

# Industry Business Center Environmental Impact Report - Addendum

State Clearinghouse No. 2003121086

On October 28, 2004, the City of Industry approved the Industry Business Center Project (IBC Project) (SCH 2003121086) (2004 IBC EIR).

The 2004 IBC EIR evaluated the development of approximately 4,146,000 net square feet of commercial and/or office space and 633,000 net square feet of industrial space on 597.4 acres, as shown in Table 1, *Industry Business Park*.<sup>1</sup> The site consists of two large development areas, one east and one west of Grand Avenue; the Pomona and Orange freeways (SR-60 and SR-57, respectively) border the south side of the project site (see Figure 1, *Regional Location* and Figure 2, *Local Vicinity*).

**Table 1 Industry Business Park**

LAND USE	IBC LAND USE (SQ FT)
Retail (Commercial Center, Regional Retail)	1,268,000
Office (Corporate Office, General Office, Business Park)	2,878,000
Industrial(M)	633,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,779,000</b>

In 2018 the Successor Agency to the Industry Urban-Development Agency proposed, and the City of Industry's Planning Commission approved, Tentative Parcel Map No. 352 which subdivided the 597.4-acre parcel comprising IBC into five numbered and ten lettered parcels. The Parcel Map concentrated on subdividing the area east of Grand Avenue, with five numbered and nine lettered lots, and created Parcel J containing all the land west of Grand Avenue. The map also included the dedication of "B" Street, which realigned the original road on the east side of Grand Avenue (see Figure 3, *Tentative Parcel Map 352*). The intersections of "B" Street and Grand Avenue remained in their original planned locations. An Addendum to the 2004 IBC EIR for TPM 352 was certified in 2018. This Parcel Map created Parcel 3, which is the subject of proposed Development Plan No. 19-03.

## 1.1 PROPOSED PROJECT

The project applicant, Majestic Realty, has submitted two development plans for three industrial buildings within the Industry Business Center for a total of 751,480 square feet. These include:

<sup>1</sup> The land uses assumed for the IBC in the 2014 City of Industry General Plan Update (SCH 2011031090) remained the same as addressed in the original mixed-use plan approved in 2004 and addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR.

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

- **Development Plan No. 19-03** proposes one concrete tilt-up industrial building located at the southeast corner of Grand Avenue and Baker Parkway on Assessor's Parcel number 8719-008-902. The building will be approximately 627,480 square feet, as shown in Figure 4, *Development Plan No. 19-03*. This property is subject to a lease between the Successor Agency to the Industry Urban Development Agency and Industry East Business Center, LLC. The General Plan land use designation of the property was changed from Industrial to Employment in 2014; this General Plan designation allows the proposed industrial use. Tentative Parcel Map No. 352 approved in 2018, created the 34.1-acre parcel, which is proposed to be developed with this plan.
- **Development Plan No. 19-04** proposes two concrete tilt-up industrial buildings located at the southwest corner of Grand Avenue and Baker Parkway on Assessor's Parcel number 8719-007-934. One building will be approximately 64,000 square feet and the other will be approximately 60,000 square feet, as shown in Figure 5, *Development Plan No. 19-04*. This property is subject to a lease between the Successor Agency to the Industry Urban Development Agency and Industry East Business Center, LLC. The General Plan land use designation of the site was changed from Industrial to Employment in 2014; this General Plan designation allows the proposed industrial use. The project site is a part of a larger parcel J created by Tentative Tract Map No. 352 approved in 2018.

The two development plans totaling 751,480 sq. ft. of industrial space represents an increase of 118,480 sq. ft. over what was addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR (633,000 sq.ft.). However, the total amount of development would not increase, as a corresponding amount of business park space would be eliminated from the IBC, as shown in the Table 2, *Land Use Summary*, below.

**Table 2 Land Use Summary**

LAND USE	EXISTING IBC LAND USE	PROPOSED IBC LAND USE	CHANGE
Retail (Commercial Center, Regional Retail)	1,268,000	1,268,000	0
Office (Corporate Office, General Office, Business Park)	2,878,000	2,759,520	-118,480
Industrial	633,000	751,480	118,480
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,779,000</b>	<b>4,779,000</b>	<b>0</b>

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designations and no General Plan Amendment or Zone Change is necessary.

