



City of Rancho Cucamonga ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY PART II

BACKGROUND

1. **Project File:** Design Review DRC2018-00326
2. **Related Files:** Variance DRC2018-00760, Minor Exception DRC2018-00761 and Minor Exception DRC2018-00762
3. **Description of Project:** ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DESIGN REVIEW DRC2018-00326, VARIANCE DRC2018-00760, MINOR EXCEPTION DRC2018-00761, AND MINOR EXCEPTION DRC2018-00762 - CHARLES JOSEPH ASSOCIATES - A request to demolish an existing metal industrial building of approximately 13,000 square feet, a request to reduce the required amount of truck trailer stall parking from 4 stalls to 1 stall, a request to reduce the required amount of vehicle parking from 96 parking stalls to 74 parking stalls, and a request to reduce the required minimum 5 foot side yard building setback to 4 feet 6 inches in conjunction with a request for site plan and architectural review to construct a 58,130 square foot industrial office, manufacturing and warehouse building on 2.76 acres of land within the Industrial Park (IP) District at 10234 4th Street; APN: 0210-371-01.
4. **Project Sponsor Name and Address:**
Charles Joseph Associates
9581 Business Center Drive, Suite D
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
5. **General Plan Designation:** Industrial Park
6. **Zoning:** Industrial Park
7. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located on a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The metal building and the parking lot are proposed for demolition. In 2017, the applicant obtained approval and demolished a cell tower located near the north area of the parcel. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Along the west property line is a wrought iron fence, a block wall along the north property line, and various trees (non-heritage) and shrubs along the east property line. There is an approximate 10 foot grade difference from north to south. The project site is bound on the north by industrial office buildings. To the east are office/industrial park buildings. To the west is a recently constructed warehouse building. Across Fourth Street, is an apartment complex (Centre Club Apartments) in the City of Ontario. The zoning of the property and all properties to the north, east, and west is Industrial Park (IP) District.
8. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**
City of Rancho Cucamonga
Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

9. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Mike Smith
(909) 477-2750, extension 4317

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

GLOSSARY – The following abbreviations are used in this report:

CALEEMOD – California Emissions Estimator Model
CVWD – Cucamonga Valley Water District
EIR – Environmental Impact Report
FEIR – Final Environmental Impact Report
FPEIR - Final Program Environmental Impact Report
NPDES – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NOx – Nitrogen Oxides
ROG – Reactive Organic Gases
PM₁₀ – Fine Particulate Matter
RWQCB – Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAQMD – South Coast Air Quality Management District
SWPPP – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," or "Less Than-Significant-Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Waste Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. 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 standard 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 1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and 2) 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.

Prepared By: _____

Date: _____

Reviewed By: _____

Date: _____

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	()	()	(✓)	()
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	()	()	(✓)	()

Comments:

- a) The project is located 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street, on the north side of Fourth Street. There are no significant vistas within or adjacent to the project site. The site is not adjacent to Haven Avenue, nor is the site within a view corridor according to General Plan Figure LU-6. No impacts are anticipated.
- b) The project site contains no scenic resources and no historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway. There are no State Scenic Highways within the City of Rancho Cucamonga. No impacts are anticipated.
- c) The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. Similar sized industrial buildings are located in the immediate area. The visual quality of the area will not degrade as a result of this project because the building is of similar scale and size to the industrial building that is immediately adjacent to the west, and the proposed building will house warehouse and manufacturing uses, which are common north and west of the project site.

The project complies with the City's technical requirements including floor area ratio; minimum building, parking lot, and wall setbacks; dock and storage area screening; and landscape coverage as described in the Development Code. A full Design Review entitlement is required prior to approval. City standards require the developer to underground existing and new utility lines and facilities to minimize unsightly appearance of overhead utility lines and utility enclosures in accordance with Planning Commission Resolution No. 87-96, unless exempted by said Resolution. As the building is of comparable scale and size to the existing industrial buildings in the surrounding area, visual impacts to the office buildings to the east and multi-family buildings to the south, across Fourth Street, a divided road with a landscaped median containing trees and groundcover, are considered less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- d) The project would increase the number of streetlights and security lighting used in the immediate vicinity. The design and placement of light fixtures will be shown on site plans which require review for consistency with City standards that require shielding, diffusing, or indirect lighting to avoid glare. Lighting will be selected and located to confine the area of illumination to within the project site. The impact is considered less than significant.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>					
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?		()	()	()	(✓)
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		()	()	()	(✓)
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause re-zoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))?		()	()	()	(✓)
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		()	()	()	(✓)
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The site is not designated as Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance according to the Farmland Resources Exhibit from the 2010 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. Similar sized industrial buildings are located in the immediate area.

There are approximately 209 acres of Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance within the City of Rancho Cucamonga according to the General Plan and the California Department of Conservation Farmland Map 2010. Concentrations of Important Farmland are sparsely located in the southern and eastern parts of the City that is characterized by existing and planned development. Farmland in the southern portion of the City is characterized by industrial,

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

residential, and commercial land uses and Farmland in the eastern portion of the City is within the Etiwanda area and planned for development. Further, a large number of the designated farmland parcels are small, ranging from 3 acres to 30 acres, and their economic viability is doubtful; therefore, they are not intended to be retained as farmland in the General Plan Land Use Plan. The General Plan FPEIR identified the conversion of farmlands to urban uses as a significant unavoidable adverse impact for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was ultimately adopted by the City Council. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for which the FPEIR was prepared and impacts evaluated. No impacts are anticipated.

- b) There is no agriculturally zoned land within the City of Rancho Cucamonga. There are no Williamson Act contracts within the City. No impacts are anticipated.
- c) There are no lands within the City of Rancho Cucamonga that is zoned as forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur related to the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Further, there are no areas within the City of Rancho Cucamonga that are zoned as forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.
- d) There are no lands within the City of Rancho Cucamonga that qualify as forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur related of the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Further, there are no areas within the City of Rancho Cucamonga that are zoned as forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production. No impacts are anticipated.
- e) The site is not designated as Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance according to the Farmland Resources Exhibit from the 2010 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. Similar sized industrial buildings are located in the immediate area. There are no active agricultural uses within one mile of the project site. There is a vineyard located approximately ¼ mile to the east at the northeast corner of Haven Avenue and Fourth Street; however, this vineyard has not been actively cultivated for several years, and it is not expected to remain as entitlements for development have been submitted. Further, the proposed project site is located ¼ mile from the inactive vineyard, with office buildings between the project site and the inactive vineyard. Development of the project site from ancillary impacts, such as fugitive dust, will not adversely impact the inactive vineyard because of 1) mitigations listed under Air Quality; 2) the distance separation and 3) buffer of the existing built environment. Lastly, there are no lands within the City of Rancho Cucamonga that qualify as forest land. Therefore, there is no potential for conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Therefore, no adverse impacts are anticipated.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	()	(✓)	()	()
c) 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 (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	()	(✓)	()	()
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	()	(✓)	()	()
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	()	()	(✓)	()

Comments:

- a) As discussed in subsection b), with mitigation measures, the project would not exceed any air quality standards and would not interfere with the region’s ability to comply with Federal and State air quality standards for Criterion 1 Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations (local air quality impacts) or Criterion 2 Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP (consistency with the 2003 AQMP). Therefore, the project is consistent with the 2003 AQMP. No impacts are anticipated.

- b) Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based ambient air quality standards (AAQS) for seven air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), coarse particulate matter with a diameter or 10 microns or less (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter less than 2.5 (PM_{2.5}) microns in diameter and lead. Among these pollutants, ozone and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) are considered regional pollutants while the others have more localized effects. In addition, the State of California has set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), vinyl chloride and visibility reducing particles. These standards are designed to protect the health and welfare of the populace with a reasonable margin of safety.

The City of Rancho Cucamonga area is within the South Coast Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) provides the SCAQMD with the authority to manage transportation activities at indirect sources. Indirect sources of pollution are generated when minor sources collectively emit a substantial amount of pollution. Examples of this include motor vehicles at an intersection, a mall and on highways. SCAQMD also regulates stationary sources of pollution within a jurisdictional area. Direct emissions from motor vehicles are regulated by the Air Resources Board (ARB).

The combination of topography, low mixing height, abundant sunshine, and emissions from the second largest urban area in the United States gives the Basin the worst air

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

pollution problem in the nation. The Basin experiences a persistent temperature inversion (increasing temperature with increasing altitude); this inversion (coupled with low wind speeds) limits the vertical dispersion of air contaminants, holding them relatively near the ground.

Pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) of 1970, the EPA established national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for six major pollutants, termed criteria pollutants: ozone (O₃), coarse particulate matter with a diameter or 10 microns or less (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter less than 2.5 (PM_{2.5}) microns in diameter, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead.

Criteria pollutants are defined as those pollutants for which the Federal and State governments have established AAQS, or criteria, for outdoor concentrations in order to protect public health. Data collected at permanent monitoring stations are used by the EPA to classify regions as “attainment” or “non-attainment” depending on whether the regions met the requirements stated in the primary NAAQS. Nonattainment areas have additional restrictions as required by the EPA. The EPA has designated the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) responsible for ensuring the Basin’s compliance with the FCAA. The South Coast Air Basin is in Non-Attainment Status for Ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}.

Specific criteria for determining whether the potential air quality impacts of a project are significant are set forth in the SCAQMD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The criteria include daily emissions thresholds, compliance with State and national air quality standards, and consistency with the current AQMP. As prescribed by SCAQMD, an Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Health Risk Assessment Impact Analysis was prepared by Kunzman Associates (March 31, 2018) that utilizes CalEEMod (Version 2016.3.2 to evaluate short-term construction emissions and short-term construction emissions for localized significant thresholds, long-term operational emissions, operation emissions for localized significant thresholds, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Short Term (Construction): Project Emissions and Impacts

The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial building. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The metal building and the partial parking lot will be demolished as part of the proposal for the new 58k industrial building. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The potential emissions associated with construction of the project are described in the following sections.

Short Term (Construction): Project Emissions and Impacts

Summary of Peak Construction Emissions: SCAQMD Regional Thresholds (with Best Available Control Measures):

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

As shown in the following tables from the Kunzman and Associates Air Quality Analysis (March 31, 2018), project implementation will not exceed significance thresholds for SCAQMD Regional Thresholds or SCAQMD Localized Thresholds. Modeling methodology utilized for Construction and Operational Regional Thresholds is CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2

Table 7

Construction-Related Regional Pollutant Emissions¹

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM10	PM2.5
Demolition						
On-Site	2.48	24.36	15.11	0.02	1.80	1.40
Off-Site	0.12	1.29	0.91	0.01	0.23	0.06
Total	2.60	25.65	16.02	0.03	2.03	1.46
Grading						
On-Site ²	2.15	24.29	10.38	0.02	3.75	2.39
Off-Site ³	0.07	0.05	0.56	0.00	0.11	0.03
Total	2.22	24.34	10.94	0.02	3.86	2.42
Building Construction						
On-Site	2.91	20.71	15.72	0.03	1.26	1.21
Off-Site	0.42	2.68	3.39	0.01	0.72	0.21
Total	3.33	23.39	19.11	0.04	1.98	1.41
Paving						
On-Site	1.44	12.57	11.85	0.02	0.73	0.67
Off-Site	0.09	0.06	0.75	0.00	0.17	0.05
Total	1.53	12.63	12.60	0.02	0.90	0.72
Architectural Coating						
On-Site	56.79	1.84	1.84	0.00	0.13	0.13
Off-Site	0.06	0.04	0.50	0.00	0.11	0.03
Total	56.85	1.88	2.34	0.00	0.24	0.16
Total for overlapping phases⁴	61.71	37.90	34.05	0.06	3.12	2.29
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No	No	No

Construction activities associated with the project will result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NO_x, SO_x, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} and are expected from the following construction activities: demolition, grading (including soil import), building construction, painting (architectural coatings) paving (curb, gutter, flatwork, and parking lot), and construction worker commuting.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Localized Significance Summary

Table 9

Local Construction Emissions at the Nearest Receptor¹

Phase	On-Site Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)			
	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Demolition	24.36	15.11	1.80	1.40
Grading	24.29	10.38	3.75	2.39
Building Construction	20.71	15.72	1.26	1.21
Paving	12.57	11.85	0.73	0.67
Architectural Coating	1.84	1.84	0.13	0.13
SCAQMD Threshold for 25 meters²	170	1,232	6	5
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Equipment Exhausts and Related Construction Activities

Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources such as site grading, utility engines, on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles, asphalt paving, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions from construction activities envisioned on site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. The use of construction equipment on site would result in localized exhaust emissions; however, as shown in the tables above, the amount will not exceed any threshold of significance.

