment access shall be restricted to designated areas. Designated areas shall be comprised of existing surfaces and previously disturbed areas (parking lots, access roads, graded and degraded areas, etc.) to the extent possible.

- Project related work limits shall be defined and work crews shall be restricted to designated work areas. Disturbance beyond the actual construction zone shall be prohibited without site-specific surveys and permission of the Biological Monitor.

PIM-2: General Vegetation Avoidance and Protection Measures

Throughout construction of the project, the following general avoidance and protection measures to protect vegetation will be implemented to the extent feasible:

- Vegetation located outside of the project work limits shall be flagged off and avoided.

- Vegetation removal within the work limits shall occur immediately before the commencement of ground-disturbing construction activities, to reduce the potential for erosion, sedimentation, and/or siltation into downstream, offsite, waters of the U.S. and state.
- Cleared or trimmed vegetation and woody debris shall be disposed of in accordance with regulatory permit conditions.

- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall be prohibited from collecting plants or parts of plants, including flowers.

**PIM-3: General Wildlife Avoidance and Protection Measures**

To minimize indirect impacts, as well as construction-related mortalities of nocturnally active species such as mammals and snakes, all non-emergency work shall be conducted during daylight hours. All unnecessary lights shall be turned off at night to avoid attracting wildlife such as insects, migratory birds, and bats. Nighttime work (and use of artificial lighting) shall not be permitted unless specifically authorized by CDFW.

- During operation of the project, impacts to the adjacent landfill hillside that may be used by avian species for breeding, foraging, or movements would occur primarily in the forms of noise and lights. Implementation of the measures below will minimize operational impacts to a less than significant level.

- All lighting along the east side of the project shall be downcast luminaries with light directed away from the adjacent landfill hillside. All installed project lighting shall be designed to be directed away from the hillside using shielded lights, low-sodium vapor lights, downcast lights, bollard lights, or other available light and glare minimization methods.

- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall be prohibited from feeding, capturing, or collecting wildlife. To avoid the potential for mortality and harassment of wildlife, all non-security related firearms, weapons, and domestic pets shall be prohibited from the project site.

- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall inspect their vehicles and equipment for the presence of wildlife prior to moving them. The biological monitor shall be contacted if a special-status species is detected and is in danger of being harmed.

- All steep-walled excavations (e.g., pitfalls, trenches, holes, bores) greater than two feet deep created during the project shall be completely covered at all times except when being actively used, to prevent entrapment of wildlife (e.g. reptiles and small mammals). If excavations cannot be covered, escape ramps (maximum slope of 2:1) shall be provided to allow trapped animals to escape and exclusion fencing shall be installed around the excavation. Excavations shall be inspected immediately before backfilling and any wildlife discovered in the excavation shall be removed by the qualified biologist.
Mitigation Measures

**MM BIO-1: Biological Monitor**

A biological monitor is a qualified biologist with experience surveying for and monitoring the special-status species relevant to the project site.

If special-status wildlife species or nesting bird species are observed and determined present within the project site during the pre-construction breeding bird surveys, then a biological monitor shall be onsite to monitor throughout activities that result in ground-disturbing activities and tree or vegetation removal to minimize the likelihood of inadvertent impacts on nesting birds and other wildlife species. Monitoring shall also be conducted periodically during construction activities to ensure no new nests occur during any vegetation removal or building demolition activities between January 1 through August 31. The biological monitor shall ensure that all biological resources mitigation measures, best management practices, avoidance, and protection measures and mitigation measures described in the relevant project permits and reports are in place and are adhered to.

The biological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt all construction activities and all non-emergency actions if sensitive species and/or nesting birds are identified and would be directly affected.

The biological monitor will stop work until the individual animal moves outside of the work area where it will not be harmed ("out of harm’s way"). Work can continue at the location once the biological monitor has determined that the activity will not result in direct impacts or adverse effects on the animal.

Nesting birds and bird nest will not be moved; a buffer will be established surrounding the nest, as described in MM-BIO-2.

**MM BIO-2: Pre-Construction Breeding Bird Survey**

If construction is anticipated to commence during the nesting season (between January 1 and August 31 of any given year, or as determined by a local CDFW office), a qualified avian biologist shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey no earlier than one week prior to construction.

In accordance with the MBTA and CFGC (3503, 3503.5, 3513), if an active bird nest of a protected species is located during the pre-construction survey and potentially will be affected, a no-activity buffer zone shall be delineated on maps and marked in the field by fencing, stakes, flagging, or other means up to 500 feet for raptors, or 100 feet for non-raptors. Materials used to demarcate the nests will be removed as soon as work is complete or the fledglings have left the nest. The qualified avian biologist (and/or qualified biological monitor with experience monitoring nesting birds) will determine the appropriate size of the buffer zone based on the type of activities planned near the nest and bird species.

Buffer zones will not be disturbed until the qualified avian biologist determines that the nest is inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the
parents, the young have left the area, or the young will no longer be affected by project activities. Periodic monitoring by the qualified avian biologist will be performed to determine when nesting is complete. After the nesting cycle is complete, project activities may begin within the buffer zone.

MM BIO-3: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP)

If a special-status species, such as burrowing owl is identified onsite, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City shall be responsible for the preparation of a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). The WEAP shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area’s environmental conditions and the environmental protection measures that must be adhered to by all workers throughout the duration of project construction.

An environmental training program shall be established to communicate environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including spill prevention, emergency response measures, protection of water quality, biological and cultural resources, and proper BMP implementation, to all construction and maintenance personnel.

Training materials shall be language-appropriate for all construction personnel. Upon completion of the WEAP, workers shall sign a form stating that they attended the program, understand all protection measures, and shall abide by all the rules of the WEAP. A record of all trained personnel shall be kept with the construction foreman at the project field construction office and shall be made available to any resource agency personnel. If new construction personnel are added to the project later, the construction foreman shall ensure that new personnel receive training before they start working. The biologist shall provide written hard copies of the WEAP and photos of the sensitive biological resources to the construction foreman.

MM BIO-4: BUOW Surveys (Breeding and Non-breeding Season)

The project site is located in the known distributional range of the burrowing owl (BUOW) (*Athene cunicularia*) and the site contains suitable habitat to potentially support BUOWs; therefore, BUOW surveys are required by CDFW, in accordance with the guidelines set forth by CDFW in the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Staff Report)* (CDFG, 2012). Surveys will be conducted by biologists who are familiar with BUOW habitat, natural history, ecology, behavior, and field identification of the species and BUOW sign.

A total of four protocol BUOW surveys will be conducted during the BUOW breeding season because BUOWs are more detectable during that season. In accordance with the *Staff Report*, one BUOW survey will be conducted between February 15th and April 15th and three surveys will be conducted at least three weeks apart between April 15th and July 15th, with at least one visit after June 15th. The *last day to conduct a BUOW survey is June 3rd* in order to get three surveys in by July 15th. Surveys will be conducted from sunrise to 10:00 a.m. or from two hours before sunset until evening twilight when weather conditions are conducive to BUOWs observations.
Biologists will conduct surveys within the project site and within a zone 500 feet out from the project site; defined the Biological Study Area (BSA). Surveys will be conducted in accessible portions of the BSA that contain BUOW essential habitat (nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal habitat). Inaccessible areas and areas of private land will be surveyed with binoculars/scopes only. Surveys will not extend beyond the BSA. Biologists will walk straight-line belt transects spaced no more than 20 meters apart to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the survey area, and examine entrances of potential burrows and suitable man-made structures for BUOWs and signs of BUOWs. Biologists will identify, record, and map with a global positioning system (GPS) unit BUOWs and potential BUOW signs. Detailed notes and wildlife species encountered during the surveys will be recorded in field notes. The purpose of the surveys is to determine if BUOWs are foraging or nesting on or adjacent to the project site.

Following completion of the focused BUOW surveys, the biologist will prepare a focused BUOW survey report in accordance with the guidelines described in the Staff Report. The report will: 1) summarize information regarding the BUOW’s natural history; 2) assess the habitat of the survey area and its suitability for the BUOW; 3) describe the number, behavior, and location of any BUOWs detected during the surveys or assess the potential presence of BUOWs onsite; 4) analyze the potential impacts on the BUOW from project development; and 5) recommend, as appropriate, best management practices (BMPs), avoidance and protection measures, and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on BUOWs. The report will include: 1) methods and results of the literature review and field surveys; 2) figures depicting the location of BUOWs, if any; and 3) site photographs.

- If no BUOWs or signs of BUOWs are observed during the surveys and concurrence is received from CDFW, project activities may begin and no further mitigation will be required.

- If BUOWs or signs of BUOWs are observed during the surveys, the site will be considered occupied and the BUOWs may need to be relocated. UltraSystems will contact CDFW to assist in the development of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, prior to commencing project activities. A passive relocation program (Burrowing Owl Mitigation Monitoring and Artificial Burrow and Exclusion Plan) may be necessary and will need to be approved by CDFW prior to commencing project activities. The costs associated with that plan and program are not included in this proposal.

- If burrowing owls or their sign are observed onsite, a pre-construction BUOW survey (Take Avoidance Survey) may be required no more than 14 days and 24 hours prior to ground disturbing activities.

**MM BIO-5: Burrowing Owl Mitigation Monitoring and Artificial Burrow and Exclusion Plan**

If BUOW are found onsite during surveys, then A Burrowing Owl Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (with the aforementioned incorporated exclusion plan) will be prepared including site-specific methodology to minimize and mitigate impacts to this species, in accordance with the guidelines set forth by CDFW in the Staff Report.
The Burrowing Owl Mitigation and Monitoring Plan may include but not be limited to the following:

- Preconstruction Surveys
- Buffer Zones around occupied burrowing owl burrows
- Burrowing owl Minimization Measures (WEAP, biological monitor, physical barriers, visible markers near burrows, etc.)
- Passive Relocation (one-way doors, artificial burrows, etc.)
- Seasonal Work Periods
- Establishment of a Conservation Easement or other legal instrument
- Consultation with CDFW.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

With implementation of project improvement measures PIM-1 through PIM-3 and mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-5 above, the project would result in less than significant impacts on plant and wildlife special-status species.

b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse impact 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**No Impact**

The project site is situated on relatively level ground, and consists of upland areas only; no ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial streams or rivers were observed during the biological survey. The BSA does not support riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts on any riparian habitat, or sensitive natural communities identified in local, regional state, or federal plans, policies, or regulations. No impact would occur and no mitigation is proposed.

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**

As previously discussed, the project site is situated on relatively level ground in a developed suburban and industrial area. Wetlands, including marshes, vernal pools, or other waters of the U.S. or State, were not observed during the biological survey. The project would not directly remove, fill, or interrupt the hydrology of state or federal protected wetlands. No impact would occur and no mitigation is proposed.
d) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?

No Impact

The project site and surrounding areas do not support resident or migratory fish species or wildlife nursery sites. The proposed project area is densely developed. The nearest natural area, the San Bernardino National Forest, and the nearest resident or wildlife corridor are approximately 2.76 and 2.85 miles, respectively, north of the proposed project site; the nearest Essential Connectivity Area and Natural Landscape Block are approximately 1.2 and 2.0 miles, respectively, north of the proposed project site. Taking into account the factors of distance and development, the project would not interfere with or impede: (1) the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; (2) established resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or (3) the use of wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur and no mitigation is proposed.

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

No Impact

No protected trees were found within the project footprint. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is proposed.

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

No Impact

The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of, nor is it located within, any HCP,. For this reason, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP and therefore, no impacts on any habitat conservation plan, natural communities conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan would occur as a result of this project. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is proposed.
4.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>f) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Methods

A cultural resources analysis was conducted for the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project site (refer to Figure 4.5-1) that included a California Historic Resources Inventory System (CHRIS) records and literature search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton for cultural resources in the project boundary and the 0.5-mile radius on April 7, 2020. Additionally, a request was made to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to conduct a search of its Sacred Lands File (SLF) for potential traditional cultural properties as well as to provide a list of local Native American tribes and tribal representatives to contact. Finally, a pedestrian survey of the project boundary was completed on May 20, 2020. The SCCIC records search was conducted prior to conducting the pedestrian survey. The NAHC request was made on April 1, 2020, and a reply was received on April 2, 2020; letters were sent to the listed tribes on April 3, 2019 (see Attachment C in Appendix H).

4.5.2 Existing Conditions

Based on the cultural resources records search, it was determined that no historic cultural resources or prehistoric archeological sites have been previously recorded within the project site boundary. Within the 0.5-mile buffer zone, there were five previously recorded historic-era cultural resources but no prehistoric archaeological sites have been recorded. No historic or prehistoric resources were observed during the field survey.
Figure 4.5-1
TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
4.5.3 Impacts Assessment

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

A historical resource is defined in § 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Historical resources are further defined as being associated with significant events, important persons, or distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction; representing the work of an important creative individual; or possessing high artistic values. Resources listed in, or determined eligible for, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), included in a local register, or identified as significant in a historic resource survey are also considered as historical resources under CEQA.

Similarly, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) criteria (contained in 36 CFR 60.4) are used to evaluate resources when complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Specifically, the NRHP criteria state that eligible resources comprise districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that: (a) are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (d) that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as a result of a project or development is considered a significant impact on the environment. Substantial adverse change is defined as physical demolition, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired. Direct impacts are those that cause substantial adverse physical change to a historic property. Indirect impacts are those that cause substantial adverse change to the immediate surroundings of a historic property, such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.

The cultural resources records search conducted at the SCCIC determined that five historic-era resources have been recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the area of potential effect (APE) of the project boundary (Table 1.3-1 in Appendix H), but none of them has been recorded within the APE. All of the sites are historic and the majority are residential sites.

According to records at the SCCIC, a single previous cultural resource survey has included a portion of the project area, and 15 surveys have been conducted within the 0.5-mile radius project buffer but not within the project APE (Appendix H).

As a result of the field survey, no historic buildings were identified within the project site. No other cultural resources were observed during the survey. Therefore, it is unlikely that historical and archaeological resources would be adversely affected by construction of the project. However, grading activities associated with development of the project would cause new subsurface disturbance and may result in the unanticipated discovery of unique historic and/or prehistoric
archeological resources. In the event of an unanticipated discovery, implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **CUL-2** described below would ensure that impacts on historical and archaeological resources would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

**MM CUL-1** Prior to the commencement of grading or excavation, workers conducting construction activities and their foremen will receive Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training from a qualified archaeologist regarding the potential for sensitive archaeological and paleontological resources to be unearthed during grading activities. The workers will be directed to report any unusual specimens of bone, stone, ceramics or other archaeological artifacts or features observed during grading and/or other construction activities to their foremen and to cease grading activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist or Native American cultural monitor is notified of the discovery by the Superintendent of the project site and can assess their significance. The WEAP shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area's environmental conditions and the environmental protection measures that must be adhered to by all workers throughout the duration of project construction.

Training materials shall be language-appropriate for all construction personnel. Upon completion of the WEAP, workers shall sign a form stating that they attended the program, understand all protection measures, and shall abide by all the rules of the WEAP. A record of all trained personnel shall be kept with the construction foreman at the project field construction office and shall be made available to any resource agency personnel. If new construction personnel are added to the project later, the construction foreman shall ensure that new personnel receive training before they start working. The archaeologist shall provide hard copies of the WEAP presentation to the construction foreman.

**MM CUL-2** If historical or unique archaeological resources are discovered during construction, the contractor shall halt construction activities in the immediate area and notify the City. An on-call qualified archaeologist shall be notified and afforded the necessary time to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). A Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall recommend the extent of archaeological monitoring necessary to ensure the protection of any other resources that may be in the area and afforded the necessary time and funds to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). Construction activities may continue on other parts of the site while evaluation and treatment of historical or unique archaeological resources takes place.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

With implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **CUL-2** above, potential impacts related to historical and archaeological resources would be less than significant.
b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

An archaeological resource is defined in § 15064.5(c) of the CEQA Guidelines as a site, area or place determined to be historically significant as defined in § 15064(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, or as a unique archaeological resource defined in § 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code as an artifact, object, or site that contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions of public interest or that has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best example of its type, or that is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person. The level ground surface elevation relative to adjacent roads suggests that the ground on the project site has been minimally disturbed, with the native surface soil remaining. It is unlikely that undisturbed unique archeological resources exist on the project site as determined by the cultural resources investigation conducted by UltraSystems, which included a CHRIIS records search of the project site and 0.5-mile radius, a search of the SLF by the NAHC, and pedestrian field survey.

The cultural resources records search conducted at the SCCIC determined that there are no known prehistoric cultural resource sites or isolates recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the project boundary (Table 1.3-1 in Appendix D). The records search revealed that five historic resources have been recorded within 0.5-mile of the project site, but none of them were located within the project boundary.

A NAHC SLF search was conducted on and within a 0.5-mile radius around the project site. The NAHC provided a response letter dated April 2, 2019, which stated that there is a record documenting the presence of traditional cultural properties within this area, and to contact the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation for more information.

The NAHC also provided UltraSystems with a list of local Native American tribes (including the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation) and specific tribal representatives to contact regarding this project. Subsequently, fifteen representatives of the eleven Native American tribes were contacted with a letter requesting a reply if they have knowledge of cultural resources in the area that they could provide, and asking if they had any questions or concerns regarding the project. The contacted tribes are:

- Agua Caliente
- Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
- Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
- Gabrielo/Tongva Nation
- Gabrielo-Tongva Tribe
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation
- San Fernando band of Mission Indians
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
- Serrano Nation of Mission Indians

As discussed in Section 4.5.1, letters were sent to fifteen representatives of eleven Native American tribes. Three responses were received from three different tribes. These letters are presented in Appendix D of this IS/MND. Jessica Mauck, Cultural Resources Analyst for the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI), stated in an email on April 9, 2020, that they do not wish to comment on this project. Email response from Patricia Garcia-Plotkin, Director of the Agua Caliente Band of
Cahuilla Indians, dated April 6 and May 12, 2020, stated that they would defer any comments to tribes closer to the project site. Email response from Jill McCormick, Historic Preservation Officer of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, dated April 14, 2020, indicated that they do not wish to comment on this project (refer to Appendix H of this IS/MND).

During the telephone calls of May 20, 2020, five calls were placed with no answer and messages were left describing the project and requesting a response. These calls were to Charles Alvarez, Councilmember of the Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe; Donna Yocum, Chairperson of the San Fernando Band of Mission Indians; Mark Cochrane, Co-Chairperson of the Serrano Nation of Mission Indians; Wayne Walker, Co-Chairperson of the Serrano Nation of Mission Indians; and Sandonne Goad, Chairperson of the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation. Messages were unable to be left for three tribal contacts. The available phone number for both Cultural Resources Manager Denisa Torres and Chairperson Robert Martin of the Morongo Band of Mission Indians was disconnected, and the telephone mailbox for Chairman Andrew Salas of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians- Kizh Nation was full.