## 1.2 PURPOSE OF AN EIR ADDENDUM

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a), an addendum shall be prepared if some changes or additions to a previously adopted EIR are necessary, but none of the conditions enumerated in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a)(1)–(3) calling for the preparation of subsequent EIR have occurred. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations):

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - (b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (d) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The proposed project would fulfill none of the conditions outlined in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a)(1)-(3) as these changes would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects requiring major revisions to the 2004 IBC EIR. Accordingly, this checklist provides the substantial evidence required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e) to support the finding that a subsequent EIR is not required and an addendum to the 2004 IBC EIR is the appropriate environmental document to address changes to the project.

As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR):

- a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.
- b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

- c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.
- d) The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.
- e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

### 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Section 15164(b) of the “CEQA Guidelines” (Title 14, Cal. Code of Regs., § 15000 et seq.) authorizes a lead agency to prepare an addendum to an EIR “if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.”

The 2004 IBC EIR found that development of the project would result in less than significant impacts with regard to Aesthetics, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, and Recreation. The following issues were found to be less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures: Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Public Services. Significant and unavoidable impacts were determined to occur with regard to Air Quality and Transportation, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

The following discussion compares the proposed project to the 2004 IBC EIR.

#### 1.3.1 Aesthetics

According to the 2004 IBC EIR, impacts to aesthetics would be **less than significant** upon the implementation of project design features and City requirements.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project, and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites’ existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. Historically, the project area has been characterized by gentle rolling hills. However, both project sites and the surrounding area have been graded for the development of industrial, manufacturing, and business center land uses.

The project will comply with all existing City design regulations and guidelines, such as the placement of buildings and structures; the design of setback areas; landscaping and architectural design parameters, lighting standards, and sign standards. With adherence to regulatory requirements, the aesthetic impacts of the proposed project **would be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**, which found impacts to Aesthetics to be **less than significant**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

### 1.3.2 Agricultural Resources

The project area and nearby vicinity do not contain soils of statewide importance, and the area is not considered prime agricultural land. The project sites have been graded and do not support agricultural use. The project sites are zoned Industrial (M) which is consistent with the proposed development. The 2004 IBC EIR found impacts to Agricultural Resources to be **less than significant**, as the City had planned to discontinue the previous agricultural activities (cattle grazing) on the site, as the area was converted to urban uses.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project, and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. Proposed project will not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR. The impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.3 Air Quality

The 2004 IBC EIR determined that **significant and unavoidable impacts** could occur even with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Development of the project does not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the EIR. The table below shows that the conversion of 118,480 sq. ft. of business park (contemplated by the 2004 Industry Business Center Project) to industrial will reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and corresponding air pollution that the 2004 IBC EIR assumed would occur from the development of the project sites. The proposed development plans would also reduce the total number of daily trips generated, as well as AM and PM peak hour trips, when compared to the 2004 IBC EIR. As set forth in Section 1.3.15, *Traffic and Circulation*, herein, the proposed development plans would reduce average daily trips (ADTs) by 485, total AM peak hour trips by 82, and total PM peak hour trips by 69. The project will incorporate all relevant mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR. With incorporation of mitigation measures, the impacts **will be no more significant than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

**VMT COMPARISON - IBC WAREHOUSE PROJECT (DP 19-03 AND DP 19-04 COMPARED TO 2004 IBC MIXED USE PROJECT)**

Land Use	Size SF	VMT
<b>Development Plans 19-03 and 19-04</b>		
Building 2 (ITE 150)	623,480	18,564
Buildings 11&12 (ITE 150)	124,000	3,692
<b>Total</b>	<b>751,480</b>	<b>22,256</b>
<b>2004 IBC Mixed Use</b>		
Area E-5 Warehouse (ITE 150)	633,000	18,832
Business Park*(ITE 110)	118,480	10,171

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

<b>Total</b>	<b>751,480</b>	<b>29,003</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-6,747</b>
Land use category applied to IBC Industrial Project: 150 Warehousing; 110 Business Park		

### 1.3.4 Biological Resources

The two project sites and their surroundings have been graded and do not contain riparian habitat. Diamond Bar Creek is located along the southeast boundary of the IBC, approximately 0.32 mile from the closest portion of the project sites. An unnamed drainage is located along the northeast corner of the IBC, approximately 0.52 mile from the closest portion of the project site. The 2003 Biological Impact Analysis identified riparian vegetation in the vicinity of these areas, along the southeast boundary and in the north east corner of IBC. The project will not result in additional impacts to these areas because of the distance.