Fugitive Dust

Fugitive dust emissions are generally emissions associated with land clearing and exposure of soils to the air and wind, and cut-and-fill grading operations. Dust generated during construction varies substantially on a project-by project basis, depending on the level of activity, the specific operation and weather conditions at the time of construction. Construction emissions can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the equipment being operated, local soils, weather conditions and other factors. The proposed project will be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 to control fugitive dust.

Architectural Coatings

Architectural coatings contain VOCs that are similar to ROCs and are part of the O₃ precursors. Based on the proposed project, it is estimated that the proposed project will result in a maximum of approximately 61.71 (includes overlapping phases) of ROG pounds/per day (combined for all construction sources) during construction. Therefore,

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

this ROG/VOC emission is the principal air emission and is less than the SCAQMD VOC threshold of 75 lbs/day.

Odors

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. These odors are temporary, short-term and intermittent, and would disperse rapidly according to the Air Quality Analysis by Kunzman Associates (March 31, 2018). These odors would not result in persistent impacts that would affect substantial numbers of people, and construction activity would cease to occur after individual construction is completed. No other sources of objectionable odors have been identified for the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are required. In compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 the proposed uses are not anticipated to emit any objectionable odors. Therefore, objectionable odors posing a health risk to potential on-site and existing off-site uses would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

The proposed project is located in San Bernardino County and it is not among the counties that are found to have serpentine and ultramafic rock in their soils. In addition, there has been no serpentine or ultramafic rock found in the project area. Therefore, the potential risk for naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) during project construction is small and less than significant.

Based on the discussion above and with implementation of the following mitigation measures, short-term, construction impacts will be less-than-significant:

- 1) **All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.**
- 2) **The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the Project are watered at least three (3) times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the midmorning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.**
- 3) **The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.**

Cumulative Impacts: Short-Term Construction Emissions

Continued development will contribute to the pollutant levels in the Rancho Cucamonga area, which already exceed Federal and State standards. During the construction phases of development, on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and energy use will generate emissions. In addition, fugitive dust would also be generated during grading and construction activities. While most of the dust would settle on or near the project site, smaller particles would remain in the atmosphere, increasing particle levels within the surrounding area. Construction is an on-going industry in the Rancho Cucamonga area. Construction workers and equipment work and operate at one development site until their tasks are complete. Nevertheless, fugitive dust

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

and equipment emissions are required to be assessed. The General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) analyzed the impacts of Air Quality based on the future build out of the City. Based upon on the Urban Emissions Model (URBEMIS7G) estimates in Table 4.3-3 of the General Plan (FPEIR), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), Ozone (O₃), and Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for significance; therefore, they would all be cumulatively considerable if they cannot be mitigated on a project basis to a level less-than-significant. This city-wide increase in emissions was identified as a significant unavoidable adverse impact for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was ultimately adopted by the City Council as noted in the Section 4.3 of the General Plan FPEIR.

With implementation of the following best practices and mitigation measures from the City's 2010 General Plan FPEIR that are designed to minimize short-term air quality impacts, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts will be less-than-significant:

- 4) **All construction equipment shall be maintained in good operating condition so as to reduce operational emissions. The contractor shall ensure that all construction equipment is being properly serviced and maintained as per manufacturers' specifications. Maintenance records shall be available at the construction site for City verification.**
- 5) **Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the developer shall submit construction plans to the City denoting the proposed schedule and projected equipment use. Construction contractors shall provide evidence that low emission mobile construction equipment will be utilized, or that their use was investigated and found to be infeasible for the project. Contractors shall also conform to any construction measures imposed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) as well as City Planning Staff.**
- 6) **The construction contractor shall utilize electric or clean alternative fuel powered equipment where feasible.**
- 7) **The construction contractor shall ensure that construction-grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use.**
- 8) **All asphalt shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule 1108.**
- 9) **All paints and coatings shall meet or exceed performance standards noted in SCAQMD Rule 1113. Paints and coatings shall be applied either by hand or high-volume, low-pressure spray.**
- 10) **All construction equipment shall comply with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403. Additionally, contractors shall include the following provisions:**
 - **Reestablish ground cover on the construction site through seeding and watering.**
 - **Pave or apply gravel to any on-site haul roads.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- **Phase grading to prevent the susceptibility of large areas to erosion over extended periods of time.**
 - **Schedule activities to minimize the amounts of exposed excavated soil during and after the end of work periods.**
 - **Dispose of surplus excavated material in accordance with local ordinances and use sound engineering practices.**
 - **Sweep streets according to a schedule established by the City if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares or occurs as a result of hauling. Timing may vary depending upon the time of year of construction.**
 - **Suspend grading operations during high winds (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 25mph) in accordance with Rule 403 requirements.**
 - **Maintain a minimum 24-inch freeboard ratio on soils haul trucks or cover payloads using tarps or other suitable means.**
- 11) **The site shall be treated with water or other soil-stabilizing agent (approved by SCAQMD and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)) daily to reduce PM₁₀ emissions, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403.**
- 12) **Chemical soil-stabilizers (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) shall be applied to all inactive construction areas that remain inactive for 96 hours or more to reduce PM₁₀ emissions.**

Project Long Term (Operational) Emissions and Impacts

Long-term air pollutant emissions are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources involving any project-related changes. The proposed project would result in a net increase in the amount of development in the area; therefore, the proposed project would result in net increases in both stationary and mobile source emissions. The stationary source emissions would come from additional natural gas consumption for on-site buildings and electricity for the lighting in the buildings and at the parking area. As shown in the following tables, project implementation will not exceed any significance thresholds for Operational Regional Standards or Operational Localized Standards. No long-term, operational impacts will occur as a result of the project.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Summary of Peak Operational Emissions

Table 10

Operational Regional Pollutant Emissions¹

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROGs	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources ²	1.35	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage ³	0.07	0.66	0.55	0.00	0.05	0.05
Mobile Sources ⁴	0.52	3.36	7.08	0.02	1.67	0.46
TRUs ⁵	2.07	0.20	2.22	0.00	0.49	0.46
Total Emissions	4.01	4.21	9.87	0.03	2.21	0.98
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 11

Local Operational Emissions at the Nearest Receptors¹

On-Site Emission Source	On-Site Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)			
	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources ²	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage ³	0.66	0.55	0.05	0.05
Vehicle Emissions ⁴	0.34	0.71	0.17	0.00
TRUs ⁶	0.20	2.22	0.49	0.46
Total Emissions	1.19	3.50	0.71	0.52
SCAQMD Thresholds ⁵	170	1,232	2	2
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Cumulative Impacts (Long Term/Operational Emissions)

CO Hot Spot Analysis

The Project would not result in potentially adverse CO concentrations or “hot spots.” Further, detailed modeling of Project-specific carbon monoxide (CO) “hot spots” is not needed to reach this conclusion. According to the Air Quality Analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates (March 31, 2018), the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan) showed that any intersection which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per hour would not violate the CO standard. Therefore, as the project does not generate enough trips to warrant a Traffic Study, no CO hot spot modeling was performed and no significant long-term air quality impact is anticipated to local air quality with the on-going use of the proposed project.

The General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) analyzed the potential impacts to air quality based on the future build out of the City. In the long-term, continued development would result in significant operational vehicle emissions based upon on the URBEMIS7G model estimates in Table 4.3-3 of the General Plan FPEIR; therefore, all developments would be cumulatively significant if they cannot be mitigated on a project basis to a less-than-significant level. This City-wide increase in emissions was identified as a significant unavoidable adverse impact for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was ultimately adopted by the City Council as noted in the Section 4.3 of the General Plan FPEIR.

With implementation of the following mitigation measures from the City’s 2010 General Plan FPEIR that are designed to minimize long-term, operational air quality impacts, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts will be less-than-significant:

- 13) **Provide adequate ingress and egress at all entrances to public facilities to minimize vehicle idling at curbsides.**
- 14) **Provide preferential parking to high occupancy vehicles and shuttle services.**
- 15) **Schedule truck deliveries and pickups during off-peak hours.**
- 16) **Improve thermal integrity of the buildings and reduce thermal load with automated time clocks or occupant sensors.**
- 17) **Landscape with native and/or drought-resistant species to reduce water consumption and to provide passive solar benefits.**
- 18) **Provide lighter color roofing and road materials and tree planting programs to comply with the AQMP Miscellaneous Sources MSC-01 measure.**
- 19) **Comply with the AQMP Miscellaneous Sources PRC-03, and Stationary Sources Operations Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance and ADV-MISC to reduce emissions of restaurant operations.**
- 20) **All industrial and commercial facilities shall post signs requiring that trucks shall not be left idling for prolonged periods (i.e., in excess of 10 minutes).**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- 21) All industrial and commercial facilities shall designate preferential parking for vanpools.**
- 22) All industrial and commercial site tenants with 50 or more employees shall be required to post both bus and Metrolink schedules in conspicuous areas.**
- 23) All industrial and commercial site tenants with 50 or more employees shall be required to configure their operating schedules around the Metrolink schedule to the extent reasonably feasible.**

c) As noted in the General Plan FEIR (Section 4.3), continued development would contribute to the pollutant levels in the Rancho Cucamonga area, which already exceed Federal and State standards. The General Plan FPEIR identified the citywide increase in emissions as a significant and adverse impact for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations was ultimately adopted by the City Council.

With implementation of mitigation measures listed in subsection b) above from the City's 2010 General Plan FPEIR, which are designed to minimize long-term, operational air quality impacts, cumulative impacts will be less-than-significant.

d) Sensitive receptors are defined as populations that are more susceptible to the effects of pollution than the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. According to the SCAQMD, projects have the potential to create significant impacts if they are located within ¼ mile of sensitive receptors and would emit toxic air contaminants identified in SCAQMD Rule 1401. The project site is located within ¼ mile of the following sensitive receptors: multi-family residential dwelling units across Fourth Street.

During construction, there is the possibility of fugitive dust to be generated from grading the site. As shown in Table 9 above, none of the criteria pollutants would exceed SCAQMD's local emission thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptor. Further, the mitigation measures listed under subsection b) above and will reduce any potential impact to less-than-significant levels.

e) Construction odors (short-term) may include odors associated with equipment use including diesel exhaust or roofing, painting and paving. These odors are temporary and would dissipate rapidly. Operational odors (long-term) are not typically associated with the proposed industrial use. The industrial building will be used for quick processing of food uses in a sealed environment. Odors from the proposed industrial use would most likely be from activities such as temporary truck idling; however, these odors would be minimal, disperse quickly, and would not be considered to be significant. Due to the distance of the nearest receptors from the proposed trash storage areas and through compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 402, no significant impact related to odors would occur during the on-going operations of the proposed industrial building. The impact is considered less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	()	()	()	(✓)
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	()	()	()	(✓)
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?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

a) The project site is located in an area developed with industrial and office uses. The site has been previously disrupted during construction of metal building and a partial parking lot. According to the General Plan Figure RC-4, and Section 4.4 of the General Plan FPEIR, the project site is within an area of sensitive biological resources: the project site is in the vicinity of potential habitat for the Delhi Sands flower loving fly soils area. Accordingly, a Habitat Suitability Evaluation (Ecological Sciences, July 11, 2018) was performed to evaluate the suitability of the site to support the endangered Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. The project site is located in the Ontario Recovery Unit, areas that contain Delhi Sands flower loving flies or have restorable habitat.

Ecological Sciences conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey on the subject site to evaluate potential habitat for DSFF on March 31 and June 16, 2018. The survey was conducted by Scott Cameron; Principal Biologist of Ecological Sciences, Inc. Mr. Cameron holds a federal permit to conduct focused survey for this species (TE-808642-8). The site was examined on foot by walking a series of meandering transects across the subject property. Dominant plant species and other habitat characteristics present at the site were identified to assess the overall habitat value. Weather conditions included hazy skies, 0-1

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

breezes, and an ambient temperature of 82-86 °F. The site is characterized as an industrial/commercial site that contains an abandoned building, asphalt parking lot, and associated infrastructure in the southern half and disturbed open areas in the northern half. Substrate consists of loamy sands with scattered gravel and extensive debris dumping. Existing development surrounds the site.

Based on results of the June 2016 habitat suitability evaluation, existing conditions present at the site are not consistent with those known or expected to support DSFF. No exposed natural or semi-natural open areas with unconsolidated wind-worked granitic soils or dunes are present. Exposure to historic and recurring substrate disturbances have substantial negative effects on potential DSFF habitat and may also prevent potentially suitable DSFF microhabitat soil conditions from developing. Substrate conditions are not consistent with those most often correlated with potential DSFF habitat. Although a few native plant species are present that are often associated with potential DSFF habitat, the context in which these species occur (e.g., scattered within highly disturbed site conditions) does not constitute a native plant community most commonly associated with potential DSFF habitat.