Chairperson Anthony Morales of the Gabrieleno/ Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians responded over telephone on May 20, 2020 stating that the area is close to the foothills and water sources and that he would recommend archaeological and Native American monitoring during project construction. The Chairperson recommended his tribal group for monitoring services (see Attachment C in Appendix H). Chairperson Robert Dorame, of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council indicated by telephone on May 20, 2020 that UltraSystems should telephone him after we conduct our survey to provide the pedestrian survey results. Following up on this request, a call was made on May 22, 2020 to Chairperson Dorame, there was no answer and the mailbox was full so no message was left. Chairperson Dorame returned our call the same day. We provided the survey results and he proceeded to ask about any close waterways. The Chairperson concluded that in the event that cultural artifacts, burial goods and patrimonial material are unearthed during construction, the Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council should be notified. If human remains are unearthed the tribe would also like to be notified regardless of what tribe is assigned by the NAHC as the “Most Likely Descendent” (see Attachment C in Appendix H).

The result of the pedestrian survey was negative for both prehistoric and historic sites and isolates on the project site. Based on the results of the records search and the onsite field survey, it is unlikely that cultural resources or tribal resources would be adversely affected by construction of the project. However, grading activities associated with development of the project would cause new subsurface disturbance and may result in the unanticipated discovery of unique historic and/or prehistoric archaeological resources. In the event of an unanticipated discovery, implementation of mitigation measure MM CUL-2 described above would ensure that impacts on archeological resources would be less than significant.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

With implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 above, potential impacts related to archaeological resources would be less than significant.
c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

As previously discussed in Section 4.5 b above, the project would be built on an area where the southern half is undisturbed, native surface that has not been previously graded and the northern half has been graded approximately two feet below the native surface. No human remains have been previously identified or recorded onsite. It is unlikely that undisturbed unique archaeological resources exist on the project site. The project proposes grading activities for the implementation of infrastructure that includes water, sewer and utility lines. Grading and trenching activities associated with development of the project would cause new subsurface disturbance and could result in the unanticipated discovery of unknown human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. In the unlikely event of an unanticipated discovery, implementation of mitigation measure CUL-3 and adherence to applicable codes and regulations would ensure that impacts related to the accidental discovery of human remains would be less than significant.

California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 identifies procedures for the discovery of human remains. CEQA § 15064.5 indicates the process for determining the significance of impacts on archaeological and historical resources. California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 stipulates the notification process during the discovery of Native American human remains, descendants, disposition of human remains, and associated artifacts.

**Mitigation Measure**

**MM CUL-3:** If human remains are encountered during excavations associated with this project, all work shall stop within a 30-foot radius of the discovery and the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be notified (§ 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The Coroner shall determine whether the remains are recent human origin or older Native American ancestry. If the coroner, with the aid of the supervising archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, they shall contact the NAHC. The NAHC shall be responsible for designating the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD (either an individual or sometimes a committee) shall be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD shall make recommendations within 24 hours of their notification by the NAHC. These recommendations may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials (§ 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code).

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

With implementation of mitigation measure CUL-3 above, potential impacts related to human remains would be less than significant.
4.6 Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Existing Conditions

Electricity

Electricity is supplied to the project site by Southern California Edison (SCE), which provides electricity to the City of Fontana (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10.9). SCE provides electricity to the project site from existing electrical service lines.

Natural Gas

Natural Gas is supplied to the project site by SoCalGas, which provides natural gas to the City of Fontana (City of Fontana, 2020b).

4.6.2 Impact Analysis

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

According to the CEQA Guidelines, “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement that provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2[d]) Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is to identify any significant irreversible environmental effects of project implementation that cannot be avoided.
Construction

The following forms of energy are anticipated to be expended during construction:

- Diesel fuel for off-road equipment (gallons).
- Electricity to deliver water for use in dust control (kilowatt-hours [kWh]).
- Motor vehicle fuel for worker commuting, materials delivery and waste disposal (gallons).

Electricity

During project construction, energy would be consumed in the form of electricity associated with the conveyance and treatment of water used for dust control and, on a limited basis, powering lights, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power.

Due to the fact that electricity usage associated with lighting and construction equipment that utilizes electricity is not easily quantifiable or readily available, the estimated electricity usage during project construction is speculative.

Lighting used during project construction would comply with Title 24 standards/requirements (such as wattage limitations). This compliance would ensure that electricity use during project construction would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. Lighting would be used in compliance with applicable City of Fontana Municipal Code requirements to create enough light for safety.

Natural Gas

Construction activities, including the construction of new buildings and facilities, typically do not involve the consumption of natural gas. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to have a demand for natural gas during project construction.

Transportation Energy

Project construction would consume energy in the form of petroleum-based fuels associated with the use of off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the project site, construction workers’ travel to and from the project site, and delivery and haul truck trips hauling solid waste from and delivering building materials to the project site.

During project construction, trucks and construction equipment would be required to comply with the California Air Resources Board’s (ARB’s) anti-idling regulations. ARB’s In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation would also apply (ARB, 2016). Vehicles driven to or from the project site (delivery trucks, construction employee vehicles, etc.) are subject to fuel efficiency standards requirements established by the federal government. Therefore, project construction activities regarding fuel use would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy.

Operation

Energy would be consumed during project operations related to space and water heating, water conveyance, solid waste disposal, and vehicle trips of employees and customers. Project operation energy usage, which was estimated by CalEEMod as part of the greenhouse gas emissions analysis (refer to Section 4.3.6) is shown in Table 4.6-1.
Table 4.6-1
ESTIMATED PROJECT OPERATIONAL ENERGY USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onroad Motor</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled per Year</td>
<td>6,235,602</td>
<td>17,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Use</td>
<td>1,000 BTU per year</td>
<td>233,653</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Use</td>
<td>Kilowatt-hours per year</td>
<td>271,636</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod estimates.

The proposed project would install energy-efficient features. Insulated and glazed windows and low E coating on windows, would be incorporated into building design. Additionally, the proposed project would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including Title 24 standards. The proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy. Additionally, there would not be any inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary energy usage in comparison to similar development projects of this nature regarding construction-related fuel consumption. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts on energy resources.

Further, the roadway network in the vicinity of the project site is served by Omnitrans, the public transit agency serving the San Bernardino Valley. It has 10 bus routes in the city (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10.9). Employees and visitors would be able to access the project site via the public transit system, thereby reducing transportation-related fuel demand.

Continued use of energy resources is consistent with the anticipated growth within the city and the general vicinity and would not result in energy consumption requiring a significant increase in energy production for the energy provider. Therefore, the energy demand associated with the project 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**

**Title 24**

The proposed project would be in compliance with the California Green Building Standards (CAL Green) Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), which includes mandatory measures for nonresidential site development, energy efficiency, water efficiency and conservation, material conservation and resource efficiency, and environmental quality.

**City of Fontana General Plan**

Chapter 12, *Sustainability and Resilience*, of the City of Fontana General Plan focuses on sustainability and resilience on resource efficiency and planning for climate change. It includes policies for new development promoting energy-efficient development in Fontana, meeting state energy efficiency goals for new construction, promoting green building through guidelines, awards and nonfinancial...
incentives, and continuing to promote and implement best practices to conserve water (Stantec, 2018b, pp. 10.9, 12.5).

The proposed project would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local requirements for energy efficiency, including Title 24 standards and General Plan Chapter 12, Sustainability and Resilience. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
# 4.7 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The technical analysis below is based on the geotechnical report created by NorCal Engineering on June 25, 2019 (refer to Appendix C) for the proposed project. The geotechnical report details the
subsection conditions and, if applicable, gives recommendations for site preparation and design to ensure the safe construction and operation of the proposed project.

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

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

Less than Significant Impact

The Alquist-Priolo Zones Special Studies Act defines active faults as those that have experienced surface displacement or movement during the last 11,650 years (i.e., during the Holocene Period). The project site is located in the seismically active region of Southern California; however, as detailed in the geotechnical report, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone (refer to Figure 4.7-1 below) (NorCal Engineering, 2019, p. 4). Although the nearest fault is located about 1.25 miles away from the project site and is capable of a magnitude 7.0 earthquake, the geotechnical report considers the potential for damage due to direct fault rupture unlikely. Additionally, the project would be constructed in accordance with standard engineering practices, and design criteria prescribed by the current California Building Code (CBC; Title 24 California Code of Regulations [CCR]) would reduce the significance of potential impacts of seismic and geologic hazards. The CBC also dictates detailed design requirements, structural design, soils and foundations considerations, and regulates the design and construction of excavations, foundations, building frames, retaining walls, and other building elements to mitigate the effects of seismic shaking and adverse soil conditions; this would ensure that public safety risks are minimized due to any potential seismic shaking event, and impacts would be less than significant. Further, the proposed project would implement the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report, which would minimize the potential risks associated with rupture of an earthquake fault. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant Impact

As mentioned above, the nearest fault to the project site is approximately 1.25 miles away and would be capable of a magnitude 7.0 earthquake. Ground shaking originating from earthquakes along other active faults in the region is expected to induce lower horizontal accelerations due to smaller anticipated earthquakes and/or greater distances to other faults (NorCal Engineering, 2019, p. 4). Additionally, the proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including current California Building Standards Code (Title 24, CCR) and implement the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report, which would minimize the potential risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.
Figure 4.7-1
REGIONALLY ACTIVE FAULTS

Disclaimer: Representations on this map or illustration are intended only to indicate locations of project parameters reported in the legend. Project parameter information supplied by others (see layer credits) may not have been independently verified for accuracy by UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. This map or illustration should not be used for, and does not replace, final grading plans or other documents that should be professionally certified for development purposes.
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iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Liquefaction is the sudden decrease in the strength of cohesionless soils due to dynamic or cyclic shaking. Saturated soils behave temporarily as a viscous fluid (liquefaction) and consequently lose their capacity to support the structures built on them. The potential for liquefaction decreases with increasing clay and gravel content but increases as the ground acceleration and duration of shaking increase. Liquefaction potential has been found to be the greatest where the groundwater level and loose sands occur within 50 feet of the ground surface.

The geotechnical report details that the project site is not within a liquefaction zone and that groundwater is over 400 feet below ground surface (bgs) (NorCal Engineering, 2019, p. 5). Additionally, the proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including current California Building Standards Code (Title 24, CCR) and implement the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report, which would minimize the potential risks associated with liquefaction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

iv) **Landslides?**

**No Impact**

Landslides occur when the stability of the slope changes from a stable to an unstable condition. A change in the stability of a slope can be caused by a number of factors, acting together or alone. Natural causes of landslides include groundwater (pore water) pressure acting to destabilize the slope, loss of vegetative structure, erosion of the toe of a slope by rivers or ocean waves, weakening of a slope through saturation by snow melt or heavy rains, earthquakes adding loads to barely stable slopes, earthquake-caused liquefaction destabilizing slopes, and volcanic eruptions.

Topography within the project site is relatively flat with a slope of less than three percent, trending south toward Sierra Parkway Avenue (Allard Engineering, 2020, p. 1-2). There are no steep slopes or hills on the project site; the nearest hills are the San Bernardino Mountains, the foothills of which begin approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the project site.

The project site is not located within an Earthquake Zone of Required Investigation (CGS, 2020), and no landslides or related features underlie, or are adjacent to, the project site. Due to the relatively level nature of the site and surrounding areas, the potential for landslides to occur at the project site is considered negligible. Additionally, as detailed in the City of Fontana LHMP, there have been no reported historical occurrences of landslides in the City of Fontana (City of Fontana, 2017).

Due to the flat nature of the topography on and in the vicinity of the project site, there are no known landslides near the site, nor is the site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, the probability of slope stability hazards affecting the site is considered negligible and no impacts are anticipated.
b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact

Construction

Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), as well as the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne) requires construction projects that may potentially result in soil erosion to implement best management practices (BMPs) to eliminate or reduce sediment and other pollutants in stormwater runoff. If one or more acres of soil would be disturbed, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required to be obtained. NPDES permits establish enforceable limits on discharges, require effluent monitoring, designate reporting requirements, and require construction and post-construction BMPs to eliminate or reduce point and non-point source discharges of pollutants, including soil (SWRCB, 2020).

As further detailed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the project applicant would be required to obtain an NPDES permit prior to project construction. This NPDES permit would require the Legally Responsible Person (LRP), such as the project owner, to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to ground-disturbing construction activities to identify construction BMPs to eliminate or reduce soil erosion and pollutants in storm water, and non-storm water discharges (including soil erosion by wind) to storm water sewer systems and other drainages. Prior to NPDES permit issuance, the LRP would upload Permit Registration Documents (PRDs) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) online Stormwater Multi-Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS). PRDs include a Notice of Intent (NOI), site map, risk assessment, SWPPP, post-construction water balance, annual fee, and signed certification statement by the LRP attesting to the validity of the information. These preventive measures during construction are intended to eliminate or reduce soil erosion. Therefore, construction-related impacts regarding soil erosion or the loss of top soil would be less than significant.

Operation

The project site is located within an area that is highly urbanized and has flat topography. Impacts from soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant because the proposed project must be designed to minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the introduction of pollutants that may result in significant impacts, generated from site runoff to the storm water conveyance system. Additionally, the proposed project would create a much larger area of impermeable surfaces compared to the existing undeveloped land. Therefore, the potential for substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil 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**

The potential impact of landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction and collapse is discussed below.

**Landslides**

As mentioned above, the project site is located in an area that has generally flat topography and is highly developed. Additionally, the project site is not within a landslide zone (CGS, 2020). Therefore, there would be no impacts in regard to landslides.

**Lateral Spreading**

Seismically-induced lateral spreading involves primarily lateral movement of earth materials due to ground shaking. It differs from slope failure in that complete ground failure involving large movement does not occur due to the relatively smaller gradient of the initial ground surface. Lateral spreading is demonstrated by near-vertical cracks with predominantly horizontal movement of the soil mass involved. The topography at the project site and in the immediate vicinity of the site is gently sloping, with no significant nearby slopes or embankments and bedrock. Under these circumstances, the potential for lateral spreading at the project site is considered low. Therefore, impacts from lateral spreading would be less than significant.

**Subsidence**

Soil shrinkage and/or bulking as a result of remedial grading depends on several factors including the depth of over-excavation, the grading method and equipment utilized, and average relative compaction. The geotechnical report details that the soil shrinkage would be 5 to 15% due to excavation, recompaction and the different depths of fill and soils throughout the project site. Therefore, the geotechnical report offers recommendations in regard to compaction (NorCal Engineering, 2020, p. 9). The proposed project would adhere to the geotechnical and design recommendations of the geotechnical report to ensure than soil conditions would not lead to significant subsidence impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Liquefaction**

As detailed above, the project site is not within a liquefaction zone and would not encounter groundwater, which is more than 400 feet bgs. Therefore, there would be no impacts.

**Collapse**

Collapsible soils consist of loose, dry, low-density materials that collapse and compact with the addition of water or excessive loading. These soils are distributed throughout the southwestern United States, specifically in areas of young alluvial fans, debris flow sediments, and loess (wind-blown sediment) deposits. Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events. This saturation eliminates the clay bonds holding
the soil grains together. Similar to expansive soils, collapsible soils result in structural damage such as cracking of the foundation, floors, and walls in response to settlement.

Soil testing was conducted as part of the geotechnical report, and results showed that the soil at the project site has different depths of fill and natural soil. The fill soil was classified as a brown, fine-to-coarse grained, gravelly to cobbly and slight silty sand, and the natural soil was classified as a light brown, fine-to-coarse grained, gravelly and slightly silty sand with some boulders (NorCal Engineering, 2019, p. 3). Additionally, the proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including current California Building Standards Code (Title 24, CCR) and implement the recommendations listed in the geotechnical report, which would minimize the potential risks associated with soil collapse. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

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

**Less than Significant Impact**

Expansive soils shrink and swell with changes in soil moisture. Soil moisture may change from landscape irrigation, rainfall, and utility leakage. Repeated changes in soil volume due to water content fluctuations may compromise structure foundations. Expansive soils are commonly very fine-grained with high to very high percentages of clay. Design provisions such as adequate reinforcements, deeper foundations or other measures may help alleviate the effects of soil expansion but may not completely eliminate the problem.

The geotechnical survey confirmed the lack of expansive soils in the uppermost layer of soil on the site, which is classified as gravelly sand and has an expansion index of 0, which is classified as "Very Low" expansion potential (NorCal Engineering, 2019, Appendix B).

The project would not be located on an expansive soil, and project-related impacts resulting from expansive soils would be less than significant. No mitigation is proposed.

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 proposed project would not include septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. For this reason, no impacts associated with septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would occur.

f) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

The project site boundary is underlain by the Young Alluvial Fan Deposits, unit 5 (Qyf5) (Morton and Matti, 2001). This deposit consists of slightly dissected surfaces and stage S7 soils of unconsolidated to slightly consolidated sand and pebble-boulder gravel. It is found in the northeast part of the
quadrangle between East Kimbark and Ames Canyons and dates to the Holocene (11,650 years before present [ybp]) (Morton and Matti, 2001).

Any substantial excavations below the uppermost layers should be closely monitored to quickly and professionally collect any specimens without impeding development. Grading and excavation activities associated with development of the project would cause new subsurface disturbance and could result in the unanticipated discovery of paleontological resources. In the event of an unexpected discovery, implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 would ensure paleontological resources or unique geologic features are not significantly affected.

Mitigation Measure

**MM GEO-1**  If paleontological resources are uncovered during project construction, the contractor shall halt construction activities in the immediate area and notify the City. The on-call paleontologist shall be notified and afforded the necessary time and funds to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). Subsequently, the monitor shall remain onsite for the duration of the ground disturbance to ensure the protection of any other resources that are found during construction on the project site.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

With implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 above, potential impacts related to paleontological resources would be less than significant.
### 4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.8.1 GHG Constituents

4.8.1.1 Introduction

Constituent gases that trap heat in the Earth’s atmosphere are called greenhouse gases, analogous to the way a greenhouse retains heat. GHGs play a critical role in the Earth’s radiation budget by trapping infrared radiation emitted from the Earth’s surface, which would otherwise escape into space. Without the natural heat-trapping effect of GHG, the Earth’s surface would be about 34°F cooler. This natural phenomenon, known as the “Greenhouse Effect,” is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. However, anthropogenic emissions of these GHGs, more than natural ambient concentrations, are responsible for the enhancement of the greenhouse effect, and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the Earth’s natural climate known as global warming or climate change (CalEPA, 2006).

4.8.1.2 Greenhouse Gases

GHGs are defined under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) as carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)), methane (CH\(_4\)), nitrous oxide (N\(_2\)O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF\(_6\)).\(^{19}\) Associated with each GHG species is a “global warming potential” (GWP), which is a value used to compare the abilities of different GHGs to trap heat in the atmosphere. GWPs are based on the heat-absorbing ability of each gas relative to that of CO\(_2\), as well as the decay rate of each gas (the amount removed from the atmosphere over a given number of years). The GWPs of CH\(_4\) and N\(_2\)O are 25 and 298, respectively (GMI, 2019). “Carbon dioxide equivalent” (CO\(_2\)e) emissions, (calculated by weighting each GHG compound’s emissions by its GWP and then summing the products.

**Carbon dioxide** (CO\(_2\)) is a clear, colorless, and odorless gas consisting of molecules made up of two oxygen atoms and one carbon atom. Fossil fuel combustion is the main human-related source of CO\(_2\) emissions; electricity generation and transportation are first and second in the amount of CO\(_2\) emissions, respectively. Carbon dioxide is the basis of GWP, and thus has a GWP of 1.

