

1. Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed Etiwanda Avenue/Country Village Road Truck Restriction Ordinance. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies consider the environmental consequences before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority. An environmental impact report (EIR) analyzes potential environmental consequences in order to inform the public and support informed decisions by local and state governmental agency decision makers. This document focuses on impacts determined to be potentially significant in the Initial Study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the City of Jurupa Valley's CEQA procedures. The City of Jurupa Valley as the lead agency has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports as necessary to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this DEIR derive from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, noise, and transportation and traffic).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This DEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. CEQA established six main objectives for an EIR:

1. Disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. Identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
3. Prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
4. Disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
5. Foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
6. Enhance public participation in the planning process.

1. Executive Summary

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; it is intended to provide an objective, factually supported analysis and full disclosure of the environmental consequences of a proposed project with the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Before approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information in the EIR; determine whether the EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency; adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives; and adopt a statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Format

Chapter 1, Executive Summary. Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this EIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

Chapter 2, Introduction. Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the project, the notice of preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

Chapter 3, Project Description. A detailed description of the project, including its objectives, its area and location, approvals anticipated to be required as part of the project, necessary environmental clearances, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting. A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the notice of preparation was published, from local and regional perspectives. These provide the baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of the project's environmental impacts.

Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis. Each environmental topic is analyzed in a separate section that discusses: the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance after mitigation is incorporated; and the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Chapter 6, Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts. Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

Chapter 7, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. Describes the alternatives and compares their impacts to the impacts of the proposed project.

1. Executive Summary

Chapter 8, Impacts Found Not to Be Significant. Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this EIR.

Chapter 9, Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project. Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

Chapter 10, Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project. Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

Chapter 11, Organizations and Persons Consulted. Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR.

Chapter 12, Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR. Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the proposed project.

Chapter 13, Bibliography. The technical reports and other sources used to prepare this EIR.

Appendices. The appendices for this document (in PDF format on a CD attached to the front cover) consist of these supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation and Initial Study
- Appendix B: Initial Study Public Review Comments; Scoping and Agency Outreach Meeting Attendance Sheets
- Appendix C: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Modeling Data
- Appendix D: Health Risk Assessment Background and Modeling Data
- Appendix E: Noise Modeling Data
- Appendix F: Traffic Analysis Study

1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This DEIR

This DEIR has been prepared as a “Project EIR,” defined by Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3). This type of EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project and should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation.

1. Executive Summary

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Jurupa Valley covers approximately 43.5 square miles in Riverside County. The City is bordered by the City of Fontana, the City of Ontario, and San Bernardino County to the north, the City of Norco and the City of Riverside to the south, the City of Eastvale to the west, and the City of Riverside and San Bernardino County to the east. The proposed project would restrict trucks over 16,000 lbs. on an approximately 0.6-mile segment of Etiwanda Avenue and an approximately one-mile segment of Country Village Road (see Figure 3-1, *Regional Location*, and Figure 3-2, *Area Roadway Network*).

Specifically, the proposed project involves the following roadway segments:

- Etiwanda Avenue between SR-60 and Hopkins Street (see Figure 3-3, *Potential Restricted Segment, Etiwanda Avenue*)
- Country Village Road between SR-60 and Philadelphia Avenue (see Figure 3-4, *Potential Restricted Segment, Country Village Road*)

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The 1.1-million-square-foot Mira Loma Commerce Center (industrial/warehouse project) was approved in 2011 by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. The Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) filed a lawsuit against the County of Riverside, the City of Jurupa Valley and others challenging the project. The lawsuit contended that the project violated the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by failing to mitigate its environmental effects on Mira Loma Village, a single-family residential neighborhood situated south of the approved project. A settlement agreement was reached in the case, *Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice v. County of Riverside*, that included a requirement to conduct a study for restricting trucks on Etiwanda Avenue between SR-60 and Hopkins Street. The City is subject to the settlement agreement.

On February 20, 2014, the City initiated traffic studies on Etiwanda Avenue from the State Route 60 to Hopkins Street. The results of the traffic study were presented at the City Council meeting of December 4, 2014. Pursuant to requirements outlined by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), it was noted that a diversion of trucks to other roadways would need further study to identify potential impacts of noise and air quality. Implementing truck restrictions would also require support from adjoining communities.

On February 5, 2015, additional traffic, air, and noise analyses were initiated. The findings, presented on May 5, 2016, revealed that truck restrictions along Etiwanda Avenue would result in the diversion of trucks that would impact residents along Country Village Road north of SR-60. The truck restriction route was expanded to include Country Village Road between SR-60 and Philadelphia Avenue.