There is no connectivity to the subject site from the nearest known (to us) DSFF population (+/- 3 miles southeast of the site) due to the presence of existing commercial development that entirely surrounds the site. While this species likely has the capability of dispersing over relatively large distances of seemingly unsuitable habitats under certain circumstances, it would be reasonable to assume (based on our current knowledge of the species) that the likelihood of DSFF dispersing to the subject site from the nearest known off-site occupied site would not be expected despite the fact that variables such as the length, width, and structural characteristics of dispersal corridors are not fully understood. Accordingly, the subject site would not be considered a viable property for preservation or restoration due to its geographic location and current/surrounding land uses which have fragmented potential DSFF habitat in the area.

Under current conditions, the site would be considered prohibitive to DSSF occupation. The underlying soil environment appears to be the most definitive factor of whether an area could potentially support DSFF. Quality of Delhi soils present within the study area was rated for its potential to support DSFF. The area mapped as Delhi soils was visually inspected and rated based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best quality and most suitable habitat in the permitted biologist's judgment:

1. Soils dominated by heavy deposits of alluvial material including coarse sands and gravels with little or no Delhi sands and evidence of soil compaction. Unsuitable.
2. Delhi sands are present but the soil characteristics include a predominance of alluvial materials (Tujunga Soils). Very Low Quality.
3. Although not clean, sufficient Delhi sands are present to prevent soil compaction. Some sandy soils exposed on the surface due to fossorial animal activity. Low Quality.
4. Abundant clean Delhi sands with little or no alluvial material or Tujunga soils present. Moderate abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

cover. Evidence of moderate degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. Moderate Quality

5. Sand dune habitat with clean Delhi sands. High abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative cover. Evidence (soil surface often gives under foot) of high degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. High Quality

Based on the above ratings and existing site conditions, the site would be considered Unsuitable for DSFF. In view of the site’s highly degraded condition, exposure to long standing disturbances, and analyses of correlative habitat information from a wide range (e.g., relatively disturbed to more natural habitats) of occupied DSFF habitats in the region, the +/- 2.76-acre site does not contain habitat suitable to support or sustain a DSFF population. It would be contrary to expectation that the FWS would require a focused protocol survey on such a degraded site. No impacts to DSFF are expected and no mitigation is required for less than significant impacts under CEQA.

- b) The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The project site is located in an urban area with no natural plant communities on the project area. Introduced (non-native) plant species recorded on site included foxtail chess (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*), soft chess (*Bromus mollis*), Mediterranean grass (*Schismus barbatus*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), horehound (*Marrubium vulgare*), short-podded mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), golden crownbeard (*Verbesina enceliodes*), and tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*). Native species recorded that included turkey-mullein (*Croton setiger*), popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys* sp.), telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*), pygmy weed (*Crassula connata*), common sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), and mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*). Landscaping trees are present along the eastern site periphery. No riparian habitat exists on-site. No impacts are anticipated.
- c) There are no water features, streams, or ephemeral drainage courses onsite. No storm drains discharge onto the project. No wetland habitat is present on-site. As a result, project implementation would have no impact on these resources.
- d) The City is primarily located in a suburban area that does not contain large, contiguous natural open space areas. Wildlife potentially may move through the north/south trending tributaries in the northern portion of the City and within the Sphere of Influence. The Project site provides local wildlife use, but is not part of a regional wildlife corridor, and therefore, the Project will not adversely affect wildlife movement.
- e) According to the demolition plan, no heritage trees are proposed for removal; therefore, the proposed project is not in conflict with any local ordinance. No impacts are anticipated.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- f) Neither the City nor the SOI are within an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved State Habitat Conservation Plan area. The project site is not located within a local conservation area according to the General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Plan, Figure RC-1. No conflicts with habitat conservation plans will occur. No impacts are anticipated.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	()	(✓)	()	()
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	()	(✓)	()	()
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	()	(✓)	()	()
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	()	(✓)	()	()

Comments:

- a) The project site has not been identified as a "Historic Resource" per the standards of Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code Section 2.24 (Historic Preservation. A Cultural Resources Assessment was performed on the project site by First Carbon Solutions (FCS; September 13, 2018). On September 4, 2018, FCS Archaeologist David Smith, conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton. The results of the records search indicate that 7 cultural resources survey reports are on file for properties within a 1-mile search radius, but that the project area has never been the subject of a cultural resources study or archaeological survey. In addition, no historic or prehistoric resources have been recorded on the project area or within the 1-mile search radius.

FCS Archaeologist Robert Mariani, MA, surveyed the project area on August 30, 2018. Approximately one-third of the parcel is occupied by the existing RV and Off-Road building and pavement, and a small cell site facility is located in the northeastern corner of the property. The remainder of the parcel is undeveloped sediment. The project area is accessed from its southern boundary via 4th Street. No historic or prehistoric cultural resources were observed during the survey. Based on the analysis of the records search results, the NAHC Sacred Lands File search, additional Native American tribal member outreach attempts, and the pedestrian survey, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity for prehistoric resources.

The project site is somewhat disturbed by prior construction of metal building, a partial asphalt parking lot, and minimal dumping. The RV and Off Road facility that was constructed in 1979 and is of insufficient age and architectural design to warrant further consideration as a cultural resource. In the event that earthwork operations result in the inadvertent discovery of historic resources, with the mitigation measure included under b) below, any impacts on historic resources will be less than significant.

- b) There are no known archaeological sites or resources recorded on the project site. A Cultural Resources Assessment was performed on the project site by First Carbon Solutions (FCS; September 13, 2018). On September 4, 2018, FCS Archaeologist David

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Smith, conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton. The results of the records search indicate that 7 cultural resources survey reports are on file for properties within a 1-mile search radius, but that the project area has never been the subject of a cultural resources study or archaeological survey. In addition, no historic or prehistoric resources have been recorded on the project area or within the 1-mile search radius.

FCS Archaeologist Robert Mariani, MA, surveyed the project area on August 30, 2018. Approximately one-third of the parcel is occupied by the existing RV and Off-Road building and pavement, and a small cell site facility is located in the northeastern corner of the property. The remainder of the parcel is undeveloped sediment. The project area is accessed from its southern boundary via 4th Street. No historic or prehistoric cultural resources were observed during the survey. Based on the analysis of the records search results and the pedestrian survey by FCS, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low to moderate sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources. The RV and Off Road facility was constructed in 1979 and is of insufficient age to warrant further consideration as a cultural resource.

The Rancho Cucamonga area is known to have been inhabited by Native Americans according to the General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.6). Construction activity, particularly grading, soil excavation, and compaction, could adversely affect or eliminate existing and potential archaeological resources. The General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) analyzed the impacts of Cultural Resources based on the future build out of the City. Although construction related archaeological monitoring is not recommended by FCS, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians contacted staff during the requisite notification period for AB 52. Based input from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, the following Cultural Resource mitigation measures and additional mitigation measures as identified in the FPEIR shall be implemented:

Cultural Resources

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians

- 1) **CR-1: In the event that pre-contact cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed within TCR-1, if any such find occurs and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.**

- 2) **CR- 2: If significant Native American historical resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to SMBMI for review and comment, as detailed within TCR-1. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- 3) **CR-3: If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.**

General Plan FEIR:

- 4) **If any prehistoric archaeological resources are encountered before or during grading, the developer will retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities, to take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study. With the assistance of the archaeologist, the City of Rancho Cucamonga will:**

- **Enact interim measures to protect undesignated sites from demolition or significant modification without an opportunity for the City to establish its archaeological value.**
- **Consider establishing provisions to require incorporation of archaeological sites within new developments, using their special qualities as a theme or focal point.**
- **Pursue educating the public about the archaeological heritage of the area.**
- **Prepare a mitigation plan consistent with Section 21083.2 Archaeological resources of CEQA to eliminate adverse project effects on significant, important, and unique prehistoric resources, including but not limited to, avoiding archaeological sites, capping or covering sites with soil, planning the site as a park or green space or paying an in-kind mitigation fee.**
- **Prepare a technical resources management report, documenting the inventory, evaluation, and proposed mitigation of resources within the project area. Submit one copy of the completed report with original illustrations, to the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center for permanent archiving.**

- c) According to the Cultural Resources Report by FCS (September 13, 2018), based on the analysis of the Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity for paleontologic resources at shallow excavation depths; however, excavations exceeding five feet may encounter paleontologically sensitive sediments. The General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.6) indicates that the Rancho Cucamonga area is on an alluvial fan. According to the research performed at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the San Bernardino County database, no paleontological sites or resources have been recorded within the City of Rancho Cucamonga or the Sphere-of-Influence, including the project site; however, the area has a high sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. The older alluvium, which would have been deposited during the wetter climate that prevailed 10,000-100,000 years ago during the Late Pleistocene epoch of the Quaternary period, when the last "Ice Age" and the appearance of modern man occurred, may contain significant vertebrate fossils. Although the FCS report does not recommend construction

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

related monitoring for paleontological resources, the project site is underlain by Quaternary alluvium per the Public Safety Element of the General Plan; therefore, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

5) If any paleontological resource (i.e. plant or animal fossils) are encountered before or during grading, the developer will retain a qualified paleontologist to monitor construction activities, to take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study. The paleontologist shall submit a report of findings that will also provide specific recommendations regarding further mitigation measures (i.e., paleontological monitoring) that may be appropriate. Where mitigation monitoring is appropriate, the program must include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

- **Assign a paleontological monitor, trained and equipped to allow the rapid removal of fossils with minimal construction delay, to the site full-time during the interval of earth-disturbing activities.**
- **Should fossils be found within an area being cleared or graded, divert earth-disturbing activities elsewhere until the monitor has completed salvage. If construction personnel make the discovery, the grading contractor should immediately divert construction and notify the monitor of the find.**
- **Prepare, identify, and curate all recovered fossils for documentation in the summary report and transfer to an appropriate depository (i.e., San Bernardino County Museum).**
- **Submit summary report to City of Rancho Cucamonga. Transfer collected specimens with a copy of the report to San Bernardino County Museum.**

d.) The proposed project is in an area that has already been disturbed by development. The project site has already been disrupted by construction of a metal building and a partial asphalt parking lot. No known religious or sacred sites exist within the project area. No evidence is in place to suggest the project site has been used for human burials. On August 29, 2018, FCS sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a review of its Sacred Lands File database to determine if any cultural resources are located on or near the project area (Appendix C). The September 4, 2018, response from NAHC noted that the record search of the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. A list of seven Native American tribal members who may have additional knowledge of the project area was included in the NAHC response. These tribal members were sent letters on September 11, 2018, asking for any additional information they might have concerning the project area. As of September 2018, no responses have been received. The California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) states that if human remains are discovered on-site, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. According to the Cultural Resources Report by FCS, in the inadvertent event that human remains are discovered during grading operations, the following mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant:

In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, Public Resource Code (PRC) Section 5097.98 must be followed. In this instance,

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

once project-related earthmoving begins and if there is accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, the following steps shall be taken:

- 6.) **There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are Native American and if an investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the “most likely descendant” of the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in PRC Section 5097.98, or**

- 7.) **Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his/her authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendent or on the project area in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:**
 - **The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission;**
 - **The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or**
 - **The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.**

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i> a) Expose people or structures to 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.	()	()	(✓)	()
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	()	()	(✓)	()
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	()	()	()	(✓)
iv) Landslides?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	()	(✓)	()	()

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	()	()	()	(✓)
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) No known faults pass through the site and it is not in an Earthquake Fault Zone, nor is it in the Rancho Cucamonga City Special Study Zone along the Red Hill Fault, according to the General Plan Figure PS-2, and Section 4.7 of the General Plan FPEIR. The Red Hill Fault is about 2.5 miles to the northwest of the site, and the Cucamonga Fault Zone lies about 6.5 miles to the north of the site. These faults are both capable of producing Mw 6.0-7.0 earthquakes. Also, the San Jacinto fault, capable of producing up to Mw 7.5 earthquakes is about 18 miles northeasterly of the site and the San Andreas, capable of up to Mw 8.2 earthquakes, is about 15 miles northeasterly of the site. Each of these faults can produce strong ground shaking. Adhering to the Uniform Building Code and Standard Conditions will ensure that geologic impacts are less-than-significant.