---

\(^{19}\) [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf).
**Section 4.8 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

*Methane* (CH$_4$) is a clear, colorless gas, and is the main component of natural gas. Anthropogenic sources of CH$_4$ are fossil fuel production, biomass burning, waste management, and mobile and stationary combustion of fossil fuel. Wetlands are responsible for most of the natural CH$_4$ emissions (USEPA, 2019). As mentioned above, within a 100-year period CH$_4$ is 25 times more effective in trapping heat than is CO$_2$.

*Nitrous oxide* (N$_2$O) is a colorless, clear gas, with a slightly sweet odor. N$_2$O has both natural and human-related sources and is removed from the atmosphere mainly by photolysis or breakdown by sunlight, in the stratosphere. The main human-related sources of N$_2$O in the United States are agricultural soil management (synthetic nitrogen fertilization), mobile and stationary combustion of fossil fuel, adipic acid production, and nitric acid production. Nitrous oxide is also produced from a wide range of biological sources in soil and water (USEPA, 2019). According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), within a 100-year span, N$_2$O is 298 times more effective in trapping heat than is CO$_2$ (IPCC, 2007).

### 4.8.2 Thresholds of Significance

Neither the City, the SCAQMD nor the State CEQA Guidelines Amendments has adopted specific quantitative thresholds of significance for addressing a project's GHG emissions. Nonetheless, §15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines serves to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of GHGs. As required in §15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, this analysis includes an impact determination based on the following: (1) an estimate of the amount of GHG emissions resulting from the project; (2) a qualitative analysis or performance based standards; (3) a quantification of the extent to which the project increases GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; and (4) the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The City of Fontana does not have an adopted threshold of significance for GHG emissions, but for CEQA purposes, it has discretion to select an appropriate significance criterion, based on substantial evidence. To provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents, the SCAQMD Board adopted an Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules, and Plans (SCAQMD, 2008a). The SCAQMD estimated that a threshold of 3,000 metric tons (MT) of CO$_2$e per year for all non-industrial projects would help subject 90% of all GHG emissions to CEQA analysis (SCAQMD, 2010). The City has selected this value as a significance criterion which has been supported by substantial evidence.

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**

**Methodology**

GHG emissions would come from both construction and operation of the proposed project. Construction of the project would result in temporary emissions of GHGs from fuel combustion by onsite construction equipment and by onroad vehicle traffic (i.e., worker commute and delivery truck trips). Operational direct GHG emissions would come from onroad mobile sources and onsite area sources, such as landscaping. Indirect GHG emissions would come from energy use, water supply,
wastewater, and solid waste. A detailed summary of the assumptions and the model data used to estimate the project’s potential GHG emissions are provided in Appendix F.

Short-term GHG emissions are those construction emissions that do not recur over the life of the project. The major construction phases included in this analysis are grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Emissions are from offroad construction equipment and onroad travel, such as worker commuting; vendor deliveries; and truck hauling of soil, building materials and construction and demolition waste.

Other GHG emissions would occur continually after buildout. GHGs are emitted from buildings because of activities for which electricity and natural gas are typically used as energy sources. Combustion of carbon-based fuel emits CO$_2$ and other GHGs directly into the atmosphere; these emissions are considered direct emissions. The project’s primary direct source of annual GHG emissions will be onroad mobile sources. GHGs are also emitted during the generation of electricity from fossil fuels; when produced offsite, these emissions are indirectly associated with the project. Indirect GHG emissions also result from the production of electricity used to convey, treat, and distribute water and wastewater. A final indirect GHG emission source is decomposition of organic waste that is generated by the project and transported to landfills.

Temporary construction and long-term operational GHG emissions from the project’s onsite and offsite project activities were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2 (CAPCOA, 2017). CalEEMod is a planning tool for estimating emissions related to land use projects. Operational emissions consider area emissions, such as space heating, from energy use associated with land uses, and from the vehicle trips associated with the land uses. To assess the overall lifetime project GHG emissions, the SCAQMD developed an Interim Guidance (SCAQMD, 2008a, p. 3-10) that recommends that construction emissions should be amortized over the life of the project, defined in the guidance as 30 years. Annualized GHG emissions are then added to the operational emissions and the sum is compared to the applicable interim GHG significance threshold.

Table 4.8-1 gives a detailed breakdown of the results of the GHG emissions analysis for both direct and indirect related sources.

### Table 4.8-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CO$_2$e (MT/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct – (Amortized Construction)</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct – Mobile (Operational)</td>
<td>2570.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct – Purchased Natural Gas</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct – Area Source</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect – Purchased Electricity (Power)</td>
<td>86.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect – Purchased Electricity (Water)</td>
<td>147.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect emission sources are those for which the project is responsible, but which are not located at the project site.
Construction

Construction is an episodic, temporary source of GHG emissions. Emissions are generally associated with the operation of construction equipment and the disposal of construction waste. To be consistent with the guidance from the SCAQMD for calculating criteria pollutants from construction activities, only GHG emissions from onsite construction activities and offsite hauling and construction worker commuting are considered as project-generated. As explained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in its 2008 white paper (CAPCOA, 2008), the information needed to characterize GHG emissions from manufacture, transport, and end-of-life of construction materials would be speculative at the CEQA analysis level. CEQA does not require an evaluation of speculative impacts (CEQA Guidelines § 15145). Therefore, the construction analysis does not consider such GHG emissions, but does consider non-speculative onsite construction activities, and offsite hauling and construction worker trips. All GHG emissions are identified on an annual basis.

The proposed project would include the construction and operation of a 115,100-square-foot warehouse building. Each construction phase involves the use of a different mix of construction equipment and therefore has its own distinct GHG emissions characteristics. A generalized construction schedule was supplied by the applicant. CalEEMod defaults were used otherwise. Construction emissions occur both onsite and offsite. Onsite air pollutant emissions consist principally of exhaust emissions from offroad heavy-duty construction equipment. Offsite emissions result from workers commuting to and from the job site, as well as from vendors and visitors to the site.

CalEEMod estimated construction GHG emissions to be 231.2 MT of CO\textsubscript{2}e. The 30-year amortized value is 7.71 MT per year.

Operation

Total unmitigated operational CO\textsubscript{2}e emissions from the project would be 2,871 MT per year. Mobile sources account for about 89.5% of these emissions. With the addition of the amortized construction emissions, the total project GHG emissions would be 2,879 MT per year, less than the significance threshold of 3,000 MT of CO\textsubscript{2}e per year. Therefore, GHG emissions would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.

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 of Fontana does not have an adopted climate action plan. An approach to identifying potential conflict with GHG reduction plans, policies, or regulations is to examine General Plan provisions that prescribe or enable GHG emissions control. The EIR for the General Plan Update (City of Fontana, 2018, Table 5.6-7) lists policies in the General Plan Update that reduce GHG emissions and help to quantify emissions reductions. However, the policies prescribe actions to be taken by the City, and not measures to be implemented by a project proponent. Nevertheless, the proposed project would not conflict with any of the GHG emission reduction policies. Furthermore, the EIR determined...
that implementation of the updated general plan will result in significantly lower GHG emissions from Fontana than would continuation of the 2003 General Plan (City of Fontana, 2018, Table 5.6-6). As was demonstrated in Section 4.11, the proposed project would have no impacts in relation to consistency with local land use plans, policies, or regulations. Therefore, the project would not hinder the GHG emission reductions of the General Plan Update.

Finally, as noted in Section 3.2.1, buildings would be designed to comply with the provisions of the California Green Building Code, Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations. As noted in Section 3.3.4, the proposed project would comply with the requirements of Fontana Municipal Code §§ 30-260, 30-265, and 30-266 with wall-mounted light-emitting diode (LED) lighting fixtures. Additionally, as noted in Section 3.2.5, new landscaping would include drought-resistant species including trees, tall shrubs, low shrubs and groundcovers and energy-efficient features, including insulated and glazed windows with low-E coating. These project features would assist the City in meeting its GHG emission reduction targets.
## 4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>
<td>X</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>
<td>X</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>X</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>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in this section is based in part upon the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) prepared by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., dated June 28, 2019 (Refer to Appendix D). The Phase I ESA presents information based on a site reconnaissance of the project area, historical
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developments of the project site, and a comprehensive database search to determine if the project site contains Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs).  

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Based on the Phase I report, there is one REC associated with the project site. The Mid Valley Landfill, a Class III landfill located east of the project site, has had a previous release of PCE in 1994 that has contaminated the groundwater of the landfill and adjacent properties, including the project site. However, after implementation of groundwater treatment system (GWTS) and a soil vapor extraction (SVE) system that has remediated the project site. After January 16, 2017, it was determined that groundwater levels in the extraction wells were too low to support even staggered pump operations, but the SVE system continues to operate (Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., 2019, p. 2).

The subject property is not identified as a potential responsible party (PRP) for the groundwater contamination. Remediation and monitoring continue under regulatory oversight. Based on depth to groundwater of over 100 feet and the low levels of volatile contaminants in groundwater, vapor intrusion is unlikely and is not considered to be a concern. Based on the identification of the PRP, ongoing remediation and monitoring under regulatory oversight, the Phase I ESA recommends no further investigation with regard to the groundwater contamination (Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., 2019, p. 3).

Construction

Transportation of hazardous materials/waste is regulated by California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 26. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) enforce federal and state regulations and respond to hazardous materials transportation emergencies. Emergency responses are coordinated as necessary among federal, state and local governmental authorities and private persons through a state-mandated Emergency Response Plan. Due to the significant short-term risks to public health and the environment associated with hazardous waste management during transportation of wastes, specific Commercial Hazardous Waste Shipping Routes are designated with the intent of minimizing the distance that wastes are transported and the proximity to vulnerable locations.

The proposed project includes the construction of a 115,100-square-foot logistics/distribution center. Construction activities would be temporary and would involve transport, storage, and use of chemical agents, solvents, paints, and other hazardous materials commonly associated with construction activities. Chemical transport, storage, and use would comply with Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA); Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); California hazardous waste control law; California Division of Safety and Health (DOSH); South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and the City of Fontana Fire Protection District requirements. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations would ensure that impacts associated with routine

21 The term Recognized Environmental Conditions is defined in Section 1.1.1 of the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, at or on a property due to any release to the environment; under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment (Converse Consultants, 2019, p. 1).
transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant.

Operation

At the time this IS/MND was prepared, the future tenant(s) of the proposed building were unknown. For the purpose of environmental analysis, the future uses onsite are assumed to be any of those uses permitted by the City of Fontana’s General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial (I-L), and the City’s Municipal Code. During operations, the future tenant may require the routine transport of hazardous materials for maintaining supplies onsite and for disposal of waste offsite. Transportation of hazardous materials can result in accidental spills, leaks, toxic releases, fire, or explosion.

The residences nearest to the project site are located: along Sierra Avenue, approximately 580 feet west of the project site (in a neighborhood designated R-PC (Residential Planned Communities) within the Sierra Lakes Specific Plan) and along Highland Avenue, approximately 0.25 mile southeast of the project site, which is also zoned as R-PC. Since hazardous materials must not be transported through existing residential areas, the tenant would propose routes that are surrounded primarily by existing industrial land uses. The City’s General Plan land use designation for the project site is I-L (Light-Industrial) with areas designated as General Commercial (C-G) to the west of the project site, Light Industrial (I-L) to the north of the project site, Sierra Lakes Boulevard right-of-way to the south of the project site, and the Renaissance Specific Plan (which has goals of creating new development and redevelopment opportunities such as the refuse disposal site) in the City of Rialto to the east (City of Fontana, 2019a; City of Rialto, 2010, Figure 1-1). Therefore, if any accidental releases of hazardous materials were to occur, they are anticipated to occur in the primarily commercial and industrial areas and along roads leading to and from the project site.

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, as described in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and implemented by Title 13 of the CFR. Appropriate documentation would be provided for all hazardous waste that is transported, as required by existing hazardous materials regulations. Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code requires businesses that handle more than a specified amount of hazardous materials onsite to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan to firefighters, health officials, planners, public safety officers, health care providers, regulatory agencies, and other interested persons (see mitigation measure HAZ-1 below). The business plan must include an inventory of the hazardous materials handled, facility floor plans showing where hazardous materials are stored, an emergency response plan, and provisions for employee safety and emergency response training.

Further, proper documentation would be required to identify which hazardous materials would be transported and which routes they would be transported along. As such, MM HAZ-2 (see below) would be implemented to ensure that the future tenant would provide proper hazardous materials transportation information.

In addition to the suggested mitigation measures, the future tenant would be required to comply with existing regulations, standards, and guidelines established by the US Environmental Protection Agency, State of California, County of San Bernardino, and City of Fontana related to storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, which would reduce the potential risk of hazardous materials exposure to a level that is less than significant.
Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be adopted to minimize or avoid impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials:

**MM HAZ-1** In the event that the future tenant will handle hazardous materials above the reportable quantity threshold, the lease agreement with the future tenant shall require the tenant to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan which would include an inventory of all hazardous materials used, stored, or otherwise managed onsite to the County of San Bernardino County Fire Department – Hazardous Materials Division and the Fontana Fire Protection District. The recommendations of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan would be included in the lease agreement (signed by the tenant) as mandatory measures required to be implemented by the tenant.

**MM HAZ-2** In the event that the future tenant will handle hazardous materials above the reportable quantity threshold, the lease agreement with the future tenant shall require the tenant, in coordination with the City of Fontana, to identify routes along which hazardous materials may routinely be transported. If essential facilities such as schools, hospitals, child care centers or other facilities with special evacuation needs are located along these routes, the tenant shall develop an emergency response plan that can be implemented in the event of an unauthorized release of hazardous materials. The recommendations of the Emergency Response Plan would be included in the lease agreement (signed by the tenant) as mandatory measures required to be implemented by the tenant.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

In addition to compliance with established regulatory framework, compliance with mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2** would provide for the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements, to ensure that potentially significant impacts regarding hazardous materials are minimized or eliminated. Impacts to the public or the environment resulting from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant after mitigation.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

Construction As mentioned above, the Phase I ESA discovered one REC in relation to the groundwater contamination created by the adjacent landfill. However, the ongoing remediation measures and depth of groundwater under the project site would create less than significant impacts. Additionally, the construction of the proposed project would adhere to applicable federal, state and local regulations in regard to the safe handling and transportation of hazardous materials during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant during construction.
Operation

As the future tenant(s) of the proposed project are not known at this time, there is a potential that the proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment during operation through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Typical incidents that could result in accidental release of hazardous materials involve: leaking storage tanks; spills during transport; inappropriate storage; inappropriate use; and/or natural disasters. Accidental releases such as these could cause contamination of soil, surface water, groundwater, and toxic fumes. Depending on the nature and extent of the contamination, groundwater supplies could become unsuitable for use as a domestic water source. Human exposure to contaminated soil or water could have potential health effects depending on a variety of factors, including the nature of the contaminant and the degree of exposure.

Chemicals and wastes stored in aboveground or underground storage tanks would follow guidelines mandated by the federal and state agencies. Aboveground tanks storing hazardous chemicals would have secondary containment to collect fluids that are accidentally released. Underground storage tanks and connecting piping would be double-walled and would have monitoring devices with alarms installed to constantly monitor for unauthorized releases in accordance with federal and state standards.

Applicable existing standards include the Cal/OSHA operational requirements, California Health and Safety Code § 25270.7, and Fontana Fire Protection District regulations regarding the installation and operation of underground tanks. These existing measures would minimize impacts to a less than significant level.

Transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental spills, leaks, toxic releases, fire, or explosion, and there is a potential for licensed vendors to transport hazardous materials to and from the project site. As discussed previously, the proposed project is subject to compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws (including Title 49 of the CFR) and regulations pertaining to the transport, use, disposal, handling, and storage of hazardous waste. Additionally, with the implementation of mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, the future tenant would coordinate with the city to ensure that transportation, handling and use of hazardous materials would create less than significant impacts. Therefore, with compliance with these regulations and mitigation measures, the proposed project would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents during transit, thereby ensuring that potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

In addition to compliance with established regulatory framework, compliance with mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 would provide for the implementation of established safety practices, procedures, and reporting requirements, to ensure that potentially significant impacts regarding the accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.
c) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**No Impact**

The closest school to the project site is Wayne Ruble Middle School, located at 6762 Juniper Ave, approximately 0.65 mile southwest of the project site. No schools are located within 0.25 mile of the project site. The project would not be within 0.25 mile of an existing or a proposed school; therefore, no impacts to schools would occur and mitigation is not required.

d) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**No Impact**

Government Code § 65962.5 requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to compile and update, at least annually, lists of the following:

- Hazardous waste and substances sites from the DTSC EnviroStor database.
- Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites by county and fiscal year in the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database.
- Solid waste disposal sites identified by SWRCB with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside waste management units.
- SWRCB Cease and Desist Orders (CDOs) and Cleanup and Abatement Orders (CAOs).
- Hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to § 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, identified by DTSC.

These lists are collectively referred to as the “Cortese List” (CalEPA, 2020). The project site is not listed in the Cortese List and there would be no impacts (CalEPA, 2020).

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 public airport is the Ontario International Airport, located approximately 10.3 miles southwest of the project site. No portion of the project site lies within the 55-dBA CNEL noise contours of that airport (City of Fontana, 2018, p. 5.10-3). Rialto Municipal Airport, a former private airport that was located approximately two miles southeast of the project site, has been permanently closed and the site of the airport has since been developed with warehouse and other commercial uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to a safety hazard or excessive noise levels associated with airports and 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 with Mitigation Incorporated**

**Construction**

The project would comply with applicable City regulations, such as City’s Fire Code in regard to providing adequate emergency access, as well as the California Building Standards Code. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Fontana would review project site plans, including location of all buildings, fences, access driveways and other features that may affect emergency access. Fire lanes would be provided for adequate emergency access. The site design for the proposed project includes access and fire lanes that would accommodate emergency ingress and egress by fire trucks, police units, and ambulance/paramedic vehicles. All onsite access and sight-distance requirements would be in accordance with city and Caltrans design requirements. The City’s review process and compliance with applicable regulations and standards would ensure that adequate emergency access would be provided at the project site at all times.

Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.17, Transportation and Traffic, the City requires preparation and implementation of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for all projects that require construction in the public right-of-way (ROW). The TMP must be reviewed and approved by the City's Traffic Engineer prior to the start of construction activity in the public ROW. The typical TMP requires such things as the installation of K-rail between the construction area and open traffic lanes, the use of flagmen and directional signage to direct traffic where only one travel lane is available or when equipment movement creates temporary hazards, and the installation of steel plates to cover trenches under construction. Emergency access must be maintained. Therefore, the proposed project would implement mitigation measure TRANS-1. With implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1, impacts in regard to emergency access during construction would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Refer to mitigation measure TRANS-1 in Section 4.17.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

After implementation of mitigation measure TRANS-1 above, the project would have less than significant construction-phase impacts on emergency access.