The proposed project for this EIR is the adoption of a City ordinance restricting medium-heavy- and heavy-heavy-duty trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating over 16,000 lbs. from accessing Etiwanda Avenue between SR-60 and Hopkins Street and Country Village Road between SR-60 and Philadelphia Avenue in the City of Jurupa Valley.

1. Executive Summary

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 Alternatives Considered and Rejected during the Planning Process

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15126[5][B][1]). Unlike land use development projects, the proposed Etiwanda / Country Village Road Truck Restriction Ordinance would implement a change in transportation operation and would not result in physical impacts to a particular site. Moreover, this project is unique because consideration of the truck restriction along Etiwanda Avenue is a requirement of the 2012 settlement reached in the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ) lawsuit challenging the County of Riverside's approval of the Mira Loma Commerce Center (see Section 3.3.1 *Description of the Project*). The requirement is tied specifically to the impact of truck traffic along this route to the adjacent Mira Loma Village community. Evaluation of a truck restriction ordinance that did not include the specified segment of Etiwanda Avenue (SR-60 to Hopkins Street) would therefore not comply with the settlement agreement.

Based on the initial traffic study prepared pursuant to the settlement agreement, however, it was determined that truck restriction exclusively on Etiwanda Avenue would divert a substantial number of trucks to Country Village Road to the east. Residential uses along this roadway would then be disproportionately impacted by the additional truck traffic. The relative impacts of the Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Restriction are evaluated.

1.5.2 Alternatives Selected for Further Analysis

1.5.2.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project alternative, trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating over 16,000 lbs. would continue to be allowed on the 0.6-mile segment of Etiwanda Avenue between SR-60 and Hopkins Street and the 1-mile segment of Country Village Road between SR-60 and Philadelphia Avenue.

Ability to Reduce Environmental Impacts

Table 1-1, *Summary of Project Alternative Impacts Compared to Proposed Project* [reproduce Table 7-1 as Table 1-1], includes a significance conclusion and impact summary for each topical area for the project alternatives, including the No Project alternative.

The No Project alternative represents what would happen if the proposed truck restriction ordinance is not implemented. For air quality and greenhouse gases, conditions were evaluated for 2020 compared to the proposed project. This year represents a worse case than 2035 (as included in the traffic study) because by 2035, higher vehicle emission standards will be reflected and reduce project-related emissions. The analysis for traffic and noise reflects year 2035 conditions, which is the worst case for those impacts. Under the No

1. Executive Summary

Project alternative, air quality, land use, and noise impacts would be increased compared to the proposed project. Future health risk and noise conditions would be significantly worse than the proposed project. Since the No Project alternative would not be consistent with General Plan policies to implement truck routes to minimize impacts to residential uses, this land-use impact would also be considered significant. Impacts to the roadway network would be different than the proposed project but considered similar as far as significance. Greenhouse gas impacts would also be similar. Overall, the proposed project is environmentally superior to the No Project alternative.

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Alternative Impacts Compared to Proposed Project

Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative		Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Restriction Alternative	
		Significance	Impact Comparison	Significance	Impact Comparison
Air Quality	LS	> S	Health risk impacts under this alternative would be substantially greater and affect residents along Etiwanda Avenue and Country Village Road. Compared to the proposed project cancer risk of 21 in a million, this alternative would result in risk as high as 66 in a million. For comparison, an acceptable risk is less than 10 in a million. Criteria pollutants related to overall vehicle emissions and miles traveled would nominally decrease and remain less than significant.	> S	Health risk impacts under this alternative would be substantially greater and affect residents along Country Village Road and Mulberry Avenue, since a substantial number of trucks would utilize these two roadways instead of Etiwanda Avenue. Since overall vehicle miles traveled would likely decrease under this alternative, air quality impacts not related to health risk would be similar to the proposed project and remain less than significant.
Greenhouse Gas	LS	= LS	A decrease in vehicle miles traveled under this alternative would decrease GHG emissions by 202 MTCO _{2e} per year. Overall GHG emissions impacts would nominally decrease and remain less than significant.	= LS	Since overall vehicle miles traveled would likely decrease under this alternative, GHG emissions would also decrease and impacts would remain less than significant.
Land Use	LS	> S	The No Project alternative would not as effectively achieve the goals and policies of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan, not avoiding impacts to sensitive residential uses. Under this alternative, truck traffic would continue to adversely affect disadvantaged and minority residential neighborhoods, particularly Mira Loma Village.	> S	This alternative would not as effectively achieve the goals and policies of the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan. Some trucks would be diverted from Etiwanda Avenue to Country Village Road, which would increase noise, health risk, and traffic along residences by Country Village Road.
Noise	LS	> S	Noise impacts to noise sensitive areas in the study area under this alternative would be greater, adversely affecting residents adjacent to Etiwanda Avenue with increases of up to 3 dBA and	> PS	Noise impacts to noise sensitive areas in the study area under this alternative would be greater, adversely affecting residents adjacent to Country Village Road.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Alternative Impacts Compared to Proposed Project