- b) The City of Rancho Cucamonga is within a designated Soil Erosion Control Area Exhibit 4.7-4 of the General Plan FPEIR. The proposed project will require the excavation, stockpiling, and/or movement of on-site soils. The Rancho Cucamonga area is subject to strong Santa Ana wind conditions during September to April, which generates blowing sand and dust, and creates erosion problems. Construction activities may temporarily exacerbate the impacts of windblown sand, resulting in temporary problems of dust control; however, development of this project under the General Plan would help to reduce windblown sand impacts in the area as pavement, roads, buildings, and landscaping are established. Therefore, the following fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels:
 - 1) **The site shall be treated with water or other soil-stabilizing agent (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) daily to reduce PM₁₀ emissions, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 or re-planted with drought resistant landscaping as soon as possible.**
 - 2) **Frontage public streets shall be swept according to a schedule established by the City to reduce PM₁₀ emissions associated with vehicle tracking of soil off-site. Timing may vary depending upon the time of year of construction.**
 - 3) **Grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 mph to minimize PM₁₀ emissions from the site during such episodes.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

4) Chemical soil-stabilizers (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) shall be applied to all inactive construction areas that remain inactive for 96 hours or more to reduce PM₁₀ emissions.

- c) The General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.7) indicates that there is a potential for the hillside areas at the northern end of the City and in the SOI for slope failure, landslides, and/or erosion. Areas subject to slope instability contain slopes of 30 percent or greater. Landslides may be induced by seismic activity, rain, or construction. The City Hillside Development Regulations prohibits the development within slopes of 30 percent or greater and limit the number of units that could be constructed within the Hillside Residential and Very Low Density Residential designations in the Hillside areas. The site is not on a slope of 30 percent or greater. The site is not within an Earthquake hazard zone or other unstable geologic unit or soil type according to General Plan FPEIR Exhibit 4.7-2. Soil types on-site consist of Tujunga Loamy Sand (TuB) (0 - 5 percent slopes) Soil association according to General Plan FPEIR Exhibit 4.7-3. Runoff is slow to very slow. No adverse impacts are anticipated.
- d) The majority of Rancho Cucamonga, including the project site, is located on alluvial soil deposits. These types of soils are not considered to be expansive. Soil types on-site consist of Tujunga Loamy Sand (TuB) (0 - 5 percent slopes) soil association according to General Plan FPEIR Exhibit 4.7-3. Runoff is slow to very slow. No adverse impacts are anticipated.
- e) The project will connect to, and be served by, the existing local sewer system for wastewater disposal. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal is proposed. No adverse impacts are anticipated.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i> a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	()	(✓)	()	()
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	()	(✓)	()	()

Comments:

- a) Regulations and Significance – The Federal government began studying the phenomenon of global warming as early as 1979 with the National Climate Protection Act (92 Stat. 601). In June of 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger established California’s Green House Gas (GHG) emissions reduction target in Executive Order (EO) S-3-05. The EO created goals to reduce GHG emissions for the State of California to 2000 levels by 2010; GHG emissions reduced to 1990 levels by 2020; and GHG emissions reduced to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Additionally, on December 7, 2009 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) issued findings regarding GHGs under rule 202(a) of the Clean Air Act: (1) that GHGs endanger human health; and (2) that this will be the first steps to regulating GHGs through the Federal Clean Air Act. The USEPA defines 6 key GHGs (carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)). The combined

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

emissions of these well-mixed greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles and engines contribute to GHG pollution.

The western states, including Arizona, California, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, already experience hotter, drier climates. California is a substantial contributor of GHGs and is expected to see an increase of 3 to 4 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) over the next century.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the lead agency for implementing AB 32, determine what the statewide GHG emission level was in 1990 and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit (427 million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent) to be achieved by 2020 and prepare a Scoping Plan to outline the main strategies for meeting the 2020 deadline. Significant progress can be made toward the 2020 goal through existing technologies and improving the efficiency of energy use. Other solutions would include improving the State’s infrastructure, and transitioning to cleaner and more efficient sources of energy.

The ARB estimates that 38 percent of the State’s GHG emissions in 2004 was from transportation sources followed by electricity generation (both in-State and out-of-State) at 28 percent and industrial at 20 percent. Residential and commercial activities account for 9 percent, agricultural uses at 6 percent, high global warming potential gases at 3 percent, and recycling and waste at 1 percent.

It is not anticipated that any single development project would have a substantial effect on global climate change but that GHG emissions from the project would combine with emissions across California, the United States, and the world to cumulatively contribute to global climate change. Therefore, consistent with the ARB’s Climate Change Scoping Plan, the proposed project was evaluated for consistency with the Early Action Measures (Scoping Plan is a recommendation until adopted through normal rulemaking). The proposed project is assessed by determining its consistency with the 37 Recommended Actions identified by ARB. In compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 97 and CEQA, the project has been analyzed based on a qualitative analysis (CEQA 15064.4). Additionally, the ARB was directed through SB 375 to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets to be achieved within the automobile and light truck sectors for 2020 and 2035.

SCAQMD and ARB maintain ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Basin. The stations closest to the project site are the Upland station and the Fontana-Arrow Highway station. The Upland station monitors all criteria pollutants except PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and SO₂ which are monitored at the Fontana-Arrow Highway station. The ambient air quality in the project area for CO, NO₂, and SO₂ are consistently below the relevant State and Federal standards (based on ARB and EPA from 2007, 2008, and 2009 readings). Ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} levels all exceed State and Federal standards regularly.

Project Related Sources of GHG’s – Based on the *Guidelines for the Implementation of California Environmental Quality Act*, Appendix G, a project would normally be considered to have a significant effect on air quality if the project would violate any ambient air quality standards, contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community. However, neither the CEQA statutes, Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidelines, nor the draft proposed changes to the CEQA Guidelines prescribe thresholds of significance or a particular methodology for performing

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

an impact analysis. Significance criteria are left to the judgment and discretion of the Lead Agency.

The City of Rancho Cucamonga has not adopted a threshold of significance for GHG emissions. However, a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year is based upon South Coast Air Quality Management District staff’s proposed GHG screening threshold for stationary sources emissions for non-industrial projects, as described in the SCAQMD’s Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans.

Project related GHG’s would include emissions from direct and indirect sources. Based on the Air Quality, Global Climate Change and Health Risk Analysis (Kunzman Associates, March 31, 2018), total project related emissions would be 1,146 MTCO₂eq/year, as shown in the following table:

Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions¹

Category	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons/Year)					
	Bio-CO ₂	NonBio-CO ₂	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Area Sources ²	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage ³	0.00	582.51	582.51	0.02	0.01	584.90
Mobile Sources ⁴	0.00	313.27	313.27	0.02	0.00	313.68
Solid Waste ⁵	13.23	0.00	13.23	0.78	0.00	32.78
Water ⁶	4.34	56.73	61.07	0.45	0.01	75.54
Construction ⁷	0.00	7.79	7.79	0.00	0.00	7.83
TRUs ⁸	0.00	131.25	131.25	0.00	0.00	131.25
Total Emissions	17.57	1,091.56	1,109.14	1.27	0.02	1,146.00
SCAQMD Draft Threshold						3,000
Exceeds Threshold?						No

As shown in the table, direct and indirect operational emissions associated with the project as compared to the SCAQMD’s interim threshold of significance of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

Cumulative Short Term (Construction) GHG Emissions – The General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.5) indicates that GHG emissions result from construction activities associated with diesel-powered construction equipment and other combustion sources (i.e. Generators, workers vehicles, material delivery, etc.). The GHG emitted by construction equipment is primarily carbon dioxide (CO₂). The highest levels of construction related GHG’s occur during site preparation including demolition, grading and excavation. Construction related GHG’s are also emitted from off-site haul trucks and construction workers traveling to the job site. Exhaust emissions from construction activities would vary each day with the changes in construction activity on site. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHG’s such as CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O. CH₄ is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Based on the Air Quality, Global Climate Change and Health Risk Analysis (Kunzman Associates, March 31, 2018), no significant impacts to GHGs from short-term construction impacts would occur as a result of the project as shown in the table above. The Green House Gas Analysis uses the CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 to evaluate potential impacts from GHG emissions. Because the project would result in minimal emissions that do not exceed the SCAQMD’s interim threshold of significance, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts is also considered minimal. The proposed project would have less than a significant short-term cumulative impact with implementation of the following enforceable actions, which are included as mitigation measures in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 of the 2010 General Plan Update FPEIR:

- 1) **The project must comply with all rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emission in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding fugitive dust including treating the site with water or other soil-stabilizing agent twice daily or replanting disturbed areas as quickly as possible.**
- 2) **The construction contractor shall select construction equipment based on low-emission factors and high energy efficiency and submit a statement on the grading plan that ensures all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufactures’ specification.**
- 3) **Trucks shall not idle continuously for more than 5 minutes.**
- 4) **Alternative fuel powered equipment shall be utilized in lieu of gasoline- or diesel-powered engines where feasible.**
- 5) **Construction should be timed so as not to interfere with peak-hour traffic.**
- 6) **Ridesharing and transit incentives shall be supported and encouraged for the construction crew.**

Cumulative Long Term (Operational) GHG’s Emissions – The primary source of GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would be from motor vehicles, combustion of natural gas for space and water heating, as well as off-site GHG emissions from generation of electricity consumed by the proposed land use development over a long term. CEQA requires the Lead Agency to review the project for “adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure,” to determine potential impacts of GHG’s. Therefore the project has been analyzed based on methodologies and information available to the City at the time this document was prepared. Estimates are based on past performance and represent a scenario that is a worst case with the understanding that technology changes may reduce GHG emissions in the future. To date, there is no established quantified GHG emission threshold.

The project involves the construction of a 58,000 square foot industrial building for food and warehouse purposes and therefore would result in an increase in the net increases of both stationary and mobile source emissions. The majority of energy consumption typically occurs during project operation (more than 80 percent and less than 20 percent during construction activities). The proposed project will incorporate several design features that are consistent with the California Office of the Attorney General’s recommended measures to reduce GHG emission including: water efficient landscaping, shade trees, and walkways that provide accessibility to public sidewalks.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project is consistent with the California Environmental Protection Agency Climate Action Team proposed early action measures to mitigate climate change included in the CARB Scoping Plan mandated under AB 32. The proposed project will incorporate several design features including: water efficient landscaping, shade trees, and walkways that provide accessibility to public sidewalks. Additionally, the City is participating in the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) with SANBAG for the San Bernardino County area pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 375.

Based on the Air Quality, Global Climate Change and Health Risk Analysis (Kunzman Associates, March 31, 2018), no significant impacts to GHGs from long-term, operational impacts would occur as a result of the project as shown in the table above. Because the project would result in minimal emissions that do not exceed the SCAQMD’s interim threshold of significance, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts is also considered minimal. The proposed project would have less than a significant long-term operational impact with implementation of the following enforceable actions, which are included as mitigation measures in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 of the 2010 General Plan Update FPEIR:

- 7) **Construction and Building materials shall be produced and/or manufactured locally. Use “Green Building Materials” such as materials that are resource efficient, recycled and manufactured in an environmentally friendly way including low-volatile-organic-compound (VOC) materials.**

- 8) **Design all buildings to exceed California Building Code Title 24 energy standard including but not limited to any combination of;**
 - **Increased insulation.**
 - **Limit air leakage through the structure.**
 - **Incorporate Energy Star or better rated windows, space heating and cooling equipment, light fixtures, and appliances.**
 - **Landscape and develop site utilizing shade, prevailing winds and landscaping.**
 - **Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems.**
 - **Install light colored “cool” roofs and cool pavements.**
 - **Install solar or light emitting diodes (LED’s) for outdoor lighting.**

- 9) **Prepare a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and include the following;**
 - **Install water efficient landscapes and irrigation systems and devices in compliance with the City of Rancho Cucamonga Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- **Use reclaimed water for landscaping within the project if available or as required by the Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD).**
- **Design building to be water efficient by installing water efficient fixtures and appliances including low flow faucets, dual flush toilets and waterless urinals/water heaters.**
- **Design irrigation to control runoff and to remove water to non-vegetated surfaces.**

10) Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste. Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste in public areas. Educate employees about reducing waste and about recycling.

b) The project involves the development of a 58,000 square foot industrial building that will be used for food and warehouse purposes, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Industrial Park.