**Operation**

**City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan**

The purpose of the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) is to provide a plan for reducing and/or eliminating risk in the City of Fontana. The goals of the LHMP are to: protect life, property, and the environment; improve public awareness; protect the continuity of government; and improve emergency management preparedness, collaboration and outreach. The LHMP states that interstates would serve as major emergency response and evacuation routes (City of Fontana, 2017, p. 124). The proposed project would not be adjacent to any interstates; therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with the City of Fontana’s emergency response and evacuation routes. Additionally, as mentioned above, the proposed project design would undergo a site design review to ensure that
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there would be adequate emergency ingress and egress within the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts in regard to emergency and evacuation plans.

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

**No Impact**

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) developed Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) for State Responsibility Areas (SRA) and Very High FHSZ Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). As shown on Figure 4.9-1 *Fire Hazard Severity Zone – State Responsibility Area* and Figure 4.9-2, *Fire Hazard Severity Zone – Local Responsibility Area*, the project site is not located within either an SRA FHSZ or a Very High FHSZ LRA for San Bernardino County (CAL FIRE, 2020).

The State of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has created, and continues to revise, a map of all FHSZ within the state, including those in the City. The “Very High FHSZ” can be used to enforce enhanced regulations from the State Fire Marshal published within the California Building Code that relate to ignition and ember-resistant building construction within the city.

The proposed project site is located within an industrialized area, and is surrounded by development. The project site is not located adjacent to wildlands that may increase the risk of wildland fires. Additionally, the project would be developed in compliance with all applicable fire codes. The project would not result in impacts due to exposure of people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, and no mitigation measures are required.
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Figure 4.9-1
FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY ZONE – STATE RESPONSIBILITY AREA
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Figure 4.9-2
FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY ZONE – LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY AREA
### 4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>X</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>X</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 offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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 offsite;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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; or</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 entire project site is undeveloped. Under existing conditions, stormwater runoff generated on the project site sheetflows across the site from west to east and discharges into the master storm drain system along Mango Avenue (Allard Engineering, 2020, p. 4-7). Through this inlet, water enters the underground storm drain system and discharges into San Sevaine Channel (SBCDPW, 2019). San Sevaine Channel discharges into the Santa Ana River (Reach 3), which is a water of the U.S. (WOUS).

Impacts related to water quality would occur during three different periods: (1) during the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest; (2) following construction, prior to the establishment of ground cover in the landscaped areas, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high; and (3) following completion of the project, when impacts related to sedimentation would diminish, but those associated with urban runoff would increase.

**Construction Pollutant Controls**

The project owner would be required by the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to obtain coverage under a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, as authorized by § 402 CWA, NPDES for projects which will disturb one or more acres of soil during construction). The Construction General Permit requires potential dischargers of pollutants into WOUS to prepare a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which establishes enforceable limits on discharges, requires effluent monitoring, designates reporting requirements, and requires construction BMPs to reduce or eliminate point and non-point source discharges of pollutants.

The project would be required to obtain an NPDES permit, prepare a SWPPP, and implement construction stormwater BMPs prior to commencement of construction activities. Additionally, BMPs must be maintained, inspected before and after each precipitation event, and repaired or replaced as necessary. Because the project is required by the SWRCB to comply with all applicable conditions of Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, potential violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during project construction would be less than significant.

**Operational Pollutant Controls**

The San Bernardino County NPDES Permit (NPDES No. CAS618036) and Waste Discharge Requirements Area-Wide Urban Storm Water Runoff Management Program regulates, through Order No. R8-2010-0036, the discharge of pollutants into WOUS through stormwater and urban runoff conveyance systems, including flood control facilities. These conveyance systems are commonly referred to as municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), or storm drains. In this context, the NPDES Permit is also referred to as an MS4 Permit.

Pursuant to the MS4 Permit, Principal Permittees (i.e., the San Bernardino County Flood Control District) and Co-Permittees (the City of Fontana is a Co-Permittee) must regulate discharges of...
pollutants in urban runoff from anthropogenic sources into storm water conveyance systems within their jurisdiction.

As new development and redevelopment occurs, it can significantly increase pollutant loads in stormwater and urban runoff, because increased population density results in proportionately higher levels of vehicle emissions, vehicle maintenance wastes, municipal sewage wastes, household hazardous wastes, fertilizers, pet waste, trash, and other anthropogenic pollutants (RWQCB, 2010). The San Bernardino County MS4 Permit requires new development and significant redevelopment projects to incorporate post-construction low-impact development BMPs into project design to comply with the local Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) or Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to reduce or eliminate the quantity, and improve the quality of, stormwater being discharged from the project site.

A preliminary WQMP (Allard Engineering, 2020; for details, refer to the grading and WQMP included in Appendix E of this document) has been prepared for the proposed project site and is included herein as Appendix E. The MS4 and the associated WQMP require the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) features to ensure that most stormwater runoff is treated and retained onsite.

The project WQMP includes structural BMPs, such as signs against waste disposal, paved pads, rain sensors, and maintenance of bays and loading docks that would limit the amount of pollutants that would affect groundwater sources. Additionally, the proposed project would include LIDs such as minimizing impervious areas, maximizing infiltration capacity, and preserving the existing drainage patterns to mitigate the impacts of runoff and stormwater pollution as close to the source as possible. These facilities are highly effective at removing water pollutants such as sediment, nutrients, trash, metals, bacteria, oil and grease, and organic compounds while reducing the volume and intensity of stormwater flow leaving a site (Allard Engineering, 2020, p. 4-5 to 4-7).

The WQMP may also include non-structural source control BMPs including but not restricted to education of property owners and employees on stormwater BMPs, scheduled project site cleaning, landscape management BMPs, and litter and debris control programs (Allard Engineering, 2020, p. 4-2 to 4-3).

With implementation of construction and operational BMPs, potential impacts to water quality would be less than significant and mitigation is not proposed.

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

The proposed project would be within the service area of the West Valley Water District (WVWD). WVWD participates in the San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan; This Urban Water Management Plan (UQMP) is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the years 2015 to 2040 (SBVRUWMP, 2015).

Regional water supply to WVWD is provided through imported from the California State Water Project (SWP), which is the largest state-built, multi-purpose water project in the country (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-1). Local precipitation that runs off as surface water and local precipitation that soaks into the ground, called "groundwater", meets about 60% of the regional demand in an
average year (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-6). The project lies within the Chino Sub basin Area (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-7). The Basin is managed through implementation of the Chino Optimum Basin Management Plan. Per the Judgment, WVWD has a minimum of approximately 1,000 AFY of extraction rights. Extractions above that amount must be replenished with SWP water through a program with the Chino Basin Watermaster (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-15).

WVWD has anticipated the future water demands such as the proposed project and concludes that they would be able to provide adequate water supply for normal, dry, and multiple dry years (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-24). Additionally, the WVWD would implement a water shortage contingency plan that is separated into four stages of water rationing. In each of the water rationing stages, there are different restrictions that would limit the use of water use such as landscaping, construction water use, maintenance of leaking pipes, etc. (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 11-17). Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impact regarding groundwater supplies.

While the project would result in a decrease in pervious surface area compared to existing conditions, the relatively small size of the proposed project site limits its potential to contribute to groundwater recharge to the Chino Sub-basin. Regardless, the proposed project would implement LID measures that would maximize the volume of stormwater runoff that would be captured and allowed to infiltrate the soil to add to groundwater recharge. These LID measures are discussed above in Section 4.10 a), Operational Pollutant Controls, and are described in detail and illustrated in the WQMP (Allard Engineering, 2020), located in Appendix E. With implementation of LID measures, stormwater would be captured and retained onsite in the two underground Stormtech Infiltration Systems while the water percolates through the soil until it reaches groundwater.

The proposed project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Project-related impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is proposed.

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

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite;

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project site is situated on relatively level ground and ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial streams or rivers were not observed during the biological survey conducted for the project.

Site preparation and grading at the project site would comply with City of Fontana grading code requirements. Furthermore, because construction of the proposed project would disturb more than one acre of ground, it would be required to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility (SWRCB, 2020).
The Construction General Permit requires the development of a SWPPP by a certified qualified SWPPP developer. The required SWPPP would be project-specific and would prescribe site-specific stormwater BMPs which would be intended to minimize or avoid having soil leave the project site, through either stormwater or wind, and thus minimize or avoid soil erosion onsite and siltation in receiving waters.

With implementation of a project-specific SWPPP and proper maintenance and replacement of required stormwater BMPs (as necessary), potential impacts resulting in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite would be minimized or avoided, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is proposed.

   ii)  Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

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

**Less than Significant Impact**

As detailed in the proposed project’s WQMP and in Section 4.10 a) above, the proposed project would incorporate operational LID BMPs in compliance with City of Fontana SUSMP permit requirements. The proposed project would be drained into a drainage area (DA1) that would be divided into two drainage management areas (DMA-1 and DMA-2) that would drain into the proposed Stormtech Chamber System – 1 & 2 (Infiltration Chamber System) respectively via a network of storm drain/gutter/grate inlets located in the driveway/truck parking area at the southern boundary line of the property for low flow infiltration (Allard Engineering, 2020, p. 1-2).

The MS4 and the project WQMP would require the implementation of water quality features to ensure that runoff is treated prior to discharge into native soils (infiltration), storm drains or other regional conveyance facilities, as described above. Therefore, upon adherence to existing state water quality requirements, including MS4 requirements, the proposed project would minimize or avoid causing a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would: (1) result in flooding on- or offsite; (2) would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (3) 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. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is proposed.

   iv)  Impede or redirect flood flows?

**No Impact**

The proposed project would be in a densely developed area and would not be near or within a five-mile radius of an open body of water. FEMA has mapped the project site as Zone X (Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% chance (500-year) annual flood (FEMA, 2020). Refer to Figure 4.10-1, FEMA FIRM Map, below.
Figure 4.10-1
FEMA FIRM MAP

National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette

Project Location

Disclaimer: Illustration provided by FEMA, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.

Sources: FEMA, June 1, 2020.
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Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
Since the project site is above the 100- and 500-year floodplains, it is not anticipated that floodwaters would reach the project site, or that the proposed project would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, no impacts associated with flooding would occur, and no mitigation is proposed.

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

**No Impact**

As described in Section 4.10 iv) above, the proposed project site is above the 100-year and the 500-year flood hazard zones and it is not anticipated that the site would become inundated due to flood.

A tsunami is a sea wave (or series of waves) of local or distant origin that results from large-scale seafloor displacements associated with large earthquakes, major submarine slides, or exploding volcanic islands (California Seismic Safety Commission, 2020). Tsunami Inundation Zones are not mapped for San Bernardino County (CGS, 2020). The closest mapped zones are in Orange County. A review of the Orange County, California Tsunami Inundation Maps (CGS, 2020) revealed that the tsunami inundation zone nearest to the proposed project site would be at Los Alamitos in northern Orange County, approximately 40 miles southwest of the project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would become inundated due to a tsunami.

A seiche is an oscillating wave caused by wind, tidal forces, earthquakes, landslides, and other phenomena in a closed or partially closed water body such as a river, lake, reservoir, pond, and other large inland water body. A review of aerial imagery (Google Earth, 2020) revealed no water bodies large enough to support a seiche within a five-mile radius of the proposed project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would be inundated by a seiche.

Per the County of San Bernardino General Plan Hazard Overlays map (County of San Bernardino, 2010), the project site is located outside of a dam inundation area. Additionally, the City of Fontana Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (City of Fontana, 2017, p. 37) states there is no major dam located upstream from the Fontana area; therefore, the city currently is not susceptible to dam inundation.

Because of the project's inland location, relatively flat topography, and lack of an adjacent body of water, the project site would not be at risk of flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche, and therefore would not be at risk of release of pollutants through inundation. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is proposed.

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

**No Impact**

As detailed in the WQMP prepared for the project and discussed in Section 4.10 a) above, stormwater would be retained onsite through LID infiltration BMPs (Allard Engineering, 2019). The project would be designed in compliance with all applicable City of Fontana regulations regarding stormwater runoff, as well as the San Bernardino County MS4 permit (Order No. R8-2010-0036, NPDES No. CAS618036) to which the City of Fontana is a signatory, and the LID capture and infiltration facilities would, through natural infiltration of soils, ensure that the water quality objectives of the San Bernardino Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) Water Quality
Control Plan (Basin Plan; RWQCB, 1995) are met. It is not anticipated that the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

The proposed project would not directly use groundwater but would buy water from the WVWD, as discussed in Section 4.10 b) above. WVWD participates in the San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan. According to the San Bernardino Valley Regional 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, water supplies would meet the needs of the service area through 2040 when considering normal, single dry year, and multiple dry years (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 11-24). Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a sustainable groundwater management plan.

No project-related impacts related to conflict with or implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater plan are anticipated, and mitigation is not proposed.
4.11 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**No Impact**

The proposed project is located on an abandoned piece of land that contains disturbed open space in the northeastern portion of the City of Fontana. The project site is surrounded primarily by light industrial to the north, commercial to the south, industrial to the east and industrial and residential to the west.

The project would introduce a new industrial warehouse, which would be similar to existing nearby land uses. Additionally, the project would not divide existing public spaces in the vicinity of the site or extend beyond the project site’s boundaries. Furthermore, no streets or sidewalks would be permanently closed as a result of the development. The project would utilize existing roadways, resulting in no change in roadway patterns. No separation of uses or disruption of access between land use types would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and 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?**

**No Impact**

As shown in Figure 4.11-1, the City's General Plan land use designation for the project site is I-L (Light Industrial) (City of Fontana, 2019a). As shown in Figure 4.11-2, the City's zoning designation for the project site is M-1 (Light Industrial), which allows for industrial warehouse uses, consistent with the proposed project (City of Fontana Municipal Code, 2020). Moreover, land uses to the north, east and west of the project site have similar land use designations. Therefore, no general plan amendment or zone change will be required for the project. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation and no impact would occur.
Figure 4.11-1

PROPOSED PROJECT SITE CURRENT GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS
Figure 4.11-2
PROPOSED PROJECT SITE CURRENT ZONING DESIGNATIONS

Summary of zoning designations:
- R-1: Single Family Residential (1-0.6 acres)
- R-2: Medium Density Residential (5-12 acres)
- R-3: Multi Family Residential (12-24 acres)
- R-4: Multi Family Medium Residential (24-36 acres)
- R-5: Multi Family High Residential (36-50 acres)

Sources: City of Fontana, September 10, 2019

Disclaimer: Illustration provided by City of Fontana, who has indicated that the information is true and correct. No other warranties are expressed or implied.
4.12 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ)-2, which is an area where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists (DOC, 2019b). However, according to the Land Use, Zoning, and Urban Design section of the City of Fontana General Plan, the City does not include mining in any of its zoning categories (Stantec, 2018a). Also, it is unlikely that anyone would propose to establish new surface mining operations within the city since it is not allowed within the city. According to 'Well Finder' generated by the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, & Geothermal Resources and Figure 4.12.1, the project site is not located near (within one mile of) any oil or gas wells (DOC, 2020b). Figure 4.12.2 shows there are no geothermal wells in the vicinity of the project.

Although this project is located within MRZ-2, where significant amounts of deposits might be present, the project cannot and will not interfere with the availability of these resources since they cannot be accessed due to the City of Fontana’s General Plan that does not allow active mining within the city limits. Therefore, the project site is not an important local mineral resource recovery site and the project would have less than significant impact on the availability of known mineral and oil-based resources of value to the region or state residents and on any locally important mineral resource recovery sites.
Figure 4.12-1
OIL AND GAS WELLS AND FIELDS

Disclaimer: Representations on this map or illustration are intended only to indicate locations of project parameters reported in the legend. Project parameter information supplied by others (see layer credits) may not have been independently verified for accuracy by UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. This map or illustration should not be used for, and does not replace, final grading plans or other documents that should be professionally certified for development purposes.
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Scale: 1:126,720
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Figure 4.12-2
GEOTHERMAL WELLS

Disclaimer: Representations on this map or illustration are intended only to indicate locations of project parameters reported in the legend. Project parameter information supplied by others (see layer credits) may not have been independently verified for accuracy by UltraSystems Environmental, Inc. This map or illustration should not be used for, and does not replace, final grading plans or other documents that should be professionally certified for development purposes.
4.13 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13.1 Characteristics of Sound

Sound is a pressure wave transmitted through the air. It is described in terms of loudness or amplitude (measured in decibels), frequency or pitch (measured in hertz [Hz] or cycles per second), and duration (measured in seconds or minutes). The decibel (dB) scale is a logarithmic scale that describes the physical intensity of the pressure vibrations that make up any sound. The pitch of the sound is related to the frequency of the pressure vibration. Because the human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies, a special frequency-dependent rating scale is used to relate noise to human sensitivity. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) provides this compensation by discriminating against upper and lower frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear. The scale is based on a reference pressure level of 20 micropascals (zero dBA). The scale ranges from zero (for the average least perceptible sound) to about 130 (for the average human pain level).

4.13.2 Noise Measurement Scales

Several rating scales have been developed to analyze adverse effects of community noise on people. Since environmental noise fluctuates over time, these scales consider that the effect of noise on people depends largely upon the total acoustical energy content of the noise, as well as the time of day when the noise occurs. Those that are applicable to this analysis are as follows:

- $L_{eq}$, the equivalent noise level, is an average of sound level over a defined time period (such as 1 minute, 15 minutes, 1 hour or 24 hours). Thus, the $L_{eq}$ of a time-varying noise and that of a steady noise are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear during exposure.
4.13.3 Existing Noise

The City of Fontana 2015 General Plan Noise and Safety Element (Stantec, 2018a, p. 11-9) defines “noise-sensitive” uses in areas of 24-hour-per-day of exposure as residential uses, hospitals, rest homes, long-term care facilities, and mental care facilities. Sensitive receivers for shorter-term exposures are defined as schools, libraries, places of worship, and passive recreation uses.

The only sensitive receivers in the project vicinity are the single-family residences that are approximately 580 feet west of the project site, along the west side of Sierra Avenue.

Due to the current pandemic, traffic levels and, consequently, neighborhood noise levels, are lower than under “normal” conditions. Ambient noise levels were therefore not measured for this project. Instead, measurement results from a 2015 noise study in the same general area as the proposed project (Lawson and Wolfe, 2015) were used to characterize existing conditions.

One of the ambient measurement locations, “L8,” is directly across Sierra Avenue from the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project site. Five other measurement points are along the west side of Sierra Avenue between the project site and Summit Avenue, and two are in the same road segment, on the east side of Sierra Avenue. For the proposed project, location L8 was considered the most representative, especially for evaluating construction noise impacts. **Table 4.13-1** summarizes the measurements at location L8.