The 2004 IBC EIR evaluated biological impacts of development within IBC. The 2004 IBC EIR found that no adverse impacts would occur to special status plants and special status animals, as it was determined that there is no reasonable likelihood for their occurrence on the project site. The 2004 IBC EIR found that impacts to riparian and wetland habitats, other sensitive natural communities, and wildlife corridors would be **less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures**.

The proposed project will not result in the development of any land that was not evaluated in the 2004 IBC EIR, and any development of that same land would result in the same impacts on biological resources (or lack thereof), regardless of the ultimate use. The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project, and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. Regulatory requirements and mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR would continue to apply to IBC development. Development of the project sites would not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2004 EIR. The impacts **will be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.5 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

The 2004 IBC EIR identified impacts to historic resources to be less than significant. The 2004 IBC EIR found the impacts to archeological and paleontological resources within IBC to be **less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures** outlined in the 2004 IBC EIR and adherence to regulatory requirements.

The proposed changes would not result in the development of any land that has not been previously analyzed in the 2004 EIR, and any development of that same land would result in the same impacts on cultural resources (or lack thereof), regardless of the ultimate use. The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project, and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The changes would not cause any additional environmental impact to the significance of an historical, archaeological, or paleontological resource or to human remains. The impacts **would be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.6 Energy

The 2004 IBC EIR did not analyze impacts to energy. However, the proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project, and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. Both project sites and the surrounding area have been graded for the development of industrial, manufacturing, and business center land uses. All new construction is required to comply with Title 24 of the California Building Code that regulates consideration of energy consumption in design.

As set forth in Section 1.3.15, *Traffic and Circulation*, herein, the proposed development plans would reduce average daily trips (ADTs) by 485, total AM peak hour trips by 82, and total PM peak hour trips by 69, from what was projected in the 2004 IBC EIR. The project will incorporate all relevant mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR. As the proposed project would not substantially increase intensity of the approved development and would result in less traffic, impacts to energy would be **less than significant**.

### 1.3.7 Geology and Soils

The following impacts were found to be **less than significant** in the 2004 IBC EIR: rupture of a known earthquake fault as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map; exposure to seismic ground shaking; erosion or loss of topsoil; result in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; and located on expansive soil with compliance with regulatory requirements, and standard conditions. The 2004 IBC EIR found that impacts from exposure of people, structures, or property to major geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, or ground failure could have a significant impact and imposed Mitigation Measures 5.5-1 through 5.5-5, including slope stability analysis prior to grading, evaluation of excavations by a geologist and geotechnical engineer, and compliance with specific excavation requirements. The 2004 IBC EIR found that these impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation**. These mitigation measures still apply to any development within IBC.

Geologic investigations prepared in association with the IBC 2004 mixed use plan concluded that portions of the IBC, including the Grand/Baker site, would be susceptible to varying degrees of impacts related to unstable soils. In response to the geologic constraints, a remedial mass grading plan was prepared and implemented.

Development under the proposed project would be required to adhere to regulatory requirements, standard conditions, Project Features and mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR.

The proposed project will have no additional geological impacts. The general placement of structures resulting from the proposed changes does not vary substantially from the plan for structure placement in the 2004 IBC

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

EIR. Therefore, the impact analysis of soil stability presented in the 2004 IBC EIR would still be applicable. No additional environmental impacts beyond those addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR would result from approval of the proposed changes. The impacts **would be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The 2004 IBC EIR did not analyze impacts to greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, the 2014 General Plan EIR is used for the analysis of the proposed project's impacts to greenhouse gas emissions.

The 2014 EIR determined that significant and unavoidable GHG impacts could occur even with the incorporation of mitigation measures. Development of the project does not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2014 EIR. As explained in the Air Quality section above, the proposed project would reduce VMT and trip generation when compared to the development of the project sites assumed and analyzed in the 2014 EIR, which in turn will reduce GHG emissions. The project will incorporate all relevant mitigation measures specified in the 2014 EIR. With incorporation of mitigation measures, the impacts **will be no more substantial** than the impacts evaluated under the 2014 EIR.