No other applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emission apply to the project. The 2010 General Plan Update includes adopted policies and Standard Conditions that respond to the Attorney General and the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). The General Plan policies and Standard Conditions guide infill and sustainable development reliant on pedestrian connections, re-use and rehabilitation of existing structures, link transportation opportunities, promote development that is sensitive to natural resources and incentivizes denser mixed use projects that maximizes diverse opportunities. The proposed project includes water efficient landscaping, shade trees, and walkways that provide accessibility to public sidewalks and therefore is consistent with the sustainability and climate change policies of the General Plan. The General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) analyzed the impacts of GHG's and determined that GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable, which would be a significant, unavoidable adverse cumulative impact. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was ultimately adopted by the City Council. Based on the Air Quality, Global Climate Change and Health Risk Analysis (Kunzman Associates, March 31, 2018), no significant impacts to GHGs from short-term, construction impacts or long-term, operational impacts would occur as a result of the project. According to the GHG Analysis by Kunzman Associates, the project meets the current standards for GHG emissions for SCAQMD and SB 32. Because the project would result in minimal emissions that do not exceed the SCAQMD's interim threshold of significance, the project's contribution to GHGs from short-term construction and long-term operational cumulative impacts is also considered minimal. With implementation of the mitigation measures listed in subsection a), less than significant impacts would occur as a result of the project. In addition, the proposed project would not hinder the State's GHG reduction goals established by AB 32 and therefore would be less than a significant impact.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND WASTE MATERIALS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	()	()	()	(✓)
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?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 1/4 mile of an existing or proposed school?	()	()	()	(✓)
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?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	()	()	()	(✓)
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	()	()	()	(✓)
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	()	()	()	(✓)
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The project proposes construction of a 58k industrial building for quick processing of food uses in a sealed environment; accordingly, the proposed project does not involve the use of hazardous materials in large quantities that would potentially result in a hazard to the public through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Development within the City may utilize or generate hazardous materials or wastes. This is usually associated with individual households, small business operations, and maintenance activities like paints, cleaning solvents, fertilizers, and motor oil or through construction activities that would use paints, solvents, acids, curing compounds, grease, and oils. These materials would be stored and used at individual sites. The City participates in a countywide interagency coalition, which is considered a full service Hazardous Materials Division that is more comprehensive than any other in the State. The City has an Emergency Operations Plan that meets State and Federal requirements and is in the process of updating the approved 2005 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. Compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations concerning the storage and handling of hazardous materials

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

and/or waste will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a level less-than-significant. No adverse impacts are expected.

- b) The project proposes construction of a 58k industrial building for quick processing of food uses in a sealed environment; accordingly, the proposed project does not involve the use of hazardous materials in large quantities that would potentially result in a hazard to the public through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project does not include the use of hazardous materials or volatile fuels. The City participates in a countywide interagency coalition, which is considered a full service Hazardous Materials Division that is more comprehensive than any other in the State. The City has an Emergency Operations Plan that meets State and Federal requirements and is in the process of updating the approved 2005 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. Compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations concerning the storage and handling of hazardous materials or volatile fuels will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a level less-than-significant. No adverse impacts are anticipated.
- c) There is a school located within ¼ mile of the project site. The nearest school to the project site, The Ontario Center (Elementary) School, is about 0.25-mile to the south at 835 N. Center Avenue in the City of Ontario. However, as noted above in Section 8 a) and b) above, the proposed project does not include the use of hazardous materials or volatile fuels. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with existing State and federal standards on the use and transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- d) The proposed project is not listed as a hazardous waste or substance materials site according to the 2010 General Plan FEIR. Recent site inspections did not reveal the presence of discarded drums or illegal dumping of hazardous materials. No impact is anticipated. No impact is anticipated.
- e) The site is located within an Airport Land Use Plan according to the General Plan Figure PS-7, General Plan FPEIR Exhibit 4.8-1, and is within 2 miles of a public airport, the Ontario International Airport. The project site is located about one mile north of the Ontario International Airport and is offset north of the flight path. According to the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Map 2-4, Airspace Protection Zones, the project is located within the High Terrain Zone, which has a maximum height limit of 70 feet. The proposed industrial/warehouse building has a maximum height of 40 feet, substantially less than the 70 foot height limit. Accordingly, the proposed building will not present a hazard to aircraft operations or penetrate airspace protection zone. No impact is anticipated.
- f) There are no private airstrips within the City. The nearest private airstrip, Cable Airport, is located approximately 2.5 miles to the west of the City's westerly limits. No impact is anticipated.
- g) The City has a developed roadway network that provides emergency access and evacuation routes to existing development. New development will be located on a site that has access to existing roadways. The City's Emergency Operation Plan, which is updated every 3 years, includes policies and procedures to be administered by the City of Rancho Cucamonga in the event of a disaster. Because the project includes one point of access off Fourth Street, one emergency access point along the west property with a reciprocal access agreement that meets the Fire District's Standards, and is required to comply with

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

all applicable City codes, including local fire ordinances, no adverse impacts are anticipated.

- h) Rancho Cucamonga faces the greatest ongoing threat from wind-driven fires in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone found in the northern part of the City; however, the proposed project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to General Plan Figure PS-1. No adverse impacts are anticipated

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	()	(✓)	()	()
b) Substantially deplete 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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) 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?	()	()	(✓)	()
d) 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 flooding on- or off-site?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) 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?	()	()	()	(✓)
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	()	(✓)	()	()
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	()	()	()	(✓)
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	()	()	()	(✓)
i) 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?	()	()	()	(✓)
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	()	()	()	(✓)

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Comments:

- a) Water and sewer service is provided by the Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD). The project is designed to connect to existing water and sewer systems. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. The General Construction Permit treats any construction activity over 1 acre as an industrial activity, requiring a permit under the State’s General NPDES permit. The State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB), through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Santa Ana Region, administers these permits.

Construction activities covered under the State’s General Construction permit include removal of vegetation, grading, excavating, or any other activity for new development or significant redevelopment. Prior to commencement of construction of a project, a discharger must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to obtain coverage under the General Permit. The General Permit requires all dischargers to comply with the following during construction activities, including site clearance and grading:

- Develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that would specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent construction pollutants from contacting storm water and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving off-site into receiving waters.
- Eliminate or reduce non-storm water discharges to storm sewer systems and other waters of the nation.
- Perform inspections of all BMPs.

Waste discharges include discharges of storm water and construction project discharges. A construction project for new development or significant redevelopment requires an NPDES permit. Construction project proponents are required to prepare an SWPPP. To comply with the NPDES, the project’s construction contractor will be required to prepare an SWPPP during construction activities, and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for post-construction operational management of storm water runoff. The applicant has submitted a WQMP, prepared by (Ware Malcomb/September 2018), which identifies BMPs to minimize the amount of pollutants, such as eroded soils, entering the drainage system after construction. Runoff from driveways, roads and other impermeable surfaces must be controlled through an on-site drainage system. BMPs include both structural and non-structural control methods. Structural controls used to manage storm water pollutant levels include detention basins, oil/grit separators, and porous pavement. Non-structural controls focus on controlling pollutants at the source, generally through implementing erosion and sediment control plans, and various Business Plans that must be developed by any businesses that store and use hazardous materials. Practices such as periodic parking lot sweeping can substantially reduce the amount of pollutants entering the storm drain system. The following mitigation measures are required to control additional storm water effluent:

Construction Activities:

- 1) **Prior to issuance of grading permits, the permit applicant shall submit to the Building Official for approval, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) specifically identifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) that**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

shall be used on-site to reduce pollutants during construction activities entering the storm drain system to the maximum extent practical.

- 2) An Erosion Control Plan shall be prepared, included in the Grading Plan, and implemented for the proposed project that identifies specific measures to control on-site and off-site erosion from the time ground disturbing activities are initiated through completion of grading. This Erosion Control Plan shall include the following measures at a minimum: a) Specify the timing of grading and construction to minimize soil exposure to rainy periods experienced in Southern California, and b) An inspection and maintenance program shall be included to ensure that any erosion which does occur either on-site or off-site as a result of this project will be corrected through a remediation or restoration program within a specified time frame.
- 3) During construction, temporary berms such as sandbags or gravel dikes must be used to prevent discharge of debris or sediment from the site when there is rainfall or other runoff.
- 4) During construction, to remove pollutants, street cleaning will be performed prior to storm events and after the use of water trucks to control dust in order to prevent discharge of debris or sediment from the site.
- 5) Prior to issuance of grading or paving permits, the applicant shall obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with obtaining coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Storm Water Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. Evidence that this has been obtained (i.e., a copy of the Waste Discharger's Identification Number) shall be submitted to the City Building Official for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit.

Post-Construction Operational:

- 6) Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit to the City Building Official for approval of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), including a project description and identifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on-site to reduce pollutants into the storm drain system to the maximum extent practicable. The WQMP shall identify the structural and non-structural measures consistent with the Guidelines for New Development and Redevelopment adopted by the City of Rancho Cucamonga in June 2004.
 - 7) Landscaping plans shall include provisions for controlling and minimizing the use of fertilizers/pesticides/herbicides. Landscaped areas shall be monitored and maintained for at least two years to ensure adequate coverage and stable growth. Plans for these areas, including monitoring provisions for a minimum of two years, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits.
- b) According to CVWD, approximately 35 percent of the City's water is currently provided from water supplies coming from the underlying Chino and Cucamonga Groundwater Basins. CVWD complies with its prescriptive water rights as managed by the Chino Basin

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Watermaster and will not deplete the local groundwater resource. The proposed project will not deplete groundwater supplies, nor will it interfere with recharge because it is not within an area designated as a recharge basin or spreading ground according to General Plan Figure RC-3. Development of the site will require the grading and excavation, but would not affect the existing aquifer, estimated to be about 300 to 470 feet below the ground surface. As noted in the General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.9), continued development citywide will increase water needs but will not be a significant impact. CVWD has plans to meet this increased need to the year 2030. No impacts are anticipated.

- c) The project will cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface water runoff because of the amount of new building and hardscape proposed on the site; however, the project will not alter the course of any stream or river. All runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities, which have been designed to handle the flows. The project design includes landscaping of all non-hardscape areas to prevent erosion. A Grading and Drainage Plan must be approved by the Building Official and City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, the project will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The impact is not considered significant.
 - d) The project will cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface water runoff because of the amount of new building and hardscape proposed on a site; however, the project will not alter the course of any stream or river. All runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities, which have been designed to handle the flows. A Grading and Drainage Plan must be approved by the Building Official and City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, increase in runoff from the site will not result in flooding on- or off-site. No impacts are anticipated.
 - e) The project will cause changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and the rate and amount of surface water runoff because of the amount of new building and hardscape proposed on a site; however, all runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities, which have been designed to handle the flows. The project will not result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. A Grading and Drainage Plan must be approved by the Building Official and City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, increase in runoff from the site will not result in flooding on- or off-site. No impacts are anticipated.
 - f) Grading activities associated with the construction period could result in a temporary increase in the amount of suspended solids in surface flows during a concurrent storm event, thus resulting in surface water quality impacts. The site is for new industrial development; therefore, the project is required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to minimize water pollution. With implementation of the mitigation measures specified under subsection a), less than significant impacts are anticipated.
- 8) The developer shall implement the BMPs identified in the Water Quality Management Plan prepared by (Ware Malcomb/September 2018) to reduce construction pollutants from entering the storm drain system to the maximum extent practical.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- g) The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area according to General Plan Figure PS-5. Further, no housing units are proposed with this project, and the project will be required to remit fees for storm drain system improvements. No adverse impacts are expected.
- h) The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area according to General Plan Figure PS-5. The project will be required to remit fees for storm drain system improvements. No adverse impacts are expected.
- i) The Rancho Cucamonga area is flood protected by an extensive storm drain system designed to adequately convey floodwaters from a 100-year storm event. The system is substantially improved and provides an integrated approach for regional and local drainage flows. This existing system includes several debris dams and levees north of the City, spreading grounds, concrete-lined channels, and underground storm drains as shown in General Plan Figure PS-6. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area according to General Plan Figure PS-5. No adverse impacts are expected.
- j) There are no oceans, lakes, or reservoirs near the project site; therefore impacts from seiche and tsunamis are not anticipated. The Rancho Cucamonga area sits at the base of the steep eastern San Gabriel Mountains whose deep canyons were cut by mountain streams. Numerous man-made controls have been constructed to reduce the mudflow impacts to the level of non-significance within the City. This existing system includes several debris dams and levees north of the City, and spreading grounds both within and north of the City. No adverse impacts are expected.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. The site is generally characterized by industrial development to the north, east, and west, and multi-family residential development to the south in the City of Ontario. The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial/warehouse building for food related uses, such as packaging and warehousing purposes. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The site will be

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

developed with an industrial building that will be similar size and scale to the newer buildings in the industrial areas of the City. No adverse impacts are anticipated.