---

22 The targets of adverse noise impacts are called “sensitive receivers” in this document, while those of adverse air quality impacts are termed “sensitive receptors.”
### Table 4.13-1
**2015 AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS NEAR PROJECT SITE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Metric</th>
<th>Daytime (7 a.m. – 10 p.m.)</th>
<th>Nighttime (10 p.m. – 7 a.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Average dBA $L_{eq}$</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum 1-hour $L_{eq}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.7 (6 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum 1-hour $L_{eq}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.4 (1 a.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBA CNEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Sierra Lakes Commerce Center. Noise Impact Analysis (Lawson and Wolfe, 2015).*

#### 4.13.4 Regulatory Setting

**State of California**

The most current guidelines prepared by the state noise officer are contained in Appendix D of the General Plan Guidelines issued by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in 2017 (OPR, 2017). These guidelines establish four categories for judging the severity of noise intrusion on specified land uses:

- **Normally Acceptable**: Is generally acceptable, with no mitigation necessary.
- **Conditionally Acceptable**: May require some mitigation, as established through a noise study.
- **Normally Unacceptable**: Requires substantial mitigation.
- **Clearly unacceptable**: Probably cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

The OPR noise compatibility guidelines assign ranges of CNEL values to each of these categories. The ranges differ for different types of sensitive receivers, and are shown in **Table 4.13-2**.
### Table 4.13-2
CALIFORNIA LAND USE COMPATIBILITY FOR COMMUNITY NOISE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Noise Exposure (dBA, CNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Low-Density Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – Multiple Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging – Motel, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arena, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Normally Acceptable:** Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.

**Conditionally Acceptable:** New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply system or air conditioning will normally suffice.

**Normally Unacceptable:** New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

**Clearly Unacceptable:** New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

**Source:** Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, 2017.
City of Fontana General Plan Noise and Safety Element

The City of Fontana General Plan EIR Noise and Safety Element (Stantec, 2018a) has the following goals, policies and actions that apply to proposed project:

**Goal 1: The City of Fontana protects sensitive land uses from excessive noise by diligent planning through 2035** (Stantec, 2018a, p.11.12).

**Policies**

- New sensitive land uses shall be prohibited in incompatible areas.
- Noise-tolerant land uses shall be guided into areas irrevocably committed to land uses that are noise-producing, such as transportation corridors.
- Where sensitive uses are to be placed along transportation routes, mitigation shall be provided to ensure compliance with state-mandated noise levels.
- Noise spillover or encroachment from commercial, industrial and educational land uses shall be minimized into adjoining residential neighborhoods or noise-sensitive uses.

**Actions**

A. The following uses shall be considered noise-sensitive and discouraged in areas in excess of 65 dBA CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level): Residential Uses; Hospitals; Rest Homes; Long Term Care Facilities; and Mental Care Facilities.

B. The following uses shall be considered noise-sensitive and discouraged in areas in excess of 65 $L_{eq}(12)$ (Equivalent Continuous Sound Level): Schools; Libraries; Places of Worship; and Passive Recreation Uses.

C. The State of California Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines shall be followed with respect to acoustical study requirements.

**Goal 2: The City of Fontana provides a diverse and efficiently operated ground transportation system that generates the minimum feasible noise on its residents through 2035** (Stantec, 2018a, p.11.13).

**Actions**

A. On-road trucking activities shall continue to be regulated in the City to ensure noise impacts are minimized, including the implementation of truck-routes based on traffic studies.

B. Development that generates increased traffic and subsequent increases in the ambient noise level adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses shall provide appropriate mitigation measures.

C. Noise mitigation practices shall be employed when designing all future streets and highways, and when improvements occur along existing highway segments.
Goal 3: The City of Fontana’s residents are protected from the negative effects of “spill over” noise (Stantec, 2018a, p.11.13).

Policy

- Residential land uses and areas identified as noise-sensitive shall be protected from excessive noise from non-transportation sources including industrial, commercial, and residential activities and equipment.

Actions

A. Projects located in commercial areas shall not exceed stationary-source noise standards at the property line of proximate residential or commercial uses.

B. Industrial uses shall not exceed commercial or residential stationary source noise standards at the most proximate land uses.

C. Non-transportation noise shall be considered in land use planning decisions.

D. Construction shall be performed as quietly as feasible when performed in proximity to residential or other noise-sensitive land uses.

City of Fontana Municipal Code

The City of Fontana’s Municipal Code contains several provisions potentially related to construction and operation of the proposed project. Prohibited noises enumerated in Chapter 18 (Nuisances), Article II - Noise include:

- Construction or repairing of buildings or structures. The erection (including excavating), demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure other than between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays, except in case of urgent necessity in the interest of public health and safety, and then only with a permit from the building inspector, which permit may be granted for a period not to exceed three days or less while the emergency continues and which permit may be renewed for periods of three days or less while the emergency continues. If the building inspector should determine that the public health and safety will not be impaired by the erection, demolition, alteration or repair of any building or structure or the excavation of streets and highways within the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and if he shall further determine that loss or inconvenience would result to any party in interest, he may grant permission for such work to be done on weekdays within the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., upon application being made at the time the permit for the work is awarded or during the progress of the work.

23 https://library.municode.com/ca/fontana/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=C0_CH18NU_ARTIINO.
24 City of Fontana Municipal Code, Chapter 18, Article II, §§ 18-63(a)(7), (8), (10), and (11). Last revised September 11, 2007.
• *Noise near schools, courts, place of worship or hospitals.* The creation of any loud, excessive, impulsive or intrusive noise on any street adjacent to any school, institution of learning, places of worship or court while the premises are in use, or adjacent to any hospital which unreasonably interferes with the workings of such institution or which disturbs or unduly annoys patients in the hospital; provided conspicuous signs are displayed in such streets indicating that the street is a school, hospital or court street.\(^{26}\)

• *Blowers.* The operation of any noise-creating blower or power fan or any internal combustion engine other than from the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on a weekday and the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on a Saturday, the operation of which causes noise due to the explosion of operating gases or fluids, unless the noise from such blower or fan is muffled and such engine is equipped with a muffler device sufficient to deaden such noise.\(^{27}\)

• *Piledrivers, hammers, etc.* The operation between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of any piledriver, steam shovel, pneumatic hammer, derrick, steam or electric hoist or other appliance, the use of which is attended by loud, excessive, impulsive or intrusive noise.\(^{28}\)

### 4.13.5 Significance Thresholds

The City of Fontana has not published explicit thresholds for use in determining significance of noise impacts under CEQA. In keeping with standard practice, two criteria were used for judging noise impacts. First, noise levels generated by the proposed project must comply with all relevant federal, state, and local standards and regulations. Noise impacts on the surrounding community are limited by local noise ordinances, which are implemented through investigations in response to nuisance complaints. It is assumed that all existing applicable regulations for the construction and operation of the proposed project would be enforced. In addition, the proposed project should not produce noise levels that are incompatible with adjacent noise-sensitive land uses.

The second measure of impact used in this analysis is a significant increase in noise levels above existing ambient noise levels as a result of the introduction of a new noise source. An increase in noise level due to a new noise source has a potential to adversely impact people. The proposed project would have a significant noise impact if it would do any of the following:

- Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards recommended in the City of Fontana General Plan Noise Element.
- Include construction activities in or within 500 feet of residential areas between 6:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day, without a permit.
- Increase short-term noise exposures at sensitive receivers during construction by 5 dBA $L_{eq}$ or more.
- Contribute, with other local construction projects, to a significant cumulative noise impact.

---

\(^{26}\) City of Fontana Municipal Code § 18-63(b)(8).
\(^{27}\) City of Fontana Municipal Code § 18-63(b)(11).
\(^{28}\) City of Fontana Municipal Code § 18-63(b)(10).
- Increase operational exposures at sensitive receivers (mainly because of an increase in traffic flow) by 5 dBA $L_{eq}$ or more.

4.13.6 Impact Analysis

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**

Construction activities, especially with heavy equipment operation, would create noise effects on and adjacent to the construction site. Long-term noise impacts include project-generated onsite and offsite operational noise sources. Onsite noise sources from the operation of the warehouse facility would include the use of mechanical equipment such as air conditioners and landscaping and building maintenance activities. Offsite noise would be attributable to project-induced traffic, which would cause an incremental increase in noise levels within and near the project vicinity. Each is described below.

This section also evaluates potential groundborne vibration that would be generated from the construction or operation of the proposed project.

**Short-Term Construction Noise**

Noise impacts from construction activities are a function of the noise generated by the operation of construction equipment and onroad delivery and worker commuter vehicles, the location of equipment, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities. Using calculation methods published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA, 2006), UltraSystems estimated the average hourly exposures at the single-family residence nearest ambient noise measurement location $L_8$. As will be discussed below, the blocking of the noise travel path by an intervening building was taken into account where applicable. The distances used for the calculation were measured from the residence to the approximate center of activity of each construction phase, since that would be the average location of construction equipment most of the time. For the purpose of this analysis, it was estimated that the construction of the proposed project would begin in November 2020 and end in July 2021.

The types and numbers of pieces of equipment anticipated in each phase of construction and development were estimated by running the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2016.3.2 (BREEZE Software, 2017b), and having the model generate land use-based default values. The CalEEMod equipment default values are based on a construction survey performed by the SCAQMD (BREEZE Software, 2017a). **Table 4.13-3** lists the equipment expected to be used. For each equipment type, the table shows an average noise emission level (in dB at 50 feet, unless otherwise specified) and a “usage factor,” which is an estimated percentage of operating time that
the equipment would be producing noise at the stated level.\textsuperscript{29,30} Equipment use was matched to phases of the construction schedule.

### Table 4.13-3
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>No. of Pieces</th>
<th>Maximum Sound Level @ 50 feet (dBA)</th>
<th>Usage Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Excavators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber-Tired Dozers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber-Tired Loaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>Cement and Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plate Compactors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>Aerial Lifts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cranes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plate Compactors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber-Tired Loaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>Rubber-Tired Loaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trenchers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Reference distance is 16 feet (Anderson, 2007).

During the utility improvements, building construction, and architectural coating phases, an existing building would be on a line-of-sight between the construction noise sources and the residence near noise monitoring location L8. The existing building would cover about 81% of the field of view. According to Caltrans, in cases where the coverage exceeds 60%, the first building attenuates about 5 dBA, with 1.5 dBA for each additional row (Caltrans, 2013, p. 2-35). For the utility improvements, building construction and architectural coating phases, the construction noise estimate was decreased by 5 dBA.

Results of the construction noise calculations are presented in Table 4.13-4. The noisiest construction phase would be grading, which would result in a maximum hourly \( L_{eq} \) of 60.5 dBA across Sierra Avenue from the project site. The City of Fontana Municipal Code does not contain standards

\textsuperscript{29} Equipment noise emissions and usage factors are from Knauer, H. et al., 2006. \textit{FHWA Highway Construction Noise Handbook}. U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Innovative Technology, Administration, Cambridge, Massachusetts, FHWA-HEP-06-015 (August 2006), except where otherwise noted.

\textsuperscript{30} Scraper, crane, and cement and mortar mixer, and roller noise emissions data from County of Ventura, Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan. Amended July 2010. This document was also source of usage factors for cranes, cement and mortar mixers, pavers, paving equipment and rollers. Rubber tired dozer noise emissions data from measurements made by Anderson (2007, p. 47) at construction sites.
with which to compare these results. Note that the calculation did not take into account further noise attenuation by an existing six-foot-high soundwall between the residences and Sierra Avenue.

**Table 4.13-5** shows the estimated short-term increase in noise exposure at the sensitive receiver near monitoring location L8. One of the significance criteria defined in **Section 4.13.5** is that the project would increase short-term noise exposures at sensitive receivers during construction by 5 dBA $L_{eq}$ or more. The increase in total noise level in all construction phases is less than or equal to 1.1 dBA, and thus would not be perceptible at the residences along Sierra Avenue. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

**Table 4.13-4**

**ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION NOISE EXPOSURES AT NEAREST SENSITIVE RECEIVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>1-Hour $L_{eq}$ (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8*</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculated by UltraSystems.

*Ambient noise measurement location in Sierra Lakes Commerce Center Noise Impact Analysis (Lawson and Wolfe, 2015).

**Table 4.13-5**

**ESTIMATED MAXIMUM INCREASES IN NOISE EXPOSURE DUE TO CONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Ambient $dBA_{Leq}$</th>
<th>Construction $dBA_{Leq}$</th>
<th>New Total $dBA_{Leq}$</th>
<th>Increase $dBA_{Leq}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Noise and Safety Element also recommends a limit of 65 dBA CNEL for residential exposures. As discussed in **Section 4.13.3**, the CNEL at the sensitive receiver was estimated from measurement data to be 71.3 dBA (Lawson and Wolfe, 2015, p. 157). Using hourly ambient noise measurement values from Lawson and Wolfe (2015), and limiting construction activity to 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m., results in a 24-hour average of 71.4 dBA CNEL. The increase due to project construction would be 0.1 dBA CNEL, which would be less than 5 dBA. Therefore, weighted average daily exposures to construction noise would be less than significant.

**Operational Noise**

**Onsite**

Onsite noise sources from the proposed warehouse facility would include operation of rooftop mechanical equipment such as air conditioners, parking lot activities, and truck deliveries. Noise
levels from these sources are generally lower than from the traffic on streets bordering the project site. Furthermore, § 18-63 of the City of Fontana Development Code limits onsite noise impacts of the operation of any noise-creating blower or power fan or any internal combustion engine other than from the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on a weekday and the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on a Saturday, the operation of which causes noise due to the explosion of operating gases or fluids, unless the noise from such blower or fan is muffled and such engine is equipped with a muffler device sufficient to deaden such noise.

Finally, most of the noise from onsite truck traffic, engine idling, and loading and unloading will be within a recess in the south side of the proposed warehouse; the structure will block the line of sight to sensitive receivers on the west. The operational noise levels would be within both the City’s daytime and nighttime residential noise standards of 70 dBA and 65 dBA, respectively. Therefore, operational noise would be less than significant.

**Mobile Sources**

The principal noise source in the project area is traffic on local roadways. The project may contribute to a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity due to project-generated vehicle traffic on nearby roadways and at major intersections.

The proposed project would generate 262 daily vehicle trips (Sarsour, 2020b). Existing roadway segment average daily traffic (ADT) data were obtained from the Sierra Lakes Commerce Center Noise Impact Analysis. ADT on Sierra Avenue south of Summit Avenue, which is where the only sensitive noise receivers near the project are, is 13,100 (Lawson and Wolfe, 2015, p. 161). The project would increase traffic by about 2%. Given the logarithmic nature of the decibel, traffic volume needs to be doubled in order for the noise level to increase by 3 dBA (ICF Jones & Stokes, 2009), the minimum level perceived by the average human ear. A doubling is equivalent to a 100% increase. Since the maximum increase in traffic in this road segment would be far below 100%, the increase in roadway noise experienced at sensitive receivers would not be perceptible to the human ear. Therefore, roadway noise associated with project operation would not expose a land use to noise levels that are considered incompatible with or in excess of adopted standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Would the project generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less than Significant Impact**

Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. Vibration can result from a source (e.g., subway operations, vehicles, machinery equipment, etc.) that causes the adjacent ground to move, thereby creating vibration waves that propagate through the soil to the foundations of nearby buildings. This effect is referred to as groundborne vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root-mean-square (RMS) velocity is usually used to describe vibration levels. PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration level, while RMS is defined as the square root of the average of the squared amplitude of the level. PPV is typically used for evaluating potential building damage,
while RMS velocity in decibels (VdB) is typically more suitable for evaluating human response (FTA, 2018, pp. 110-111).

The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for most people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings (FTA, 2018, p. 120).

Construction Vibration

Construction activities for the project have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that propagate through the ground and diminishes in intensity with distance from the source. Vibration impacts can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage of buildings at the highest levels. The construction activities associated with the project could have an adverse impact on both sensitive structures (i.e., building damage) and populations (i.e., annoyance).

The construction vibration analysis used formulas published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (FTA, 2018, p. 185). For a standard reference distance of 25 feet, peak particle velocity is found from:

$$PPV = PPV_{ref} \times \left( \frac{25}{D} \right)^{1.5}$$

where

- $PPV_{ref}$ = Reference source vibration at 25 feet
- $D$ = Distance from source to receiver

The vibration level (VdB) for a standard reference distance of 25 feet is found from:

$$VdB = L_{vref} - 30 \log\left( \frac{D}{25} \right)$$

where

- $L_{vref}$ = Reference source vibration level at 25 feet
- $D$ = Distance from source to receiver

The FTA has published standard vibration levels for construction equipment operations, at a distance of 25 feet (FTA, 2006, p. 12-12). The smallest distance from project construction activity to a residential receiver would be about 615 feet. The calculated vibration levels expressed in VdB and PPV for selected types of construction equipment at distances of 25 and 615 feet are listed in Table 4.13-6.
As shown in Table 4.13-6, the vibration level of construction equipment at the nearest sensitive receiver is at most 0.002 inch per second, which is less than the FTA damage threshold of 0.12 inch per second PPV for fragile historic buildings, and 52 VdB, which is less than the FTA threshold for human annoyance of 80 VdB. Vibration impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Table 4.13-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>PPV at 25 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Vibration Decibels at 25 feet (VdB)</th>
<th>PPV at 615 feet (in/sec)</th>
<th>Vibration Decibels at 615 feet (VdB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory roller</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded trucks</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bulldozer</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Data at 25 feet from (FTA, 2006, p. 12-12); calculations by UltraSystems.

Operational Vibration

Groundborne vibrations at the project site and immediate vicinity currently result from heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g. freight trucks) on the nearby local roadways, and the project would not result in a substantial increase of these heavy-duty vehicles on the public roadways. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with operation of the project would be less than significant.

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 public airport is the Ontario International Airport, located approximately 10.3 miles southwest of the project site. No portion of the project site lies within the 55-dBA CNEL noise contours of that airport (City of Fontana, 2018, p. 5.10-3). Rialto Municipal Airport, a former private airport that was located approximately two miles southeast of the project site, has been permanently closed and the site of the airport has since been developed with warehouse and other commercial uses. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels and no impact would occur.

---

33 A maximum of 11 peak hour trips per day (as passenger car equivalents), according to the trip generation memorandum for this project (Sarsour, 2020a).
## 4.14 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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)?

**Less than Significant Impact**

The project proposes a 115,100-square-foot warehouse facility. It does not propose construction of any residential uses. Proposed offsite utility improvements would be minor and not of the scale to induce indirect unplanned population growth in the project area. The project would create limited employment opportunities (both during the construction and operational phases). However, it is anticipated that employees from the local workforce would be hired during both the construction and operational phases of the project. The project is not of the scope or scale to induce people to move from out of the project area to work at the proposed project. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur regarding unplanned growth as a result of the project. Based on the discussion above, a less than significant impact would occur.

### b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**No Impact**

The project site is currently vacant and contains no residential structures. No impact would occur.
4.15 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>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>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Fire Protection?

Less than Significant Impact

Fire prevention, fire protection and emergency response services for the city of Fontana are provided by the Fontana Fire Protection District (FFPD) through a contract with the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The FFPD also investigates and mitigates hazardous materials and has firefighters with special expertise in wildfires (Stantec, 2018a, p. 8-6). The FFPD is staffed with 129 full-time personnel. The FFPD has a response time goal for all service calls to arrive on scene in six minutes or less (City of Fontana, 2019c, p. 351).

There are seven fire stations in the city. Fire Station 78 is the closest to the project site and is located at 7110 Citrus Avenue, approximately 2.4 miles southwest of the project site (City of Fontana, 2020c). This station serves the northern areas of the city of Fontana and is staffed with one Captain, one Engineer, two Firefighter Medics, and one Firefighter. The station is equipped with one medic engine and one squad vehicle (City of Fontana, 2020c).