### 1.3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2004 IBC EIR found the following impacts to be **less than significant**, upon the implementation of project design features: create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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; and impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The 2004 IBC EIR found potentially significant impacts related to location on a site included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and imposed Project Design Features and mitigation measures; the 2004 IBC EIR concluded that these impacts would **be less than significant with mitigation**. These mitigation measures would continue to apply to the project site.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The proposed changes would not result in additional impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials. The Project Design Features and mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR would continue to apply to the proposed project. The impacts **will be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures or alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

The 2004 IBC EIR found that impacts to the following would be **less than significant** upon regulatory requirements: violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; substantially deplete



## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in the flooding on- or off-site; and otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The 2004 IBC EIR found the following impacts to be **less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated**: substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; 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; and expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

The proposed project sites are not in a 100-year flood hazard area and no structures would be placed within a 100-year floodplain as a result of the proposed changes. There are no significant water bodies identified within the project vicinity.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and does not propose development of any land not considered under the 2004 IBC EIR, increase overall square footage or intensity of development, or increase population or employment. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The project will conform to all regulatory requirements, conditions of approval, project design features, and mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR. The impacts **will be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 EIR**. No new mitigation measures or alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.11 Land Use and Planning

The 2004 IBC EIR found that the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts, and impacts were determined to be **less than significant**.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The proposed industrial land use is permitted by and would not otherwise conflict with the zoning or general plan designation of the site. The proposed changes would not result in the development of any land not considered in the 2004 IBC EIR. The impacts **will be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.12 Mineral Resources

Impacts to Mineral Resources were found to be **less than significant** in the 2004 IBC EIR. The proposed project does not result in the development of any land not considered in the 2004 IBC EIR. The proposed

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The impacts **will be no more substantial than the impacts evaluated under the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.13 Noise

The 2004 IBC EIR determined that impacts to noise would be **less than significant** upon implementation of regulatory requirements and project design features. Development of the project does not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development or allow any uses not permitted by the project sites' General Plan land use designation or Industrial (M) zoning. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The noise generated during operation of the proposed industrial buildings will not be greater than, and because of advances in technology will likely be less than, the noise levels assumed and analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR. Vehicle related noise would decrease as the number of trips and VMT would decrease.

The impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**. No mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.14 Population and Housing

The 2004 IBC EIR found that development of the land uses would result in **less than significant impacts** to population and housing.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any increase in development net square footage or land use intensity. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The project would not induce population growth in the area or displace housing or people beyond that analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR. The proposed changes would not result in the development of any land not considered in the 2004 IBC EIR. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.15 Public Services and Utilities

The 2004 IBC EIR found that development of the land uses would result in **less than significant impacts with mitigation measures incorporated** to fire protection services and police protection services; impacts to the following were found to be **less than significant** with the implementation of regulatory requirements:

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

school services, wastewater services, water services, solid waste services, electricity services, and natural gas services.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The project would not result in the development of any land not considered in the 2004 IBC EIR, and the proposed changes would not substantially affect the population or employment growth, and therefore demand for public services and utilities, in any way not considered in the 2004 IBC EIR. Therefore, the impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**, which assumed the full development of the entire IBC site, specifically including the project sites. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.16 Recreation

Impacts to Recreation were found to be **less than significant** in the 2004 IBC EIR.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. The project would not induce population or employment growth beyond that analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR and therefore would not increase demand for or use of parks. Because there would be no increase in use, no deterioration of facilities would occur as a result of the proposed changes. The impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.17 Traffic and Circulation

The 2004 IBC EIR determined that **significant and unavoidable impacts** could occur even with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

The proposed development plans include minor conversion of land uses within IBC when compared to the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and do not propose any substantial change in intensity or scale of approved development. The proposed development plans are consistent with, and permitted by, the project sites' existing Employment General Plan land use designation and Industrial (M) zoning. As also explained in Section 1.3.3, *Air Quality*, of this Addendum, the table below shows that the conversion of 118,480 sq. ft. of business park (contemplated by the 2004 Industry Business Center Project and analyzed in the 2004 EIR) to industrial would reduce the number of vehicle trips and VMT generated by the development of the project sites, and no impact would occur beyond the impacts already fully analyzed by the 2004 IBC EIR and no impact would occur.