- b) The project site land use designation is Industrial Park. The proposed project (58k industrial building for food use) is consistent with the General Plan and does not interfere with any policies for environmental protection, or SCAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan. The site will be developed with an industrial building that will be similar size and scale to the newer buildings in the industrial areas of the City. The development of the site will be consistent with the land use designations as described in the Development Code and General Plan. The minimum building, parking lot, and wall setbacks; dock and storage area screening; and landscape coverage are consistent with the Development Code and the General Plan. As such, no impacts are anticipated. As such, no impacts are anticipated.
- c) The project site is not located within any habitat conservation or natural community plan area. According to General Plan Figure RC-4 and Section 4.10 of the General Plan FPEIR, the project site is not within an area of sensitive biological resources but the project is located in the vicinity is located near an area for potential habitat for the Delhi Sands Flower Loving Fly (DSFLF). Accordingly, a Habitat Suitability Evaluation (Ecological Sciences, July 11, 2018) was performed to evaluate the suitability of the site to support the endangered Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. The project site is located in the Ontario Recovery Unit, areas that contain Delhi Sands flower loving flies or have restorable habitat.

Ecological Sciences conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey on the subject site to evaluate potential habitat for DSFF on March 31 and June 16, 2018. The survey was conducted by Scott Cameron; Principal Biologist of Ecological Sciences, Inc. Mr. Cameron holds a federal permit to conduct focused survey for this species (TE-808642-8). The site was examined on foot by walking a series of meandering transects across the subject property. Dominant plant species and other habitat characteristics present at the site were identified to assess the overall habitat value. Weather conditions included hazy skies, 0-1 breezes, and an ambient temperature of 82-86 °F. The site is characterized as an industrial/commercial site that contains an abandoned building, asphalt parking lot, and associated infrastructure in the southern half and disturbed open areas in the northern half. Substrate consists of loamy sands with scattered gravel and extensive debris dumping. Existing development surrounds the site.

Based on results of the June 2016 habitat suitability evaluation, existing conditions present at the site are not consistent with those known or expected to support DSFF. No exposed natural or semi-natural open areas with unconsolidated wind-worked granitic soils or dunes are present. Exposure to historic and recurring substrate disturbances have substantial negative effects on potential DSFF habitat and may also prevent potentially suitable DSFF microhabitat soil conditions from developing. Substrate conditions are not consistent with those most often correlated with potential DSFF habitat. Although a few native plant species are present that are often associated with potential DSFF habitat, the context in which these species occur (e.g., scattered within highly disturbed site conditions) does not constitute a native plant community most commonly associated with potential DSFF habitat.

There is no connectivity to the subject site from the nearest known (to us) DSFF population (+/- 3 miles southeast of the site) due to the presence of existing commercial

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

development that entirely surrounds the site. While this species likely has the capability of dispersing over relatively large distances of seemingly unsuitable habitats under certain circumstances, it would be reasonable to assume (based on our current knowledge of the species) that the likelihood of DSFF dispersing to the subject site from the nearest known off-site occupied site would not be expected despite the fact that variables such as the length, width, and structural characteristics of dispersal corridors are not fully understood. Accordingly, the subject site would not be considered a viable property for preservation or restoration due to its geographic location and current/surrounding land uses which have fragmented potential DSFF habitat in the area.

Under current conditions, the site would be considered prohibitive to DSSF occupation. The underlying soil environment appears to be the most definitive factor of whether an area could potentially support DSFF. Quality of Delhi soils present within the study area was rated for its potential to support DSFF. The area mapped as Delhi soils was visually inspected and rated based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best quality and most suitable habitat in the permitted biologist’s judgment:

1. Soils dominated by heavy deposits of alluvial material including coarse sands and gravels with little or no Delhi sands and evidence of soil compaction. Unsuitable.
2. Delhi sands are present but the soil characteristics include a predominance of alluvial materials (Tujunga Soils). Very Low Quality.
3. Although not clean, sufficient Delhi sands are present to prevent soil compaction. Some sandy soils exposed on the surface due to fossorial animal activity. Low Quality.
4. Abundant clean Delhi sands with little or no alluvial material or Tujunga soils present. Moderate abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative cover. Evidence of moderate degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. Moderate Quality
5. Sand dune habitat with clean Delhi sands. High abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative cover. Evidence (soil surface often gives under foot) of high degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. High Quality

Based on the above ratings and existing site conditions, the site would be considered Unsuitable for DSFF. In view of the site’s highly degraded condition, exposure to long standing disturbances, and analyses of correlative habitat information from a wide range (e.g., relatively disturbed to more natural habitats) of occupied DSFF habitats in the region, the +/- 2.76-acre site does not contain habitat suitable to support or sustain a DSFF population. It would be contrary to expectation that the FWS would require a focused protocol survey on such a degraded site. No impacts to DSFF are expected and no mitigation is required for less than significant impacts under CEQA.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> 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?	()	()	()	(✓)
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?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The site is not designated as a State Aggregate Resources Area according to the City General Plan, Figure RC-2 and Table RC-1; therefore, there is no impact.
- b) The site is not designated by the General Plan, Figure RC-2 and Table RC-1, as a valuable mineral resource recovery site; therefore, there is no impact.

12. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i> a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	()	()	(✓)	()
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	()	()	(✓)	()
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	()	()	(✓)	()
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	()	(✓)	()	()
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?	()	()	(✓)	()
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The project site is bordered by industrial to the north, 4th Street to the south, commercial and office uses to the east, and industrial uses to the west. Multi-family attached residential dwelling units are located south of the project site along 4th Street. The State of California defines sensitive receptors as those land uses that require serenity or are otherwise adversely affected by noise events or conditions. Schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, single and multiple-family residential, including transient lodging, motels and hotel uses make up the majority of these uses or areas. Sensitive receptors that may be affected by project generated noise include the multi-family detached residential dwelling

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

units located approximately 100 feet south of the project site (across 4th Street within the City of Ontario). In addition, hotel uses are located approximately 320 feet east of the site; and Ontario Center School is located approximately 0.24 miles south of the project site. To analyze noise and vibration impacts, a Noise Impact Analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates. The full text, tables, exhibits and appendices are available as part of the Noise Impact Analysis. Selected Tables and Exhibits have been included in the Initial Study.

Onsite Impacts from Traffic Noise

According to the Noise Impact Analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates (July 5, 2018), One (1) 10-minute daytime representative noise measurement was obtained at 12:56 p.m. PM to 1:06 p.m. on March 23, 2018 with an American National Standards Institute (ANSI Section S14 1979, Type 1) Larson Davis model LxT sound level meter in order to document existing ambient noise levels in the project area. Field worksheets and noise measurement output data are included in Appendix C of the Noise Impact Analysis. The short-term noise measurement was taken near the existing multifamily attached residential dwelling units located to the south of the project site along 4th Street. Table 3 provides a summary of the short-term ambient noise data. The ambient noise level was measured at 71.5 dBA Leq. The dominant noise source was from vehicles traveling on 4th Street and Center Avenue. Secondary noise sources included noise associated with aircrafts and birdsong.

The project area is located in an environment heavily dominated by existing transportation related noise sources. The I-10 Freeway lies to the south of the project site. The lanes of the I-10 Freeway are located approximately 3,400 feet south of the multi-family attached residential dwelling units located along 4th Street. The I-10 Freeway in the vicinity of the proposed project has a vehicle mix of approximately 93.3% autos, 2.7% medium trucks, and 4.0% heavy trucks with an annual average daily traffic volume of 265,000 vehicles obtained in data provided by the California Department of Transportation (<http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/>). The FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model FHWA-RD-77-108 was utilized to calculate the distance to the existing 65 noise contour from the I-10 Freeway. This effort did not take into account any intervening topography or buildings. Based on the modeling, noise levels associated with the I-10 Freeway currently exceed 65 CNEL up to 13,500 feet (approximately 2.6 miles) from the centerline.

The project site is within an area of noise levels exceeding City standards according to General Plan Figure PS-9 at build-out. The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue. The principal source of noise that would impact the project site is traffic. Generally, warehouse/distribution operations are not sensitive to noise impacts. The City of Rancho Cucamonga land use compatibility guidelines set forth noise/land use compatibility criteria for various land use types. The guidelines state that the proposed warehouse and manufacturing use is “normally acceptable” in areas with noise levels of up to 75 CNEL and “conditionally acceptable” in areas with noise levels of up to 80 CNEL (see Table 4).

The City’s General Plan identifies principal roadways and their classifications. Roadways in the vicinity of the proposed project that have the ability to impact noise levels at the proposed project site include 4th Street. 4th Street is classified as a Major Divided Arterial on the City of Rancho Cucamonga’s General Plan Circulation Plan. The City’s 2010 General Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Appendix H - Traffic

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Study) identifies the Year 2030 average daily traffic volume for 4th Street in the vicinity of the project site as approximately 26,100 average daily vehicle trips.

Buildout vehicle noise associated with 4th Street was modeled using the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model - FHWA-RD-77-108 (see Appendix E). Buildout worst-case traffic noise levels are expected to reach up to approximately 77 dBA CNEL at the right of way of the roadway and up to approximately 75 dBA CNEL at the portion of the proposed building that lies closest to 4th Street, approximately 100 feet north of the centerline of the roadway. Therefore, noise levels at the project site would not exceed the City’s noise/land use compatibility criteria for warehouse and manufacturing uses. No mitigation is required.

The office use associated with such operations would be the most sensitive to noise impacts. However, due to the concrete wall construction of the buildings and the setbacks between the buildings and the street, noise impacts will be less than significant.

Noise Impacts to Offsite Receptors from Onsite Operational Noise

Land uses immediately surrounding the project site consist of commercial uses to the north, 4th Street to the south, commercial and office uses to the east, and industrial uses to the west. The nearest sensitive receptors are the multi-family attached residential dwelling units located approximately 100 feet south of the project site. A noisiest hour scenario was modeled utilizing the SoundPLAN model. The location of HVAC equipment was estimated based on other similar facilities. Each unit was given a sound power level of 80 dBA. Loading areas were assigned a sound power level of 92, the proposed on-site generator was assigned a sound pressure level of 78.8 dB at 10 meters from the noise source, and the parking lots were modeled based on the number of spaces, type (car or truck) and peak hour trip generation. As shown on Figure 6 from the Noise Analysis, project peak hour operational noise levels will not exceed the daytime noise criteria for residential land uses of 65 dBA nor the nighttime noise criteria of 60 dBA at the nearest residential land uses. No mitigation is required. Noise impacts will be less than significant.

- b) The Noise Impact Analysis by Kunzman Associates (July 5, 2018) includes a vibration impact analysis. A vibration impact would generally be considered significant if it involves any construction-related or operations-related impacts in excess of 0.2 +inches per second (in/sec) PPV. Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment used on the site. Operation of construction equipment causes ground vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with distance. Buildings respond to these vibrations with varying results ranging from no perceptible effects at the low levels to slight damage at the highest levels.

The nearest existing structure (an office/commercial building) to the project site is located approximately 10 feet from the eastern project boundary. The nearest multifamily attached residential structure is located approximately 140 feet south of the project site. As shown in Table 2, the threshold at which there may be a risk of cosmetic architectural damage to engineered concrete and masonry buildings is 0.30 PPV in/second and the risk of architectural damage to normal dwellings with plastered walls and ceilings starts at 0.2 PPV. Primary sources of vibration during construction would be bulldozers. Vibratory rollers may also be utilized near the property line. As shown in Table 1, operation of large bulldozer could produce up to 0.089 PPV and a vibratory roller could generate up to 0.21 PPV; and operation of a large bulldozer could generate up to (0.089 PPV) at a distance of 25 feet (two of the most vibratory pieces of construction equipment). Groundborne

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

vibration at sensitive receptors associated with this equipment would drop off as the equipment moves away. For example, as the vibratory roller moves further than 100 feet from the sensitive receptors, the vibration associated with it would drop below 0.0026 PPV.

Annoyance to Persons

As shown in Table 2, vibrations are annoying to people in buildings at 0.20 PPV. Project construction activities may result in groundborne vibration that is annoying but limited to activities occurring within 100 feet of sensitive receptors and occurring only during site grading and preparation activities. There is an existing commercial/office building located as close as ten feet from the eastern project property line. Groundborne vibration levels could reach up to 0.57 at ten feet from the equipment source. The closest residential structure is at least 140 feet from the project site. Vibration levels would fall to 0.03 at this distance. Annoyance related to project construction would be very short-term at the adjacent office building and would not be significant. Proposed project best management measures will minimize effects related to annoyance.