Fire Station 79 is located on 5075 Coyote Canyon Road, approximately 3.9 miles northwest of the project site (City of Fontana, 2020c). The station serves the northern area of the city of Fontana and is staffed with one captain, one engineer, and one firefighter medic. The station is equipped with one medic engine (City of Fontana, 2020c).

The project proposes a 115,100-square-foot warehouse/logistics/distribution center. Travel time to the project site from Station 78 is approximately six minutes. Therefore, the FFPD response time for the closest fire station to the project site would be within the FFPD’s goal of having a six-minute response time. Furthermore, a new fire station is proposed to be built on Casa Grande Avenue, approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site. Given the proximity, it is anticipated that the response time for the new/proposed fire station would be less than six-minutes.
The project site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE, 2008, and CAL FIRE, 2020). The project would be in compliance with applicable portions of the City of Fontana Municipal Code, Chapter 11: Fire Prevention. The project would also be consistent with the 2016 edition of the California Residential Code (CRC), Section 237; and the 2018 edition of the International Fire Code (IFC), as adopted and amended by the Fire District.

Furthermore, the adequacy of existing water pressure and water availability in the project area would be verified by the FFPD during the proposed project’s plan check review process. Compliance with the above-mentioned codes and FFPD standards is mandatory and routinely conditioned upon projects. The project, once operational, would be inspected periodically by the FFPD.

Development of the project site would be consistent with the land use goals and strategic policy map included in the City of Fontana’s 2015-2035 General Plan and has therefore been planned for, from the standpoint of long-term infrastructure needs (Stantec, 2018a, Chapter 15). In addition, the Fontana Fire Protection District collects development mitigation fees for fire facilities which would be available to fund additional fire protection facilities as needed.

The project’s demands on fire protection services would have a less than significant impact.

b) Police Protection?

Less than Significant Impact

The City of Fontana Police Department provides police and law enforcement services in the project area. The FPD has 188 sworn officers. FPD is comprised of four separate divisions: Office of the Chief of Police; Administrative Services; Field Services; and Special Operations (City of Fontana, 2018a). The nearest police station to the project site is located at 17005 Upland Avenue, approximately 3.5 miles south of the project site (City of Fontana, 2020d). Given the estimated population of 213,739 in 2018 (City of Fontana, 2020e), the FPD has an approximate service to population ratio of one sworn officer per 1,038 residents (1.04 sworn officers per 1,000 residents) (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.12-1).

The residential population is not expected to increase as a result of the proposed project. While the project would create limited employment opportunities (both during the construction and operational phases), it is anticipated that employees from the local workforce would be hired during both phases. The project is not of the scope or scale to induce people to move from out of the project area to work at the proposed project. Therefore, the ratio of sworn officers to residents is not expected to change.

Moreover, development of the project site is consistent with the overall growth anticipated by the General Plan at buildout and has therefore been planned for from the standpoint of long-term infrastructure needs (Stantec, 2018a, Chapter 15). The project would not result in a substantial increase in the population and housing in the surrounding area nor is it expected to significantly affect the existing service capacity of the FPD. Therefore, less than significant impacts on police protection services would occur.
c) Schools?

No Impact

The project site is located within the Fontana Unified School District (FUSD). FUSD provides public education for over 40,000 students and includes 29 elementary schools, seven middle schools and five high schools (FUSD, 2019). FUSD schools serving the project site include Dorothy Grant Innovations Academy (grades K-5), Wayne Ruble Middle School (grades 6-8), and Summit High School (grades 9-12). Dorothy Grant Innovations Academy is 1.92 miles southwest of the project site at 7069 Isabel Lane. Wayne Middle School is 0.75 mile southwest of the project site at 6762 Juniper Avenue. Summit High School is 1.72 miles northwest of the project site at 15551 Summit Avenue.

The project does not propose any new residential uses. Therefore, no impact on schools would occur.

d) Parks?

Less than Significant Impact

Recreational services in the city of Fontana are provided by the City's Department of Facilities and Parks, which maintains over 40 parks, sports facilities, and community centers (City of Fontana, 2020a). The City's park acreage standard is five acres of public park land per 1,000 residents. The City currently has approximately 1,359 acres total in parks and land for public use, enough to meet this performance standard (Stantec, 2018a, p. 7.10).

Cambria Park, located at 17140 Cambria Avenue, is approximately 0.47 mile south of the project site. The park includes facilities such as a small tot-lot, benches and a large open lawn area (City of Fontana, 2020f). Patricia Murrujo Park, located at 5730 Avenal Place, is approximately 1.18 miles northwest of the project site. The park includes facilities such as a playground and picnic park shelter (City of Fontana, 2020g).

The project does not propose residential land uses and/or is not anticipated to add new residents to the city. It is possible that employees at the project site may visit nearby parks; however, the potential impact of these visits on parks would be less than significant.

e) Other Public Facilities?

No Impact

Library services in the city are provided by the San Bernardino County Library System, which is comprised of 32 branch libraries. Within the city of Fontana, there are three libraries: the Fontana Lewis Library and Technology Center located at 8437 Sierra Avenue; the Summit Branch Library located at 15551 Summit Avenue; and the Kaiser High School Library located at 11155 Almond Avenue (San Bernardino County Public Library, 2020). The Summit Branch Library is located approximately 1.73 miles northwest of the project site. The project is not of the scope or scale to induce any population growth. Therefore, the project would have no impact on other public facilities.
4.16 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) 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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Recreational services in the city of Fontana are provided by the City’s Department of Facilities and Parks, which maintains over 40 parks, sports facilities, and community centers (City of Fontana, 2020a). The City’s park acreage standard is five acres of public park land per 1,000 residents. The City currently has approximately 1,359 acres total in parks and land for public use, enough to meet this performance standard (Stantec, 2018a, p. 7.10).

The project proposes a 115,100-square-foot logistics/distribution center. The residential population is not expected to increase as a result of the proposed project. While the project would create limited employment opportunities (both during the construction and operational phases), it is anticipated that employees from the local workforce would be hired during both phases. Moreover, the land uses nearest to the project site are primarily light industrial and/or commercial.

The parks nearest to the project include Cambria Park, located approximately 0.47 mile south of the project site, and Patricia Murrujo Park located approximately 1.18 miles northwest from the project site. It is possible that employees at the project site may visit these parks; however, the potential impact of these visits on parks would be less than significant.

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**

As described above, the project does not propose new or expanded recreational facilities that would have potential adverse effects on the environment. Therefore, no impact would occur.
4.17 Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on a trip generation assessment that was conducted by Omar Sarsour for the proposed project (refer to Appendix J). The trip generation assessment estimates the combination of existing and future vehicular trips from the project site based on implementation of the proposed project. The trip generation estimates are based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition trip rates for usage code –150 Warehouse.

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 following City and County plans, ordinances and policies would apply to the project.

City of Fontana Active Transportation Plan (ATP)
The 2017 Fontana ATP is used to implement infrastructure improvements for better connectivity throughout Fontana, to surrounding cities, and the region by providing safe and comfortable walking and bicycling linkages (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.13-14). The proposed project would not create walking or bicycling linkages, and therefore the proposed project would not conflict with the ATP.

City of Fontana Development Impact Fee (DIF) Program
The City's DIF program was adopted pursuant to Government Code § 66000 et seq. Fontana's Development Services Department oversees the use of the DIF fees, which fund projects in the City's capital improvement program (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.13-14). The proposed project is not part of the DIF program, and therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the DIF program.
San Bernardino Congestion Management Program (CMP)
The intent of the CMP is to provide the analytical basis for transportation decisions through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process, a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System. The San Bernardino County CMP, published by the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), defines a network of state highways and arterials in the county and provides guidelines regarding level of service (LOS) standards, impact criteria, and a process for mitigation of impacts on CMP facilities (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.13-14). With certain exceptions, the minimum acceptable LOS for CMP facilities is defined as LOS E. More specifically, the CMP states, “In no case shall the LOS standards established be below the LOS E or the current level, whichever is farthest from LOS A. When the LOS on a segment or at an intersection fails to attain the established LOS standard, a deficiency plan shall be adopted pursuant to Section 65089.4” (San Bernardino Associated Governments, 2016, p. 1-2). The San Bernardino County CMP was last updated in 2016 (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, 2018).

The proposed project would front Mango Avenue. Commercial and business access would be available via the two driveways along Mango Avenue and emergency access would available via an easement along Sierra Avenue. Access for pedestrians from the public right-of-way (ROW) to the building onsite would be via the walkway along Mango Avenue, which fronts the east side of the project site.

The project site’s primary connections to the nearest regional transportation corridor, the I-210 Freeway, is via Sierra Avenue located approximately 420 feet west of the project site (Google Earth Pro, 2020). The nearest public transit facility (i.e., bus or train stop) is the Omnitrans bus stop on Route 82 about 500 feet southwest of the project site, at the intersection of Sierra Avenue and Sierra Lakes Parkway (Google Earth Pro, 2020; Omnitrans, 2020). No Class I, II or III bikeways are located along Sierra Avenue or Mango Avenue (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.13-1) or anywhere else near the project site. There will be no conflict with present or future bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

As mentioned above, the project would have primary access along Mango Avenue and access along Sierra Avenue would only be used for emergency vehicles. Per the General Plan DEIR for the city’s General Plan Update 2015-2035, no intersection or road segment of Mango Avenue in the City of Fontana has LOS “E” or worse. Segments of Sierra Avenue in the City of Fontana operate at a LOS E; however, the section of Sierra Avenue that is located west of the project site, does not operate at a LOS D or lower (Stantec, 2018b, pp. 5.13-8 to 5.13-9). The service level is not expected to change once the proposed project is constructed and operational due to the limited number of daily trips (approximately 26 AM peak hour trips and 29 PM peak hour trips34) created by the project. The estimated project trips contribute less than 50 peak hour (two-way) trips after full development; therefore, further traffic analysis is not required (refer to Appendix J). Therefore, since the generated amount of traffic would not increase more 50 peak hour trips, the proposed project would not affect the current level of service, and there would be less than significant impacts to existing LOS.

Given that the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of the City General Plan’s Circulation Element, the City’s ATP, and San Bernardino’s CMP, or interfere with public transit or bicycle transportation, project impacts would be less than significant.

---

34 This is the total project traffic expected into and out of the project site in Passenger Car Equivalents (PCEs) of: 2-Axle Truck = 1.5 PCE, 3-Axle Truck = 2.0 PCE and 4 (or more)-Axle Trucks – 3.0 PCE (Omar Sarsour Engineering, 2020, p. 3)
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

**Less than Significant Impact**

Section 15064.3, Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts, of the CEQA Guidelines describes specific considerations for evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. Section 15064.3(b) includes criteria for analyzing transportation impacts. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) which focuses on the overall miles traveled by vehicles within a region, is the new metric for transportation analysis and replaces automobile delay (Level of Service -LOS), which is no longer used as a criterion for determining a significant environmental effect under CEQA (City of Fontana, June 2020). For land use projects, “Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3).

On June 9, 2020, the City of Fontana adopted Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Thresholds for determining transportation impacts pursuant to CEQA Guidelines. This adoption was required by Senate Bill (SB) 743 and the recent changes to Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA analysis of VMT and traffic impacts associated with projects proposed in the City of Fontana, the City also adopted Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Level of Service Assessment (City of Fontana, June 2020). The City’s Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for VMT Assessment, provides project screening criteria and guidance for analysis of VMT assessments. The following VMT screening criterion was utilized for the proposed project.

- **Project Net Daily Trips Less Than 500 ADT:** The City presumes that projects that generate fewer than 500 average daily trips (ADT) would not cause a substantial increase in the total citywide or regional VMT and would therefore have a less than significant impact on VMT. Projects which generate less than 500 ADT include warehouse projects with an area of 287,000 square feet or less.

The proposed project is a 115,100-square-foot warehouse facility. Per the trip generation assessment prepared for the project (refer to Appendix J), the project would generate approximately 262 daily trips. As the project is expected to generate less than 500 average daily trips, therefore, using the “Project Net Daily Trips Less Than 500 ADT Type Screening” criteria, per the City’s TIA Guidelines (City of Fontana, June 2020), a further project-level VMT assessment is not required for the proposed project. The project would have a less than significant impact regarding conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3.

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)?

**Less than Significant Impact**

Commercial and business vehicles would access the facility via the driveways along Mango Avenue and emergency vehicles would access the site via Sierra Avenue. Access for pedestrians from the public ROW to the building onsite would be via the walkway along Mango Avenue. All onsite access and sight-distance setbacks would be in accordance with City of Fontana and Caltrans design requirements. The project would not substantially alter or impact roads, sight lines or offsite land uses. The proposed project would not house or utilize farm equipment, construction equipment or other unusually slow vehicles that would present a traffic hazard. Therefore, the project would not
increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, and traffic hazard impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

**Construction**

During the project construction phase, lanes and sidewalks may be temporarily closed off. To ensure that circulation and emergency access during construction is adequate, the City requires preparation and implementation of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for all projects that require construction in the public ROW. Therefore, the proposed project would implement mitigation measure **TRANS-1**. With implementation of mitigation measure **TRANS-1**, impacts in regard to emergency access during construction would be less than significant.

**Operation**

The project would comply with applicable City regulations, such as the requirement to comply with the City’s Fire Code with regard to providing adequate emergency access, as well as the California Building Standards Code. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the City of Fontana would review project site plans, including location of all buildings, fences, access driveways and other features that may affect emergency access. Fire lanes would be provided for adequate emergency access. The site design for the proposed project includes access and fire lanes that would accommodate emergency ingress and egress by fire trucks, police units, and ambulance/paramedic vehicles. All onsite access and sight-distance requirements would be in accordance with City and Caltrans design requirements. The City’s review process and compliance with applicable regulations and standards would ensure that adequate emergency access would be provided at the project site at all times. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access and there would be no impacts in this regard.

**Mitigation Measures**

**MM TRANS-1** The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) must be reviewed and approved by the City’s Traffic Engineer prior to the start of construction activity in the public right-of-way (ROW). The typical TMP requires items such as the installation of K-rail between the construction area and open traffic lanes, the use of flagmen and directional signage to direct traffic where only one travel lane is available or when equipment movement creates temporary hazards, and the installation of steel plates to cover trenches under construction. The TMP must provide that emergency access must be maintained at all times.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

After implementation of mitigation measure **TRANS-1** described above, the project would have less than significant construction-phase impacts on emergency access.
### Section 4.18 - Tribal Cultural Resources

#### 4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.18.1 Methods

Information from the Phase I Cultural Resources Inventory Report, dated May 22, 2020 (see Appendix H), prepared by UltraSystems for the Mango Avenue Industrial Warehouse Project describes the research for and analysis of potential cultural resources data conducted for the project. This research included a cultural resources record search at the SCCIC, a SLF record search by the NAHC, and a pedestrian survey assessment (see Section 4.5).

No prehistoric archaeological resources were observed during the field survey. Previous cultural resources surveys within the 0.5-mile radius resulted in no archaeological sites or isolates being recorded. During the cultural resources record search at the SCCIC, no prehistoric resources were found. The results of the pedestrian assessment indicate it is highly unlikely that prehistoric properties would be adversely affected by construction of the project. The cultural resource study findings at the SCCIC suggest that there is a low potential for finding prehistoric resources.
One potential resource (as defined by Public Resources Code § 21074) has been noted ("NAHC Sacred Land File Records Search" in Appendix H of this IS/MND). A Traditional Cultural Resource (TCR) site was documented within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site in the NAHC’s SLF search, though its location and description were not provided.

As discussed in Section 4.5, the NAHC recommended contacting the Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to learn further information about the SLF site. Therefore, UltraSystems sent a letter to the Gabrielino-Kizh Nation, along with the other 14 tribal contacts provided by the NAHC.

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

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

No Impact

The Cultural Resources investigation determined that there are no TCRs listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k) within the project site or within a 0.5-mile radius surrounding the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires meaningful consultation with California Native American Tribes regarding potential impacts on TCRs, as defined in Public Resources Code § 21074. TCRs are sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either eligible or listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or local register of historical resources (California Natural Resources Agency [CNRA], 2007).

As part of the AB 52 process, Native American tribes must submit a written request to a lead agency to be notified of projects within their traditionally and culturally affiliated area. The lead agency must provide written, formal notification to those tribes within 14 days of deciding to undertake a project. The tribe must respond to the lead agency within 30 days of receiving this notification if they want to engage in consultation on the project, and the lead agency must begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving the tribe’s request. Consultation concludes when either (1) the parties agree to mitigation measures (MMs) to avoid a significant effect on a TCR, or (2) a party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes mutual agreement cannot be reached.
In compliance with AB 52, letters were sent by the City of Fontana’s Planning Department (City) to all applicable Native American Tribes. Brett Hamilton, Associate Planner with the City’s Community Development Department, has taken the lead for this process. The letters were sent March 2, 2020 and April 7, 2020 by certified mail to the following tribes:

- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians,
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians,
- Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation,
- Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians,
- Gabrieleno/Tongva Nation,
- Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council,
- Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe, Morongo Band of Mission Indians,
- Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation,
- San Fernando Band of Mission Indians, and
- Serrano Nation of Mission Indians.

The City received a reply from the Gabrieleno – Kizh Nation on March 17, 2020 by email with an attached letter requesting consultation. On March 17, 2020, Mr. Hamilton made correspondence with the Gabrieleno – Kizh Nation requesting an available date and time for consultation. A consultation teleconference call between the City and the Gabrieleno – Kizh Nation was conducted May 21, 2020. The City provided the Kizh Nation with requested information via email on May 21, May 27 and June 4, 2020. The City received a response from Donna Yocum of the San Fernando Band of Mission Indians indicating that all projects that disturb cultural resources are important to all tribal groups. Another response was received from Jessica Mauck of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on April 9, 2020 indicating that the project area is in their traditional territory but they have no concerns with the project. She included two mitigation measures that were incorporated into mitigation measure TCR-1 below. The last email response was received on April 14, 2020 from Jill McCormick of the Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation indicating that they had no concerns with the project. The remaining three tribes did not reply to the City within the 30-day response period nor have they to date. With this, AB 52 consultation has been concluded (B. Hamilton, personal communication; August 3, 2020).

A potential resource as defined by Public Resources Code § 21074 has been noted (Attachment C: “NAHC Sacred Land File Records Search” in Appendix H to this Initial Study). A traditional cultural site was documented within a half-mile radius of the project site in the NAHC’s SLF search, though its location and description were not provided. The NAHC recommended contacting the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to learn further information about the SLF site; Smith did send a letter to the Gabrieleno-Kizh Nation, along with the other 14 tribal contacts listed by the NAHC, and received replies (Appendix H). The project site has not been recommended for historic designation for prehistoric resources or TCRs.

No prehistoric archaeological resources were observed during the field survey. The previous cultural resources surveys within the 0.5-mile radius resulted in no archaeological sites or isolates being recorded. During the cultural resources record search at the SCCIC, no prehistoric resources were found. The results of the pedestrian assessment indicate it is highly unlikely that prehistoric properties will be adversely affected by construction of the project. The cultural resource study findings at the SCCIC suggest that there is a low potential for finding resources.
Mitigation for minimizing impacts on potential TCRs is applicable to the project site because the land at the site was largely unused resulting in minimal disturbance to the native soil of the project site. The northern half of the project had been graded approximately two feet below the original native surface, exposing some soil but still consisting largely of small pebbles and small rock. The eastern edge of the parcel along Mango Street had been graded back approximately 35 feet level with the road and approximately two feet below the original surface.