Environmental Impact	Proposed Project	No Project Alternative		Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Restriction Alternative	
		Significance	Impact Comparison	Significance	Impact Comparison
			residences adjacent to Country Village Road with increases of up to 2 dBA. Traffic noise increases of 3 dBA to residences adjacent to Etiwanda Avenue would be significant.		Noise impacts to residences along Country Village Road would likely be significant.
Transportation/ Traffic	S	= S	Intersection level of service along Etiwanda Avenue and Country Village Road would worsen compared to the proposed project. Four more intersections along Etiwanda Avenue and County Village Road would be significantly impacted. This alternative would result in significant impacts at fewer (9 instead of 12) freeway ramps. Traffic impacts for the No Project alternative would be increased at intersections but decreased at freeway ramps. Overall, the traffic impact under the No Project alternative would be similar to the proposed project.	= S	Intersection level of service along Country Village Road and Philadelphia Street would worsen compared to proposed project. More intersections along County Village Road and Philadelphia Street would be significantly impacted. This alternative would result in significant impacts at fewer freeway ramps. Traffic impacts for this alternative would be increased at intersections but decreased at freeway ramps. Overall, the traffic impact under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

- > Impact would be greater than proposed project
- = Impacts would be similar to the proposed project
- LS Less than Significant Impact
- PS Potentially Significant Impact
- S Significant Impact (if not indicated, impacts could be mitigated to less than significant)

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

This summary references the project objectives as numbered in Section 3.2, *Project Objectives*. The preparation of this DEIR achieves the project objective to comply with the Consent Judgement in *CCA EJ v. County of Riverside* (Objective 1). Assuming that City decision makers move forward and review the environmental findings of this DEIR in addition to other factors and consider the adoption of the ordinance, whether or not the ordinance is adopted, Objective 2 would also be achieved. However, the No Project alternative would not achieve project objectives 3 and 4. This alternative would not be consistent with the goals in the City's General Plan to designate truck routes and manage commercial truck impacts to disadvantaged and other residential neighborhoods (Objective 3). Also, as quantified in this DEIR, relative to the proposed project, the No Project alternative would increase exposure to toxic air contaminants at sensitive receptors and residential neighborhoods (Objective 4). Since transportation would be similar to the proposed project, it is determined to be similar in maintaining the efficiency of the local regional transportation system (part of Objective 4). In summary, this alternative would achieve two of the four project objectives.

1. Executive Summary

1.5.2.2 TRUCK RESTRICTION ORDINANCE: ETIWANDA AVENUE ONLY ALTERNATIVE

Consideration of a truck restriction ordinance along Etiwanda Avenue between SR-60 and Hopkins Street is the court settlement requirement. Although preliminary studies indicated that restricting trips only on Etiwanda Avenue would result in diversion of substantial truck traffic to Country Village Road (and resulting impacts to residences along that arterial), detailed studies were not conducted. This alternative is provided to provide decision makers with a more comprehensive analysis and comparison to the proposed project.

Ability to Reduce Environmental Impacts

Table 1-1, *Summary of Project Alternative Impacts Compared to Proposed Project*, includes a significance conclusion and impact summary for each topical area for the project alternatives, including the Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Restriction alternative.

Air quality, land use, and noise impacts would be increased under this alternative relative to the proposed project. Future health risk and noise conditions would be substantially worse for residents along Country Village Road. Health risk impacts would be significant, and noise levels may increase as much as 3 dBA, and therefore would also be significant. This alternative would partially comply with the General Plan policy to implement truck routes to minimize impacts to residential uses, but since it would result in significant impacts to Country Village Road residences, the land use impact would also be considered significant. Impacts to the roadway network would be different than the proposed project but considered similar as far as significance. Greenhouse gas impacts would also be similar. Overall, the proposed project is environmentally superior to the Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Reduction alternative.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