---

#### IBC WAREHOUSE PROJECT (DP 19-03 AND DP 19-04 COMPARED TO 2004 IBC MIXED USE PROJECT)

---

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

Land Use	Size SF	ADT	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Development Plans 19-03 and 19-04								
Building 2 (ITE 150)	623,480	1,421	107	31	138	42	112	154
Buildings 11&12 (ITE 150)	124,000	283	21	6	27	8	23	31
Total	751,480	1,704	128	37	165	50	135	185
2004 IBC Mixed Use								
Area E-5 Warehouse (ITE 150)	633,000	1,442	109	32	141	42	116	158
Business Park* (ITE 110)	118,480	747	93	13	106	13	83	96
Total	751,480	2,189	202	45	247	55	199	254
Difference		-485	-74	-8	-82	-5	-64	-69

Land use category applied to IBC Industrial Project: 150 Warehousing; 110 Business Park  
PCE: passenger car equivalent.

Development of the project does not introduce any impacts beyond those addressed in the 2004 IBC EIR. The project will incorporate all relevant mitigation measures specified in the 2004 IBC EIR. With incorporation of mitigation measures, the impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR**. No new mitigation measures are necessary, and no alternatives analyses are required.

### 1.3.18 Wildfire

The 2004 IBC EIR did not analyze impacts to wildfires. However, the project site is located in an urbanized portion of the City, with surrounding paved areas and access to fire hydrants. The proposed project would not impair emergency response or evacuation plans, and would not change the topography, weather, or add fuel to the project site. The proposed project would not add infrastructure such as overhead power lines in areas with wildland vegetation. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

### 1.3.19 Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

No land would be developed as a result of the proposed changes that was not evaluated for development in the 2004 IBC EIR. There would be no additional construction in the project area as a result of the approval of the development plans. There would be no net increase in industrial square footage. The proposed changes would not lead to increases in population and employment. The impacts of the proposed project **will be no**

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

**more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR.** No new mitigation measures or alternatives analyses would be required.

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

No land would be developed as a result of the proposed changes that was not evaluated for development in the 2004 IBC EIR. There would be no net increase in industrial square footage. The impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR.** No new mitigation measures or alternatives analyses would be required.

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

No land would be developed as a result of the proposed changes that was not evaluated for development in the 2004 IBC EIR. There would be no additional construction in the project area as a result of these changes. There would be no net increase in industrial square footage. The proposed changes would not lead to increases in population or employment. The impacts of the proposed project **will be no more substantial than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR.** No new mitigation measures or alternatives analyses would be required.

### 1.3.20 Conclusion

There are no substantial changes in the circumstances or new information that was not known and could not have been known at the time of the adoption of the 2004 Certified EIR. The previously adopted mitigation measures would be required to be implemented, and no new or previously considered mitigation measures would be required to be adopted.


The proposed project consists entirely of land uses permitted by project sites’ existing General Plan land use designation and zoning and represents a minor change from the impacts that were assumed and analyzed by the 2004 IBC EIR. As a result, and for the reasons explained in this Addendum, the project would not cause any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of significant environmental impacts disclosed in the 2004 IBC EIR. In fact, the proposed project would result in less impacts than analyzed in the 2004 IBC EIR in numerous important respects, including impacts relating to air quality and traffic. Thus, the proposed project does not trigger any of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 allowing the preparation of a subsequent EIR, and the appropriate environmental document as authorized by CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(b) is an addendum. Accordingly, this EIR Addendum has been prepared. The Addendum describes the changed components of the proposed tentative parcel map, analyzes impact changes, and demonstrates that the project will not create any new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of those significant environmental impacts disclosed in the 2004 Certified EIR.

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 1 - Regional Location



----- Project Boundary

0 5  
Scale (Miles)



Source: ESRI, 2004


PlaceWorks

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 2 - Local Vicinity



--- Project Boundary

0 3,000  
Scale (Feet)





Source: ESRI, 2004

PlaceWorks

## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*

Figure 3 - Tentative Parcel Map 352



## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*





## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## DEVELOPMENT PLANS 19-03 AND 19-04

*This page intentionally left blank.*