Even with the minimal disturbance, the potential for subsurface prehistoric deposits is considered to be low. However, mitigation would be implemented to further reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. The applicable mitigation measure related to TCRs is provided below.

**Mitigation Measure**

**MM TCR-1:** In the event that a monitor is required and/or Native American cultural resources are discovered while working on site, all work shall be suspended 50 feet around the resource(s) and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the overall project may continue during this period if the following activities are initiated:

- Initiate consultation between the appropriate Native American tribal entity (as determined by a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards) and the City/project applicant;
- Transfer cultural resources investigations to the appropriate Native American entity (as determined by a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards) as soon as possible; and
- If the qualified archaeologist determines the resource(s) to be a “unique archaeological resource” consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 or a “tribal cultural resource” consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21074. A Cultural Resources Management Plan shall be prepared by the project archaeologist and submitted to the City Planning Division and South Central Coast Information Center at California State University Fullerton.

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Mitigation measure **TCR-1** requires consultation of a qualified archaeologist and the local Native American representative, if unanticipated discoveries are made during construction activities.
# 4.19 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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) 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>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

**Water Treatment:** As detailed in threshold 4.19 b) below, there would be sufficient water supplies to serve the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not require new or expanded water facilities. The project would have a less than significant impact in this regard.

**Wastewater Treatment:** The City’s sanitary sewer system involves more than 437 miles of sewer lines and pump stations (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10.7). Regional domestic wastewater treatment services
are provided under the Regional Sewer Service Contract with the Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA). The City’s wastewater is treated at the IEUA’s Regional Plant (RP)-1. The plant has undergone several expansions to increase the wastewater treatment capacity to its current 44 million gallons per day. The plant treats an average effluent wastewater flow of approximately 28 million gallons per day (IEUA, 2020).

The project proposes an industrial development on an approximately 5.8-acre site. As shown in Table 4.19-1, the proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 59 gallons per day of effluent. The wastewater estimated to be generated by the proposed project per day is a fraction of IEUA’s RP-1 daily capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient capacity available at the RP-1 to meet the needs of the proposed project.

### Table 4.19-1
**ESTIMATED PROJECT WASTEWATER GENERATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Generation Rate Gallons Per Net Acre Per Day (GPAD)</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
<th>Wastewater Generated (GPD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>59.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. City of Fontana, General Plan Update FEIR, Table 5.12-8 Wastewater Generation Factors, pp. 5.12-5.17.

The project proposes offsite sewer improvements to connect the sewer lines from the project site to the existing sewer network in Mango Avenue. All sewer line sizes and connections are subject to review by the City. The project applicant will work with the City’s Public Works Department for necessary approvals and ensure compliance with applicable requirements. No new treatment facilities or expanded entitlements will be required. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact regarding wastewater treatment.

**Stormwater Drainage:** The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) is responsible for implementing and overseeing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) programs for the City of Fontana. The project would be required by the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to obtain coverage under a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, as authorized by Section 402 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The project would be required to obtain an NPDES permit, prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) prior to commencement of construction activities; additionally, BMPs must be maintained, inspected after each precipitation event, and repaired or replaced as necessary (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.12-23 - 5.12-24).

The San Bernardino County Area-Wide Urban Storm Water Runoff Management Program regulates, through Order No. R8-2010-0036, the discharge of pollutants into waters of the U.S. through stormwater and urban runoff conveyance systems, including flood control facilities. These conveyance systems are commonly referred to as municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), or storm drains. Pursuant to the NPDES Permit (NPDES, also referred to as an MS4 Permit; NPDES No. CAS618036), Principal Permittees (i.e., San Bernardino County Flood Control District) and Co-Permittees (the City of Fontana is a Co-Permittee) must regulate discharges of pollutants in urban runoff from anthropogenic sources into storm water conveyance systems within their jurisdiction.
Project compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce potential erosion/siltation impacts during the construction phase of the project to a less than significant level. The proposed project would be designed in compliance with applicable City of Fontana regulations regarding stormwater runoff and the project would be reviewed by the City of Fontana Public Works Department to ensure that the development would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Refer to Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional information.

**Electric Power:** Electric power for the City of Fontana is provided by Southern California Edison (SCE) (City of Fontana, 2020b). The proposed project is located in a developed area, and infrastructure for providing electric power to the area is well established. SCE typically utilizes existing utility corridors to reduce environmental impacts, and has energy-efficiency programs to reduce energy usage and maintain reliable service throughout the year (SCE, 2020). The project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable Title 24 regulations, and would not necessitate the construction or relocation of electric power facilities. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

**Natural Gas:** The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the primary distributor of retail and wholesale natural gas across Southern California, including the City of Fontana. SoCalGas provides services to residential, commercial, and industrial consumers, and also provides gas for electric generation customers. In its 2018 California Gas Report, SoCalGas analyzed an 18-year demand period, from 2018-2035, to determine its ability to meet projected demand (California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2018, p. 63).

SoCalGas expects total gas demand to decline 0.74 percent annually from 2018 to 2035 as a result of energy-efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity goals, modest economic growth in its service region, and advanced metering infrastructure (California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2018, p. 66). Transportation-related industrial uses account for 2.7 percent of total industrial gas demand, and the proposed project is not of the size or scope to increase this demand (California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2018, p. 73). Moreover, SoCalGas plans on implementing aggressive energy-efficiency programs that will result in natural gas savings across all sectors that will ensure longevity of its natural gas supplies and adequate generation rates (California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2018, p. 78). Therefore, anticipated natural gas supply is adequate to meet demand in the SoCalGas region, and the proposed project is not expected to impact this determination. Thus, no natural gas facilities would have to be constructed or relocated, and a less than significant impact would occur.

**Telecommunications Facilities:** Telecommunication services, including internet, phone, and television, for the city of Fontana are provided by AT&T. The AT&T tower nearest the proposed project is located near 17173 Valley Boulevard, approximately five miles south of the project site (Google Earth Pro, 2020b). The proposed project would not interfere with operation of AT&T’s facilities, and a less than significant impact would occur.
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**

As detailed further in Section 4.10, Hydrology, the project site lies within the service area of the West Valley Water District (WVWD). WVWD participates in the San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan; This Urban Water Management Plan (UQMP) is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the years 2015 to 2040 (SBVRUWMP, 2015).

WVWD would receive its regional water supplies from the California State Water Project (SWP) and would receive its local water supply from the Chino Sub basin (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 2-1 and 2-15). During normal and wet years, WVWD uses SWP water for groundwater recharge. Additionally, the WVWD would implement a water shortage contingency plan that is separated into four stages of water rationing. In each of the water rationing stages, there are different restrictions that would limit the use of water use such as landscaping, construction water use, maintenance of leaking pipes, etc. (SBVRUWMP, 2015, p. 11-17). To determine the reliability of its water supplies, WVWD analyzed anticipated water supply and demand for normal, dry, and multiple dry years. These analyses totaled the amount of water expected from each of its supplies during various types of years, and compared them with anticipated demand, accounting for water conservation policies to be implemented in dry years. As shown in Tables 4.19-2, 4.19-3, and 4.19-4 below, water supplies are adequate to meet projected demand in normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

**Table 4.19-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>41,900</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>48,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>15,601</td>
<td>19,644</td>
<td>21,598</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>21,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Volumes are in acre-feet (AF).

*Source:* San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, 2015, p. 11-24

**Table 4.19-3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Volumes are in acre-feet (AF).

*Source:* San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, 2015, p. 11-24
Table 4.19-4
WVWD MULTIPLE DRY YEARS SUPPLY AND DEMAND COMPARISON (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>24,481</td>
<td>26,183</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>15,847</td>
<td>16,989</td>
<td>14,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>23,802</td>
<td>25,492</td>
<td>27,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>19,538</td>
<td>17,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>33,030</td>
<td>38,530</td>
<td>42,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
<td>45,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>18,719</td>
<td>20,030</td>
<td>21,422</td>
<td>22,943</td>
<td>24,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>14,311</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>20,608</td>
<td>22,087</td>
<td>20,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Volumes are in acre-feet (AF).
Source: San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, 2015, p. 11-24

Moreover, although the project would use water during project operation, increased water use from projects such as the proposed project have been accounted for in the latest UWMP prepared for WVWD. The UWMP found that with its current water supplies, planned future water supplies, and water conservation, WVWD will be able to reliably provide water to its customers. Although a minor increase in the demand for water would occur as a result of the project, the increase would not be significant because adequate water supplies and facilities are available to serve the proposed project, and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

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 described under threshold 4.19 a) above, the volume of wastewater generated by the project represents only a small fraction of the existing daily capacity of the wastewater treatment facility providing service in the area. Therefore, the wastewater anticipated to be generated by the project would be within the existing capacity of the wastewater treatment provider and less than significant impacts 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

Solid waste disposal services for Fontana are provided by Burrtec Waste Industries, a private company under franchise agreement with the City. Burrtec also operates the City's curbside recycling (including greenwaste recycling) program. Currently, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill located adjacent to the City of Fontana, in Rialto, is the primary solid waste depository for the area (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10.8).

The current permitted solid waste disposal at the Mid-Valley Landfill is 7,500 tons per day. As of 2019, the facility had 61,219,377 cubic yards of capacity remaining and the anticipated life for the landfill at its currently permitted capacity is 2045 (CalRecycle, 2020).

Project construction and operation would generate solid waste requiring disposal at local landfills. Materials generated during construction of the project would include paper, cardboard, metal, plastics, glass, concrete, lumber scraps and other materials. During construction (short-term) and operation (long-term), bulk solid waste, excess building material, fill, and other construction-related solid waste, would be disposed of in a manner consistent with State of California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (CIWMA) and would be removed from the project site. Existing regulations related to recycling during construction and operation phases of the project require that the project provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage, and collection of nonhazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, and metals.

The project is anticipated to have 40 employees which, using the solid waste generation rate in Table 4.19-5, would result in an estimated generation of 48 tons of waste per year. As discussed above, the current permitted solid waste disposal at the Mid-Valley Landfill is 7,500 tons per day. Therefore, the project’s construction waste would represent a small fraction of the City’s landfill capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Generation Rate¹</th>
<th>Waste (tons/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation related light-industrial</td>
<td>1.20 (tons/employee/year)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19-5
ESTIMATED PROJECT-GENERATED SOLID WASTE

Notes:

The project’s estimated increase of 0.13 ton of waste per day represents a small fraction of the Mid-Valley Landfill’s daily capacity (0.0017%). Since sufficient permitted landfill capacity exists to support operation of the proposed project, no adverse impact on either solid waste collection service or the landfill disposal system would occur. Therefore, project impacts on existing solid waste disposal facilities would be less than significant.

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

In 1989, the California Legislature enacted the California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939), in an effort to address solid waste problems and capacities in a comprehensive manner. The law required each city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000.

The San Bernardino Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (SBCIWMP) outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities would implement to create an integrated and cost-effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of AB 939 and its diversion mandates. The Infrastructure and Green Systems Element of the City of Fontana General Plan outlines programs to reduce, recycle and properly divert solid waste from sanitary landfills (Stantec, 2018a, p. 10.8).

Solid waste generated by the project would be collected by Burrtec Waste Industries, the designated waste hauler, and transported offsite to transfer facilities and landfills for reuse, recycling and/or disposal, as appropriate (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.12-20). Burrtec delivers solid waste to the Mid-Valley Landfill, which operates under a permit from San Bernardino County Department of Public Health, Solid Waste Management Division which requires regular reporting and monitors compliance.

The proposed project would comply with the SBCIWMP and the City’s waste reduction procedures and comply with applicable elements of AB 1327, Chapter 18 (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991) and other applicable local, state, and federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to regional landfills is reduced in accordance with existing regulations. Impacts are considered less than significant.
## 4.20 Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>X</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>X</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>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A wildfire is an uncontrolled fire that spreads through vegetative fuels, posing danger and threatening life and property. Wildfires can occur in undeveloped areas and spread to urban areas, where development can be heavily concentrated. The City is surrounded by foothills that have steep terrain and light, flashy fuels, and the predominate weather patterns feature high temperatures and low humidity, as well as seasonal high-speed Santa Ana winds. These factors together, with many homes that are built near or in the interface zone, have created a potential for significant damage due to wildfire. Historically, most of the wildfires in the City have occurred in northwest Fontana, with occasional fires in the Jurupa Hills. Northwest Fontana has high chaparral vegetation, steep slopes and is subject to hot Santa Ana winds blowing down the Cajon Pass. The Jurupa Hills have high grasses and steep slopes. The City has established a Fire Hazard Overlay District in sections of North Fontana and open space areas in South Fontana to reduce risk from wildfire.

The project is located generally in the central part of the city of Fontana. As demonstrated in Figure 4.9-2 (refer to Section 4.9), the project site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone Local Responsibility Area. Review of the CAL FIRE Fire Resource and Assessment Program (FRAP) maps for state responsibility areas (SRAs) in San Bernardino County indicates that the project site is not located in an SRA (CAL FIRE, 2020). Moreover, the City of Fontana does not contain any areas classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZs) in local responsibility areas (LRAs) (CAL FIRE, 2008). Therefore, the project site is not located in a fire hazard severity zone, and is not located in a fire hazard severity zone for either an SRA or an LRA, as detailed in Figure 4.9-1 and...
Figure 4.9-2 (refer to Section 4.9). However, there is a VHFHSZ in a local responsibility area that is approximately 0.4 mile to the north.

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**

As detailed above, the project site is not located in areas or lands classified as VHFHSZs. However, as shown in Figure 4.9-1, the project site is located 0.4 miles north of a VHFHZ LRA. The City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) anticipates that all interstates would serve as evacuation routes, and Interstate 210 is adjacent to the site, accessible from an on-ramp 0.25 mile south of the site at Sierra Avenue. The City has accommodated for continued growth and development in VHFHSZs and the proposed project would not affect efficacy of established fire-safety plans. Since the project is not located in an SRA or LRA and development near LRAs and VHFHSZs has been accounted for in the City's safety plans, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (City of Fontana, 2018b). A less than significant impact 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**

As detailed above, the project site is not located in areas or lands classified as VHFHSZs. However, the project site is near a VHFHZ LRA to the north. No slopes are located on the project site which could exacerbate wildfire risks. Historically, northwestern Fontana has faced the majority of wildfires in the city due to slopes and Santa Ana winds blowing down from the Cajon Pass. These fires have been contained in that region (Stantec, 2018b, pp. 5.7-10 – 5.7-11). Therefore, the project would not expose project occupants (i.e., those working at the project site during project operations) to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. 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**

As detailed above, the project site is not located in areas or lands classified as VHFHSZs, but is near VHFHSZs located to the north. However, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. As demonstrated in this document, neither construction nor operation of the project would result in significant temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. It would be constructed in compliance with applicable building
and fire codes. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact in this regard.

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**

As detailed above, the project site is not located in or near areas or lands classified as VHFHSZs, but is near a VHFHSZ to the north. However, the proposed project would not 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. The project site is relatively flat and is not located in an area with high slopes or unstable ground conditions. Moreover, the City of Fontana 2017 LHMP, states that there have been no historical occurrences of landslides in the city. The majority of the City of Fontana, including the project site, has relatively stable geology and soils with a very low risk of liquefaction (Stantec, 2018b, p. 5.5-10). Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact in this regard.
4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the project have:</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) 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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Section 4.4 of this document addresses impacts on biological resources. The project site is located in an urbanized setting and provides low habitat value and low occurrence potential for special-status plant and wildlife species identified in the BSA. Based on an assessment of the wildlife species generated by the literature review and query from publicly available databases35 for reported occurrences within a 5-mile radius of the project site, only one sensitive wildlife species, burrowing

35 Databases include California Natural Diversity Database and USFWS’ Information, Planning, and Conservation, (IPaC). Previous studies and reports within the project site and project vicinity were reviewed to gain a sense of the existing conditions at the time the studies were conducted.
The burrowing owl was determined to have a moderate potential to occur on the project site. Considering that there are piles of concrete slabs on the project site, there is a potential for burrowing owl individuals to utilize these structures for burrowing and nesting purposes. There is a potential that rodents, a preferred prey source, would forage in the non-native annual grassland onsite. Due to the onsite presence of burrowing structures and prey sources, there is a moderate potential for this species to occur on the project site. Furthermore, the project site and surrounding area could potentially provide cover and nesting habitat for bird species that have adapted to urban areas, and are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code. No nests were observed during biological survey conducted on the project site. However, trees in adjacent properties within the typical 200 to 500-foot buffer zone were not surveyed. Offsite trees could provide suitable future or current nesting sites, including nesting sites for passerine species such as the ones observed during the biological survey. Birds that nest on the ground, such as killdeer may also utilize the unvegetated areas within the project site for nesting. With the implementation of project improvement measures PIM-1 through PIM-3 and mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-5, the project would have a less than significant impact on nesting bird species as well as special-status plant and wildlife species.

Section 4.5 of this document addresses potential impacts on Cultural Resources. The project would be built on vacant land that has been graded. Based on the cultural resources records search, it was determined that no historic cultural resources have been previously recorded within the project site boundary. The result of the pedestrian survey was negative for both prehistoric and historic sites and isolates on the project site. Based on the results of the records search and tribal consultation it is unlikely that cultural resources or tribal resources would be adversely affected by construction of the project. No human remains have been previously identified or recorded onsite. It is unlikely that undisturbed unique archaeological resources exist on the project site. However, grading activities associated with development of the project would cause new subsurface disturbance and could potentially result in the unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources. Mitigation measures CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3 are recommended to reduce potential impacts on archeological resources and human remains to a less than significant level.

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The proposed project would be consistent with regional plans and programs that address environmental factors such as air quality, water quality, and other applicable regulations that have been adopted by public agencies with jurisdiction over the project for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects.

Sections 4.3 and 4.13 of this Initial Study address potential impacts related to Air Quality and Noise, respectively. As detailed in Section 4.3, air quality impacts associated with project construction and operation would be less than significant and do not warrant mitigation. As detailed in Section 4.13, construction and operational noise impacts associated with the project site were found to be less than significant and do not warrant mitigation.
The project would create employment opportunities (both during the construction and operational phases); employees from the local workforce would be hired during both the construction and operational phases of the project. The project is not of the scope or scale to induce people to move from outside of the project area to work at the proposed project. The project does not include a housing component or otherwise support an increase in the resident population of the City and would utilize existing infrastructure for its operation. Therefore, indirect population growth resulting solely from the project is expected to be less than significant.

Because the project would not increase environmental impacts after mitigation measures are incorporated, the incremental contribution to cumulative impacts is anticipated to be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

**Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**

The Phase I ESA report prepared for the project states that there was one Recognized Environmental Concern (REC) identified for the project site, which is groundwater contamination sourced from the adjacent landfill located east of the project site. However, as detailed in **Section 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials)**, current ongoing remediation would result in less than significant impacts. Further, the future tenant is unknown at this time and use of specific hazardous materials is unknown. With the implementation of mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**, potential impacts associated with handling of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

As discussed in **Sections 4.1 through 4.20** of this document, after the implementation of mitigation measures, potential adverse environmental effects were found to be less than significant on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.
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7.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared in conformance with § 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and § 15097 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which requires all state and local agencies to establish monitoring or reporting programs whenever approval of a project relies upon a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The MMRP ensures implementation of the measures being imposed to mitigate or avoid the significant adverse environmental impacts identified through the use of monitoring and reporting. Monitoring is generally an ongoing or periodic process of project oversight; reporting generally consists of a written compliance review that is presented to the decision-making body or authorized staff person.