This summary references the project objectives as numbered in Section 3.2, *Project Objectives*. The preparation of this DEIR achieves the project objective to comply with the Consent Judgement in the *CCAEJ v. County of Riverside* lawsuit (Objective 1). Assuming that City decision makers move forward and review the environmental findings of this DEIR in addition to other factors and consider the adoption of the ordinance, whether or not the ordinance is adopted, Objective 2 would also be achieved. However, the Etiwanda Avenue Only Truck Restriction alternative would not achieve project objectives 3 and 4. This alternative would not be completely consistent with the goals in the City's General Plan to designate truck routes and manage commercial truck impacts to disadvantaged and other residential neighborhoods (Objective 3). It would reroute truck trips from Etiwanda Avenue and reduce traffic, health risk, and noise impacts to Mira Loma Village. However, this would be at the expense of increasing these impacts at residences along Country Village Road. As such, compared to the proposed project, the Etiwanda Avenue Only restriction would substantially increase exposure to toxic air contaminants at sensitive receptors and residential neighborhoods (Objective 4). Since transportation would be similar to the proposed project, it is determined to be similar in maintaining the efficiency of the local regional transportation system (part of Objective 4). In summary, this alternative would achieve two of the four project objectives.

1. Executive Summary

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to:

1. Whether this DEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project.
2. Whether the benefits of the project override those environmental impacts which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
3. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.
4. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the project besides the Mitigation Measures identified in the DEIR.
5. Whether there are any alternatives to the project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed project and achieve most of the basic project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. There are no specific areas of known controversy concerning the proposed project. The City of Jurupa Valley has no knowledge of any expressed opposition to the proposed project.

Prior to preparation of the DEIR, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for a 30-day review period (February 9, 2018 to March 10, 2018, and a public scoping meeting was held on March 1, 2018. A second scoping meeting was conducted March 13, 2018 to solicit comments from affected agencies (surrounding cities, and transportation and resource agencies). Comments received in response to the NOP and at the two scoping meetings are detailed in Section 2.2, *Notice of Preparation and Initial Study*, and copies of comment letters received and attendees at these meetings are included in Appendix B. The majority of comments related to the requested scope of the technical studies to be conducted for the EIR, and also the potential for the diversion of truck traffic to increase traffic volumes and create new impacts in surrounding cities (Ontario, Fontana, and Eastvale).

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-2 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant, and mitigation measures are identified for all significant impacts. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented. With the exception of transportation impacts, the project's impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

1. Executive Summary

Implementation of the truck restriction ordinance would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to a local intersection with grade separation (Milliken Avenue/Mission Boulevard) and also result in significant, unavoidable impacts to the state freeway system. Preliminary fair share contribution and cost estimates for required improvements to mitigate the project's impacts have been calculated. The project-related fair-share cost estimate for local intersection improvements is \$92,900,000 and the fair share cost estimate for project-related impacts to state highway facilities is \$ 1,083,610. Both the intersection and freeway improvements are outside the City of Jurupa Valley's jurisdiction. While the City will coordinate with other agencies and seek funding for improvements to mitigate project impacts, there is no guarantee that the mitigation measures will be implemented. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.3 AIR QUALITY			
Impact 5.1-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not generate short-term emissions in exceedance of SCAQMD'S threshold criteria.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the generation of long-term emissions in exceedance of SCAQMD's operation-phase regional significance thresholds.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-3: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations of toxic air contaminants.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not generate CO hotspots.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-5: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-6: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
Impact 5.2-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not generate a net increase in GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.2-2: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
Impact 5.3-1: Project Implementation would not conflict with the Southern California Association of Governments 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy goals.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-2: The proposed project would be consistent with the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-3: The proposed project would not conflict with the adopted Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.12 NOISE			
Impact 5.4-1: Project implementation would result in long-term operation-related noise that would not result in substantial noise increases.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
Impact 5.5-1: Project truck traffic restrictions would impact levels of service in the local circulation system.	Potentially significant.	T-1: In the event the City of Ontario proposes to widen the South Milliken Avenue Grade Separation to 4 lanes to accommodate southbound through movement, the City of Jurupa Valley shall participate in a funding agreement with the City of Ontario (and other applicable agencies) to fund its fair share contribution to this improvement. Preliminary fair share calculation is 5.5 percent.	Significant and unavoidable

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.5-2: The project would impact levels of service in the freeway system.	Potentially significant.	T-2: The city shall coordinate with RCTC, Caltrans and Ontario to update areawide roadway plans and programs; and seek funding for improvements as needed to achieve Caltrans', RCTC and local jurisdiction standards to fund its fair share contribution to this improvement.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.5-3: The truck restrictions implemented with the project would result in designated highways exceeding county congestion management agency service standards.	Potentially significant.	No feasible mitigation measures were identified.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.5-4: Project circulation improvements have been designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.5-5: The proposed project complies with adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation.	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact

1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.