Architectural Damage

Table 2 identifies PPV levels between 0.3 as the level that possible cosmetic structural damage could occur to engineered concrete and masonry buildings. Use of a vibratory roller within 18 feet of the adjacent commercial building could result in cosmetic architectural damage. The closest multi-family attached residential structure is at least 140 feet from the project site. Vibration levels would fall to 0.03 at this distance. No structural damage would occur to residential structures. As discussed in the proposed project description, caution will be utilized if large equipment is utilized within 18 feet of existing structures. Proposed project best management measures will minimize effects related to annoyance. Impacts related to groundborne vibration would be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Table 2

Vibration Level Peak Particle Velocity (PPV)	Human Reaction	Effect on Buildings
0.006–0.019 in/sec	Threshold of perception, possibility of intrusion	Vibrations unlikely to cause damage of any type
0.08 in/sec	Vibrations readily perceptible	Recommended upper level of vibration to which ruins and ancient monuments should be subjected
0.10 in/sec	Level at which continuous vibration begins to annoy people	Virtually no risk of “architectural” (i.e., not structural) damage to normal buildings
0.20 in/sec	Vibrations annoying to people in buildings	Threshold at which there is a risk to “architectural” damage to normal dwelling – houses with plastered walls and ceilings
0.3 in/sec	-	Possible cosmetic structural damage to engineered concrete and masonry
0.4–0.6 in/sec	Vibrations considered unpleasant by people subjected to continuous vibrations and unacceptable to some people walking on bridges	Vibrations at a greater level than normally expected from traffic, but would cause “architectural” damage and possibly minor structural damage. At 0.5 PPV possible cosmetic structural damage to buildings built of reinforced concrete, steel or timber.

c) The primary source of ambient noise levels in Rancho Cucamonga is traffic. A worst-case project generated traffic noise level was modeled utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model - FHWA-RD-77-108. Traffic noise levels were calculated from the centerline of the analyzed roadway to the nearest sensitive receptor. The modeling is theoretical and does not take into account any existing barriers, structures, and/or topographical features that may further reduce noise levels. Therefore, the levels are shown for comparative purposes only to show the difference in with and without project conditions. Roadway input parameters including average daily traffic volumes (ADTs), speeds, and vehicle distribution data is shown in Table 7. The potential off-site noise impacts caused by an increase of trips from operation of the proposed project on the nearby roadways were calculated for the following scenarios:

Existing Year (without Project): This scenario refers to existing year traffic noise conditions and is demonstrated in Table 8.

Existing Year (Plus Project): This scenario refers to existing year traffic noise conditions with incorporation of the proposed project and is demonstrated in Table 8.

According to the Noise Impact Analysis, noise impacts would be considered significant if the project increases noise levels at a noise sensitive land use by 3 CNEL and if the existing noise levels already exceed the residential land use compatibility standard of 65 CNEL or the project increases noise levels from below the 60 CNEL standard to above 65 CNEL. As stated in Noise Impact Analysis Section IV - C2, the measured existing conditions at the multi-family attached residential dwelling units to the south of the project

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

site have been identified as being above both the City’s base ambient noise level standards identified in Chapter 17.66 of the City’s Municipal Code as well as the normally acceptable residential noise standards in Table 4.

As shown in Table 8, existing traffic noise levels without the project exceed the residential land use compatibility standard of 65 CNEL for multi-family attached residential dwelling uses. Existing traffic noise modeling resulted in a noise level of 73.01 CNEL at the nearest sensitive receptors from the affected road segment; and Existing Plus Project traffic noise modeling resulted in a noise level of 73.11 CNEL at the nearest sensitive receptors from the affected roadway segment (see Table 8). In no case, however, would project generated vehicle trips cause an increase in the ambient noise levels that exceeds 3.0 CNEL. No mitigation is required. Traffic noise calculation outputs are included as Appendix E in the Noise Impact Analysis. Noise impacts will be less than significant.

Table 8

Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (CNEL)

Roadway	Segment	Distance from roadway centerline to nearest sensitive receptor (feet)	Modeled Noise Levels (CNEL)					
			Existing	Existing Plus Project	Increase	Exceeds Land Use Compatibility Standards	Over 3 dB Increase?	Substantial Increase?
4th Street	West of Haven Avenue	90	73.01	73.11	0.10	YES	NO	NO

- d) Existing multi-family attached residential dwelling units to the south may be temporarily affected by short-term noise impacts associated with the transport of workers, the movement of construction materials to and from the project site, ground clearing, excavation, grading, and building activities.

As described by the City’s Municipal Ordinance Section 17.66.050 and as presented in Section IV – C2 of this report, construction noise is considered a short-term impact and would be considered significant if construction activities are undertaken outside the allowable times or if they exceed 65 dBA at adjacent residential, school, church or similar types of land uses; or if they exceed 70 dBA at any adjacent commercial or industrial land uses. As stated in Section III(B) above, the existing ambient noise level at the northern property line of the multi-family dwelling units to the south of the project site was 71.5 dBA Leq, which is already above both the residential and commercial/industrial noise standards.

Project generated construction noise will vary depending on the construction process, type of equipment involved, location of the construction site with respect to sensitive receptors, the schedule proposed to carry out each task (e.g., hours and days of the week) and the duration of the construction work.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

A review and an analysis of proposed equipment lists by phase was conducted to determine which phase would result in the loudest noise levels. Based on the type and number of equipment proposed, the demolition phase is expected to be the loudest construction phase.

The SoundPLAN noise model was utilized to predict a likely worst-case demolition noise scenario. Equipment expected to be utilized during the demolition phase includes a concrete saw, a dozer, a tractor, a front end loader and a backhoe. Typical noise sources and noise levels associated with the demolition phase of construction are shown in Table 6 of the Noise Impact Analysis. Equipment was placed on the site in the SoundPLAN model in a realistic fashion and not assumed to all be operating on the property line. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings.

As shown on Figure 5 from the Noise Impact Analysis, demolition activities may reach 59 dBA Leq at the property line and 53 dBA Leq at the multi-family attached residential dwelling units to the south with implementation of all project best management measures listed in the project description. Project construction will need to comply with the City's allowed hours for construction activities and implementation of all project best management mitigation measures listed in the project description to reduce demolition related construction noise to below significance.

The General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.12) indicates that during a construction phase, on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, and construction equipment will generate noise exceeding City standards. The following measures from the Noise Impact Analysis and the City's General Plan FEIR are provided to ensure that noise impacts are mitigated to a level less than significant:

- 1) **Construction or grading shall not take place between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a national holiday.**
- 2) **Construction or grading noise levels shall not exceed the standards specified in Development Code Section 17.66.050, as measured at the property line. Developer shall hire a consultant to perform weekly noise level monitoring as specified in Development Code Section 17.66.050. Monitoring at other times may be required by the Building Official. Said consultant shall report their findings to the Building Official within 24 hours; however, if noise levels exceed the above standards, then the consultant shall immediately notify the Building Official. If noise levels exceed the above standards, then construction activities shall be reduced in intensity to a level of compliance with above noise standards or halted.**
- 3) **During the entire construction period, construction contractors will equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards.**
- 4) **During the entire construction period equipment will be shut off and not left to idle when not in use.**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- 5) **During the entire construction period, the contractor will locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.**
- 6) **During the entire construction period crushing, grinding or chipping activities, concrete saws, hydraulic equipment, jackhammers, and pneumatic equipment noise sources will be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors.**

The preceding mitigation measures will reduce the disturbance created by on-site construction equipment but do not address the potential impacts because of the transport of construction materials and debris. The following mitigation measures shall then be required:

- 7) **Haul truck deliveries shall not take place between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a national holiday. Additionally, if heavy trucks used for hauling would exceed 100 daily trips (counting both to and from the construction site), then the developer shall prepare a noise mitigation plan denoting any construction traffic haul routes and include appropriate noise mitigation measures. To the extent feasible, the plan shall denote haul routes that do not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings.**
- e) The site is located within an airport land use plan and is approximately one mile from a public airport (Ontario International Airport). The Project is located approximately one mile north of the Ontario Airport and is offset north of the flight path. Per the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project site is within the Airport Influence Area; however, according to the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the noise impact zones do not extend to the project site. The project site will not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise levels. With the sound attenuation provided by the building and the flight being offset, the impact is considered less than significant.
- f) The nearest private airstrip, Cable Airport, is located approximately 2.5 miles to the west of the City's westerly limits. No impact is anticipated.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i> a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	()	()	()	(✓)

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Comments:

- a) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The site is generally characterized by industrial development to the north, east, and west, and residential development to the south in the City of Ontario. The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial building. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The site will be developed with an industrial building that will be similar to the newer buildings in the industrial areas of the City. The project is located in a predominantly developed industrial area and will not induce population growth. Once constructed, the proposed project will have a limited number of employees; hence, the project will not create a demand for additional housing as a majority of the employees will likely be hired from within the City or surrounding communities. No impacts are anticipated.

- b) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The site is generally characterized by industrial development to the north, east, and west, and residential development to the south in the City of Ontario. The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial building. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The site will be developed with an industrial building that will be similar to the newer buildings in the industrial areas of the City. The project site is zoned industrial and does not contain any housing units that will be demolished. No adverse impact is expected.

- c) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The site is generally characterized by industrial development to the north, east, and west, and residential development to the south in the City of Ontario. The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial building. The project site is comprised of a parcel totaling 2.76 acres of land, located on the north side of Fourth Street, approximately 300 feet west of the intersection of Center Avenue and Fourth Street. Presently, the southern half of the site contains a nonconforming, combination metal and masonry building, and a partially improved asphalt parking lot. The parcel is approximately 200 feet wide by 600 feet deep. The northern half of the project site is vacant with ruderal vegetation covering the site. Industrial buildings are located to the west and north, and office and industrial park buildings to the east. The site will be developed with an industrial building that will be similar to the newer buildings in the industrial areas of the City. The project site is zoned industrial and does not contain any housing units; therefore, no displacement of people will occur. No adverse impact is expected.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>14. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i></p>				
a) Fire protection?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Police protection?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Schools?	()	()	()	(✓)
d) Parks?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) Other public facilities?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The project would be served by Fire Station #4 at 11297 Jersey Boulevard located about 2 miles northeast of the project site. The project will not require the construction of any new facilities or alteration of any existing facilities or cause a decline in the levels of service, which could cause the need to construct new facilities. Standard conditions of approval from the Uniform Building and Fire Codes will be placed on the project to lessen the future demand and impacts to fire services. No impacts are anticipated.
- b) Additional police protection is not required as the addition of the project will not change the pattern of uses within the surrounding area and will not have a substantial increase in property to be patrolled as the project site is within an area that is regularly patrolled.
- c) The site is located in a developed industrial area and is currently served by the Cucamonga School District and the Chaffey Joint Union High School District. The project will be required to pay School Fees as prescribed by State law prior to the issuance of building permits. No impacts are anticipated.
- d) The nearest park is Golden Oak Park at along 6th street, between Archibald and Hellman Avenues, approximately 1.75 miles northwest of the project site. The project will not require the construction of any new facilities or alteration of any existing facilities or cause a decline in the levels of service, which could cause the need to construct new facilities. A standard condition of approval will require the developer to pay Park Development Fees. No impacts are anticipated.
- e) The proposed project will utilize existing public facilities. The site is in a developed area, currently served by the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The project will not require the construction of any new facilities or alteration of any existing facilities or cause a decline in the levels of service, which could cause the need to construct new facilities. Cumulative development within Rancho Cucamonga will increase demand for library services. According to the General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.14), there will be a projected increase in library space demand but with the implementation of standard conditions the increase in Library Services would be mitigated to less than significant impact. Additionally, the closest public library, the Paul A. Biane Library, recently completed a second floor addition

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

that added 13,500 square feet of specialized programming space. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for which the FPEIR was prepared and impacts evaluated. Therefore, no adverse impact is expected.

15. RECREATION. <i>Would the project:</i> a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The site is in a developed industrial area, currently served by the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The nearest park is Golden Oak Park at along 6th street, between Archibald and Hellman Avenues, approximately 1.75 miles northwest of the project site. The project is a 58k industrial building and does not include any new housing, nor will it be a large employment generator that would cause an increase in the use of parks or other recreational facilities. A standard condition of approval will require the developer to pay Park Development Fees. No impacts are anticipated.
- b) See a) response above.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i> a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	()	()	(✓)	()
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	()	()	(✓)	()
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	()	()	()	(✓)
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	()	()	()	(✓)

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	()	()	()	(✓)
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The project site is located at 10234 4th Street about ¼ mile west of Haven Avenue, a major north-south arterial. The site is generally characterized by industrial development to the north, east, and west, and residential development to the south in the City of Ontario. The project proposes to construct a 58k industrial building for food related packaging and warehousing purposes. The square footage breakdown of the uses within the building are as follows: 27k warehouse; 25k manufacturing; and 7k office. To evaluate the number of daily trips, peak hour trips and trip distribution analysis, a Trip Generation Comparison was prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc (June 29, 2018). Trip generation rates were determined for daily trips, morning peak hour inbound and outbound trips, and evening peak hour inbound and outbound trips for the project land uses. By multiplying the trip generation rates by the land use quantities, the traffic volumes are determined.