It is the intent of the MMRP to: (1) provide a framework for document implementation of the required mitigation; (2) identify monitoring/reporting responsibility; (3) provide a record of the monitoring/reporting; and (4) ensure compliance with those mitigation measures that are within the responsibility of the lead agency and/or project applicant to implement.

The following subjects require mitigation:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources

The following subjects do not require mitigation:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry
- Air Quality
- Energy
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Services
- Wildfire

Table 7.0-1 lists impacts, mitigation measures and project improvement measures adopted by the City of Fontana in connection with approval of the proposed project, level of significance after mitigation, responsible and monitoring parties, and the project phase in which the measures are to be implemented. Only those environmental topics for which mitigation is required are listed in this Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/ MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold 4.4a)</strong> Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>MM BIO-1: Biological Monitor</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A biological monitor is a qualified biologist with experience surveying for and monitoring the special-status species relevant to the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If special-status wildlife species or nesting bird species are observed and determined present within the project site during the pre-construction breeding bird surveys, then a biological monitor shall be onsite to monitor throughout activities that result in tree or vegetation removal to minimize the likelihood of inadvertent impacts on nesting birds and other wildlife species. Monitoring shall also be conducted periodically during construction activities to ensure no new nests occur during any vegetation removal or building demolition activities between January 1 through August 31. The biological monitor shall ensure that all biological resources mitigation measures, best management practices, avoidance, and protection measures and mitigation measures described in the relevant project permits and reports are in place and are adhered to.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The biological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt all construction activities and all non-emergency actions if sensitive species and/or nesting birds are identified and would be directly affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Prior to the Start of Project Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The biological monitor will stop work until the individual animal moves outside of the work area where it will not be harmed (&quot;out of harm's way&quot;). Work can continue at the location once the biological monitor has determined that the activity will not result in direct impacts or adverse effects on the animal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nesting birds and bird nest will not be moved; a buffer will be established surrounding the nest, as described in MM-BIO-2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM BIO-2: Pre-Construction Breeding Bird Survey</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If construction is anticipated to commence during the nesting season (between January 1 and August 31 of any given year, or as determined by a local CDFW office), a qualified avian biologist shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey no earlier than one week prior to construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.0-1
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
### TOPICAL AREA

#### IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In accordance with the MBTA and CFGC (3503, 3503.5, 3513), if an active bird nest of a protected species is located during the pre-construction survey and potentially will be affected, a no-activity buffer zone shall be delineated on maps and marked in the field by fencing, stakes, flagging, or other means up to 500 feet for raptors, or 100 feet for non-raptors. Materials used to demarcate the nests will be removed as soon as work is complete or the fledglings have left the nest. The qualified avian biologist (and/or qualified biological monitor with experience monitoring nesting birds) will determine the appropriate size of the buffer zone based on the type of activities planned near the nest and bird species. Buffer zones will not be disturbed until the qualified avian biologist determines that the nest is inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, or the young will no longer be affected by project activities. Periodic monitoring by the qualified avian biologist will be performed to determine when nesting is complete. After the nesting cycle is complete, project activities may begin within the buffer zone. MM BIO-3: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) If a special-status species, such as burrowing owl is identified onsite, prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the County shall be responsible for the preparation of a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP). The WEAP shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area’s environmental conditions and the environmental protection measures that must be adhered to by all workers throughout the duration of project construction. An environmental training program shall be established to communicate environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including spill prevention, emergency response measures, protection of water quality, biological and cultural resources, and proper BMP implementation, to all construction and maintenance personnel. Training materials shall be language-appropriate for all construction personnel. Upon completion of the WEAP, workers shall sign a form stating that they attended the program, understand all protection measures, and shall abide by all the rules of the WEAP. A record of all trained personnel shall be kept with the construction foreman at the project field construction office and shall be made available to any resource agency personnel. If new construction personnel are added to the project later, the construction foreman shall ensure that new personnel receive training</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
<td>3. Prior to the Start of Project Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### TOPICAL AREA IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before they start working. The biologist shall provide written hard copies of the WEAP and photos of the sensitive biological resources to the construction foreman.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
<td>3. Prior to the Start of Project Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM BIO-4: BUOW Surveys (Breeding and Non-breeding Season)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located in the known distributional range of the burrowing owl (BUOW) (<em>Athene cunicularia</em>) and the site contains suitable habitat to potentially support BUOWs; therefore, BUOW surveys are required by CDFW, in accordance with the guidelines set forth by CDFW in the <em>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (Staff Report)</em> (CDFG, 2012). Surveys will be conducted by biologists who are familiar with BUOW habitat, natural history, ecology, behavior, and field identification of the species and BUOW sign.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total of four protocol BUOW surveys will be conducted during the BUOW breeding season because BUOWs are more detectable during that season. In accordance with the <em>Staff Report</em>, one BUOW survey will be conducted between February 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and April 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and three surveys will be conducted at least three weeks apart between April 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and July 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, with at least one visit after June 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;. <strong>The last day to conduct a BUOW survey is June 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; in order to get three surveys in by July 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;.</strong> Surveys will be conducted from sunrise to 10:00 a.m. or from two hours before sunset until evening twilight when weather conditions are conducive to BUOW observations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologists will conduct surveys within the project site and within a zone 500 feet out from the project site; defined the Biological Study Area (BSA). Surveys will be conducted in accessible portions of the BSA that contain BUOW essential habitat (nesting, foraging, wintering, and dispersal habitat). Inaccessible areas and areas of private land will be surveyed with binoculars/scopes only. Surveys will not extend beyond the BSA. Biologists will walk straight-line belt transects spaced no more than 20 meters apart to allow 100 percent visual coverage of the survey area, and examine entrances of potential burrows and suitable man-made structures for BUOWs and signs of BUOWs. Biologists will identify, record, and map with a global positioning system (GPS) unit BUOWs and potential BUOW signs. Detailed notes and wildlife species encountered during the surveys will be recorded in field notes. The purpose of the surveys is to determine if BUOWs are foraging or nesting on or adjacent to the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following completion of the focused BUOW surveys, the biologist will prepare a focused BUOW survey report in accordance with the guidelines described in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 7.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Report: The report will: 1) summarize information regarding the BUOW's natural history; 2) assess the habitat of the survey area and its suitability for the BUOW; 3) describe the number, behavior, and location of any BUOWs detected during the surveys or assess the potential presence of BUOWs onsite; 4) analyze the potential impacts on the BUOW from project development; and 5) recommend, as appropriate, best management practices (BMPs), avoidance and protection measures, and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid potential impacts on BUOWs. The report will include: 1) methods and results of the literature review and field surveys; 2) figures depicting the location of BUOWs, if any; and 3) site photographs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If no BUOWs or signs of BUOWs are observed during the surveys and concurrence is received from CDFW, project activities may begin and no further mitigation will be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If BUOWs or signs of BUOWs are observed during the surveys, the site will be considered occupied and the BUOWs may need to be relocated. UltraSystems will contact CDFW to assist in the development of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, prior to commencing project activities. A passive relocation program (Burrowing Owl Mitigation Monitoring and Artificial Burrow and Exclusion Plan) may be necessary and will need to be approved by CDFW prior to commencing project activities. The costs associated with that plan and program are not included in this proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If burrowing owls or their sign are observed onsite, a pre-construction BUOW survey (Take Avoidance Survey) may be required no more than 14 days and 24 hours prior to ground disturbing activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM BIO-5: Burrowing Owl Mitigation Monitoring and Artificial Burrow and Exclusion Plan</td>
<td>If BUOW are found onsite during surveys, then A Burrowing Owl Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (with the aforementioned incorporated exclusion plan) will be prepared including site-specific methodology to minimize and mitigate impacts to this species, in accordance with the guidelines set forth by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) in the Staff Report (2012). The Burrowing Owl Mitigation and Monitoring Plan may include but not be limited to the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preconstruction Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MM BIO-5: Burrowing Owl Mitigation Monitoring and Artificial Burrow and Exclusion Plan

- Project Applicant
- Field Verification
- 1. City of Fontana and CDFW
- 2. City of Fontana
- 3. Prior to the Start of Project Construction
### Section 7.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.5 Cultural Resources | • Buffer Zones around occupied burrowing owl burrows  
• Burrowing owl Minimization Measures (WEAP, biological monitor, physical barriers, visible markers near burrows, etc.)  
• Passive Relocation (one-way doors, artificial burrows, etc.)  
• Seasonal Work Periods  
• Establishment of a Conservation Easement or other legal instrument  
• Consultation with CDFW. | | | | | |

**Threshold 4.5a)** Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

**MM CUL-1:** Prior to the commencement of grading or excavation, workers conducting construction activities and their foremen will receive Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training from a qualified archaeologist regarding the potential for sensitive archaeological and paleontological resources to be unearthed during grading activities. The workers will be directed to report any unusual specimens of bone, stone, ceramics or other archaeological artifacts or features observed during grading and/or other construction activities to their foremen and to cease grading activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist or Native American cultural monitor is notified of the discovery by the Superintendent of the project site and can assess their significance.

The WEAP shall be implemented to educate all construction personnel of the area's environmental conditions and the environmental protection measures that must be adhered to by all workers throughout the duration of project construction.

Training materials shall be language-appropriate for all construction personnel. Upon completion of the WEAP, workers shall sign a form stating that they attend the program, understand all protection measures, and shall abide by all the rules of the WEAP. A record of all trained personnel shall be kept with the construction foreman at the project field construction office and shall be made available to any resource agency personnel. If new construction personnel are added to the project later, the construction foreman shall ensure that new personnel receive training before they start working. The archaeologist shall provide hard copies of the WEAP presentation to the construction foreman.

Project Applicant  
Field Verification  
1. City of Fontana  
2. City of Fontana  
3. Prior to Project Construction
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### Section 7.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM CUL-2: If historical or unique archaeological resources are discovered during construction, the contractor shall halt construction activities in the immediate area and notify the City. An on call qualified archaeologist shall be notified and afforded the necessary time to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). The qualified archaeologist shall recommend the extent of archaeological monitoring necessary to ensure the protection of any other resources that may be in the area and afforded the necessary time and funds to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). Construction activities may continue on other parts of the site while evaluation and treatment of historical or unique archaeological resources takes place.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
<td>3. During Project Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold 4.5b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 above.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 above.</td>
<td>1. Project Applicant</td>
<td>2. Field Verification</td>
<td>3. Refer to mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold 4.5c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>MM CUL-3: If human remains are encountered during excavations associated with this project, all work shall stop within a 30-foot radius of the discovery and the San Bernardino County Coroner will be notified (§ 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code). The Coroner will determine whether the remains are recent human origin or older Native American ancestry. If the coroner, with the aid of the supervising archaeologist, determines that the remains are prehistoric, they will contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will be responsible for designating the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD (either an individual or sometimes a committee) will be responsible for the ultimate disposition of the remains, as required by § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. The MLD will make recommendations within 24 hours of their notification by the NAHC. These recommendations may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials (§ 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code).</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
<td>3. During Project Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 7.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td><strong>Threshold 4.7f)</strong> Project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</td>
<td>MM GEO-1: If paleontological resources are uncovered during project construction, the contractor shall halt construction activities in the immediate area and notify the City. The on-call paleontologist shall be notified and afforded the necessary time and funds to recover, analyze, and curate the find(s). Subsequently, the monitor shall remain onsite for the duration of the ground disturbance to ensure the protection of any other resources that are found during construction in the project site.</td>
<td>Project Applicant</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>1. City of Fontana</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td><strong>Threshold 4.9a)</strong> Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>MM HAZ-1: In the event that the future tenant will handle hazardous materials above the reportable quantity threshold, the lease agreement with the future tenant shall require the tenant to submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan which would include an inventory of all hazardous materials used, stored, or otherwise managed onsite to the County of San Bernardino County Fire Department – Hazardous Materials Division and the Fontana Fire Protection District. The recommendations of the Hazardous Materials Business Plan would be included in the lease agreement (signed by the tenant) as mandatory measures required to be implemented by the tenant.</td>
<td>Future Tenant</td>
<td>Review and Approval of Hazardous Materials Business Plan</td>
<td>1. County of San Bernardino Fire Department</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM HAZ-2: In the event that the future tenant will handle hazardous materials above the reportable quantity threshold, the lease agreement with the future tenant shall require the tenant, in coordination with the City of Fontana, to identify routes along which hazardous materials may routinely be transported. If essential facilities such as schools, hospitals, child care centers or other facilities with special evacuation needs are located along these routes, the tenant shall develop an emergency response plan that can be implemented in the event of an unauthorized release of hazardous materials. The recommendations of the Emergency Response Plan would be included in the lease agreement (signed by the tenant) as mandatory measures required to be implemented by the tenant.</td>
<td>Future Tenant</td>
<td>Review and Approval of Emergency Response Plan</td>
<td>1. County of San Bernardino Fire Department</td>
<td>2. City of Fontana</td>
<td>3. Post-Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold 4.9b)</strong> Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 7.0 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold 4.9f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure TRANS-1 below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure TRANS-1 below.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure TRANS-1 below.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure TRANS-1 below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.17 Transportation**

| Threshold 4.17d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? | MM TRANS-1: The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) must be reviewed and approved by the City’s Traffic Engineer prior to the start of construction activity in the public right-of-way (ROW). The typical TMP requires items such as the installation of K-rail between the construction area and open traffic lanes, the use of flagmen and directional signage to direct traffic where only one travel lane is available or when equipment movement creates temporary hazards, and the installation of steel plates to cover trenches under construction. The TMP must provide that emergency access must be maintained at all times. | Project Applicant | Field Verification | 1. City of Fontana | 2. City of Fontana | 3. During Construction |

**4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources**

| Threshold 4.18a): 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: | MM TCR-1: In the event that a monitor is required and/or Native American cultural resources are discovered while working on site, all work shall be suspended 50 feet around the resource(s) and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the overall project may continue during this period if the following activities are initiated: | Project Applicant | Field Verification, Review and Approval of Cultural Resources Management Plan | 1. Native American Tribes and City of Fontana | 2. City of Fontana | 3. During Construction |
| | | | | | | |
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### TOPICAL AREA IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **ENFORCEMENT AGENCY**
   - If the qualified archaeologist determines the resource(s) to be a "unique archaeological resource" consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 or a "tribal cultural resource" consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21074. A Cultural Resources Management Plan shall be prepared by the project archaeologist and submitted to the City Planning Division and South Central Coast Information Center at California State University Fullerton.

2. **MONITORING AGENCY**

3. **MONITORING PHASE**

(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.

### TOPICAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT IMPROVEMENT MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **4.4 Biological Resources**

#### Threshold 4.4a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**PIM-1: Project Limits and Designated Work Areas**

- To avoid impacts on common native and special-status wildlife, the project proponent shall implement the following measures prior to project construction and commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal.
- The project boundary shall be set at the minimum size to accomplish necessary work, resulting in minimal impacts on sensitive biological resources.
- Specifications for the project boundary, limits of grading, project related parking, storage areas, laydown sites, and equipment storage areas shall be mapped and clearly marked in the field with temporary fencing, signs, stakes, flags, rope, cord, or other appropriate markers. All markers shall be maintained by the contractor until the completion of activities in that area. No

**Project Applicant**

**Field Verification**

1. City of Fontana
2. City of Fontana
3. Prior to the Start of Project Construction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICAL AREA IMPACT</th>
<th>MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE/MONITORING PARTY</th>
<th>MONITORING ACTION</th>
<th>1. ENFORCEMENT AGENCY</th>
<th>2. MONITORING AGENCY</th>
<th>3. MONITORING PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Threshold 4.4a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | Vegetation shall be removed outside of the marked areas and no construction debris, equipment, or soils shall be placed outside of the marked areas.  
- To minimize disturbance, the construction/laydown activities, parking, staging, storage, spoil management, and equipment access shall be restricted to designated areas. Designated areas shall be comprised of existing surfaces and previously disturbed areas (parking lots, access roads, graded and degraded areas, etc.) to the extent possible.  
- Project related work limits shall be defined and work crews shall be restricted to designated work areas. Disturbance beyond the actual construction zone shall be prohibited without site-specific surveys and permission of the Biological Monitor. | Project Applicant | Field Verification | City of Fontana | City of Fontana | During Project Construction |

**PIM-2: General Vegetation Avoidance and Protection Measures**

Throughout construction of the project, the following general avoidance and protection measures to protect vegetation will be implemented to the extent feasible:

- Vegetation located outside of the project work limits shall be flagged off and avoided.
- Vegetation removal within the work limits shall occur immediately before the commencement of ground-disturbing construction activities, to reduce the potential for erosion, sedimentation, and/or siltation into downstream, offsite, waters of the U.S. and state.
- Cleared or trimmed vegetation and woody debris shall be disposed of in accordance with regulatory permit conditions.
- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall be prohibited from collecting plants or parts of plants, including flowers.

**PIM-3: General Wildlife Avoidance and Protection Measures**

To minimize indirect impacts, as well as construction-related mortalities of nocturnally active species such as mammals and snakes, all non-emergency work shall be conducted during daylight hours. All unnecessary lights shall be turned off at night to avoid attracting wildlife such as insects, migratory birds, and bats.

- Project Applicant
- Field Verification

- City of Fontana
- City of Fontana
- During Project Construction
Nighttime work (and use of artificial lighting) shall not be permitted unless specifically authorized by CDFW.

- During operation of the project, impacts to the adjacent landfill hillside that may be used by avian species for breeding, foraging, or movements would occur primarily in the forms of noise and lights. Implementation of the measures below will minimize operational impacts to a less than significant level.
- All lighting along the east side of the project shall be downcast luminaries with light directed away from the adjacent landfill hillside. All installed project lighting shall be designed to be directed away from the hillside using shielded lights, low-sodium vapor lights, downcast lights, bollard lights, or other available light and glare minimization methods.
- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall be prohibited from feeding, capturing, or collecting wildlife. To avoid the potential for mortality and harassment of wildlife, all non-security related firearms, weapons, and domestic pets shall be prohibited from the project site.
- Contractors, subcontractors, employees, and site visitors shall inspect their vehicles and equipment for the presence of wildlife prior to moving them. The biological monitor shall be contacted if a special-status species is detected and is in danger of being harmed.
- All steep-walled excavations (e.g., pitfalls, trenches, holes, bores) greater than two feet deep created during the project shall be completely covered at all times except when being actively used, to prevent entrapment of wildlife (e.g. reptiles and small mammals). If excavations cannot be covered, escape ramps (maximum slope of 2:1) shall be provided to allow trapped animals to escape and exclusion fencing shall be installed around the excavation. Excavations shall be inspected immediately before backfilling and any wildlife discovered in the excavation shall be removed by the qualified biologist.