Based upon the analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates, the proposed project is projected to generate a total of approximately 223 daily vehicle trips in Passenger Car Equivalents, 30 Passenger Car Equivalents of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 36 Passenger Car Equivalents of which will occur during the evening peak hour (Table 3). Typically, no further traffic analysis is required when a project contributes less than 50 peak hour trips to the roadway system.

Table 3

Project Net Trip Generation (in PCEs¹)

Description	Peak Hour						Daily
	Morning			Evening			
	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	
Manufacturing ²	22	4	26	8	19	27	163
Warehousing ³	3	1	4	1	4	5	60
Total	25	5	30	9	27	36	223

As noted in the General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.16), continued development will contribute to the traffic load in the Rancho Cucamonga area. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for which the FPEIR was prepared and impacts evaluated. The project is in an area that is mostly developed with street improvements existing or included in project design. As demonstrated by the Trip Generation Comparison by Kunzman Associates (2018), the project will not create a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, traffic volume, or congestion at intersections. The project site will be required to provide street improvements (curb, gutter and sidewalk) along the street

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

frontage of the site per City roadway standards. In addition, the City has established a Transportation Development fee that must be paid by the applicant prior to issuance of building permits. Fees are used to fund roadway improvements necessary to support adequate traffic circulation. The impact is considered less than significant.

- b) Based upon the analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates, the proposed project is projected to generate a total of approximately 223 daily vehicle trips in Passenger Car Equivalents, 30 Passenger Car Equivalents of which will occur during the morning peak hour and 36 Passenger Car Equivalents of which will occur during the evening peak hour (see Table 3 above). In November 2004, San Bernardino County voters passed the Measure I extension which requires local jurisdictions to impose appropriate fees on development for their fair share toward regional transportation improvement projects. On May 18, 2005, the City of Rancho Cucamonga adopted a Comprehensive Transportation Fee Schedule updating these development impact fees. As a result, the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency waived the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Traffic Impact Analysis reporting requirement. This project will be required, as a condition of approval, to pay the adopted transportation development fee prior to issuance of building permit. The project is in an area that is mostly developed with all street improvements existing. The project will not negatively impact the level of service standards on adjacent arterials. The project will be required to provide street improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk) along the street frontage of the site. The impact is considered less than significant.
- c) Located approximately 1 mile northerly of the Ontario Airport, the site is offset north of the flight path and will not change air traffic patterns. The project is located within the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). However, the proposed use and building is within the allowable height limits, and the project will not present a hazard to aircraft operations. No impacts are anticipated.
- d) The project is in an industrial area that is substantially developed. The project will be required to provide street improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk) along the street frontage of the site. The project design does not include any sharp curves or dangerous intersections or farming uses. The project will, therefore, not create a substantial increase in hazards because of a design feature. No impacts are anticipated.
- e) The project will be designed to provide access for all emergency vehicles during construction and upon completion of the project and will therefore not create an inadequate emergency access. The project site includes one access point off Fourth Street, and a reciprocal fire access agreement with the property to the west. The proposed site plan and reciprocal fire access agreement has been reviewed and approved by the Fire Construction Services section of the Building and Safety Department. No impacts are anticipated.
- f) The design of the project includes, or the project will be conditioned to provide, features supporting transportation and vehicle trip reduction including bicycle racks at the office area, preferential parking for car/vanpools, pedestrian connections to the public sidewalks, etc. The project site is within walking distance to the Omnitrans Route 81 along Haven Avenue, and a connection to Route 61 along Fourth Street; therefore, the project has the ability to provide bus transit connections. No impacts are anticipated.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> <i>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 the cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i></p> <p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1 (K)?</p>	()	(✓)	()	()
<p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	()	(✓)	()	()

Comments:

- a) The project site has not been identified as a "Historic Resource" per the standards of Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code Section 2.24 (Historic Preservation). A Cultural Resources Assessment was performed on the project site by First Carbon Solutions (FCS; September 13, 2018). On September 4, 2018, FCS Archaeologist David Smith, conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton. The results of the records search indicate that 7 cultural resources survey reports are on file for properties within a 1-mile search radius, but that the project area has never been the subject of a cultural resources study or archaeological survey. In addition, no historic or prehistoric resources have been recorded on the project area or within the 1-mile search radius.

FCS Archaeologist Robert Mariani, MA, surveyed the project area on August 30, 2018. Approximately one-third of the parcel is occupied by the existing RV and Off-Road building and pavement, and a small cell site facility is located in the northeastern corner of the property. The remainder of the parcel is undeveloped sediment. The project area is accessed from its southern boundary via 4th Street. No historic or prehistoric cultural resources were observed during the survey. Based on the analysis of the records search results, the NAHC Sacred Lands File search, additional Native American tribal member outreach attempts, and the pedestrian survey, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity for prehistoric resources.

The project site is somewhat disturbed by prior construction of metal building, a partial asphalt parking lot, and minimal dumping. In the event that earthwork operations result in the inadvertent discovery of historic resources, with the mitigation measure included under Section 5 (Cultural Resources) paragraph b) above, any impacts on historic resources will be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) There are no known archaeological sites or resources recorded on the project site. A Cultural Resources Assessment was performed on the project site by First Carbon Solutions (FCS; September 13, 2018). On September 4, 2018, FCS Archaeologist David Smith, conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton. The results of the records search indicate that 7 cultural resources survey reports are on file for properties within a 1-mile search radius, but that the project area has never been the subject of a cultural resources study or archaeological survey. In addition, no historic or prehistoric resources have been recorded on the project area or within the 1-mile search radius.

FCS Archaeologist Robert Mariani, MA, surveyed the project area on August 30, 2018. Approximately one-third of the parcel is occupied by the existing RV and Off-Road building and pavement, and a small cell site facility is located in the northeastern corner of the property. The remainder of the parcel is undeveloped sediment. The project area is accessed from its southern boundary via 4th Street. No historic or prehistoric cultural resources were observed during the survey. Based on the analysis of the records search results and the pedestrian survey by FCS, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low to moderate sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources.

The Rancho Cucamonga area is known to have been inhabited by Native Americans according to the General Plan FPEIR (Section 4.6). Construction activity, particularly grading, soil excavation, and compaction, could adversely affect or eliminate existing and potential archaeological resources. The General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) analyzed the impacts of Cultural Resources based on the future build out of the City. Although construction related archaeological monitoring is not recommended by FCS, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians contacted staff during the requisite notification period for AB 52. Based input from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, any impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources will be less than significant with the imposition of mitigation measures listed in Section 5 (Cultural Resources) paragraph b.

In conformance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), staff sent a Tribal Consultation Request on October 17, 2018, of the proposed project to the following Tribal Communities who had requested to be notified: Gabrieleno/ Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation and Morongo Band of Mission Indians. Following the prescribed timelines for AB52, staff received responses from the following 3 Tribes: San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, and Morongo Band of Mission Indians. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians requested a copy of the Cultural Resources Report and a mitigation measure that Tribal Monitoring occur during all ground disturbing activities. Staff sent a follow-up response on December 6, 2018 to the Morongo Band of Mission Indians with 1) a copy of the Cultural Resources Report and 2) a response requesting if formal consultation was desired. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians did not respond to staff’s December 6, 2018 correspondence regarding consultation. The Morongo Band of Mission Indians requested mitigation measure for monitoring has been included as a mitigation measure. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requested that mitigation measures be incorporated, which are included below. Should any undocumented archaeological or cultural resources be discovered during grading activities, adherence to the mitigation measures listed below will ensure that all impacts will be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Moronggo Band of Mission Indians:

- 1.) A member of the Moronggo Band of Mission Indians shall be present during all ground disturbing activities.

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians:

- 2.) TCR-1: The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in CR-1, of any pre-contact resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with SMBMI, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents SMBMI for the remainder of the project, should SMBMI elect to place a monitor on-site.
- 3.) TCR-2: Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to SMBMI. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with SMBMI throughout the life of the project.

Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation:

- 4.) Retain a Native American Monitor/Consultant: The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and is listed under the NAHC’s Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. This list is provided by the NAHC. The monitor/consultant will only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation as activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project area. The Tribal Monitor/consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day’s activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and monitor/consultant have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.
- 5.) Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural and Archaeological Resources: Upon discovery of any archaeological resources, cease construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and tribal

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Tribe will request reburial or preservation for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation takes place (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 [f]). If a resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to constitute a “historical resource” or “unique archaeological resource”, time allotment and funding sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures, or appropriate mitigation, must be available. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, they shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

- 6.) **Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects:** Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and excavation halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and PRC 5097.98 shall be followed.

- 7.) **Resource Assessment & Continuation of Work Protocol:** Upon discovery, the tribal and/or archaeological monitor/consultant/consultant will immediately divert work at minimum of 150 feet and place an exclusion zone around the burial. The monitor/consultant(s) will then notify the Tribe, the qualified lead archaeologist, and the construction manager who will call the coroner. Work will continue to be diverted while the coroner determines whether the remains are Native American. The discovery is to be kept confidential and secure to prevent any further disturbance. If the finds are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the NAHC as mandated by state law who will then appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD).

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

8.) **Kizh-Gabrieleno Procedures for burials and funerary remains:** If the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation is designated MLD, the following treatment measures shall be implemented. To the Tribe, the term “human remains” encompasses more than human bones. In ancient as well as historic times, Tribal Traditions included, but were not limited to, the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains. These remains are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later; other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered as associated funerary objects.

9.) **Treatment Measures:** Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the land owner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. The Tribe will work closely with the qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be taken which includes at a minimum detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Tribe for data recovery purposes. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure completely recovery of all material. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location is considered a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created. Once complete, a final report of all activities is to be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does NOT authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive diagnostics on human remains.

Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items should be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.

Professional Standards: Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction projects will be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

associated funerary objects shall be taken. Principal personnel must meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	()	()	()	(✓)
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	()	()	()	(✓)
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	()	()	(✓)	()
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	()	()	()	(✓)
e) 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?	()	()	()	(✓)
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	()	()	(✓)	()
g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	()	()	()	(✓)

Comments:

- a) The proposed project is served by the CVWD sewer system, which has waste treated by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency at the RP-1 and RP-4 treatment plants. The RP-1 capacity is sufficient to exceed the additional development within the western and southern areas of the City. The RP-4 treatment plant has a potential ultimate capacity of 28 mgd which is considered more than adequate to capacity to treat all increases in wastewater generation for buildout of the General Plan. The project is required to meet the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding wastewater. No impacts are anticipated.
- b) The proposed project is served by the CVWD sewer system, which has waste treated by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency at the RP-4 treatment plant located within Rancho Cucamonga and RP-1 located within City of Ontario, neither of which is at capacity. The project is required to meet the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding wastewater. No impacts are anticipated.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c) All runoff will be conveyed to existing storm drain facilities, which have been designed to handle the flows. A Grading and Drainage Plan must be approved by the Building Official and City Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. The impact is considered less than significant.
- d) The CVWD provides water treatment, storage and distribution of domestic water to Rancho Cucamonga and portions of the cities of Ontario and Fontana, and a tract in Upland. The current daily water usage in the CVWD service area is approximately 41.7 million gallons per day (mgd). Residential water use amounts to about 60 percent of the total water consumed. Landscaping (public and private) is the next largest consumer of water at 20 percent.

Under Senate Bill 610 (SB 610), Water Supply Assessments are required for projects that exceed the following sizes: 1) residential development of more than 500 dwelling units; 2) shipping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet; 3) commercial office buildings employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet; 4) hotel or motel having more than 500 rooms; 5) industrial, manufacturing, processing plant, or industrial park housing more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet; 6) mixed use project including one or more of the projects specified above; 7) any other project that would demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than the amount of water required by a 500-dwelling unit project; and 8) any project that accounts for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of existing service connections for a public water system. Under SB 221, a Water Supply Assessment is required when: 1) A project that is a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units; 2) a project that accounts for an increase of 10 percent or more in the number of existing service connections for a public water system; and 3) applies to development agreements that include such subdivision.

The City has determined that the proposed 58k industrial building does not meet one of the requirements; therefore, a Water Supply Assessment is not required. The project is served by the CVWD water system. There is currently a sufficient water supply available to the City of Rancho Cucamonga to serve this project. No impacts are anticipated.

- e) The proposed project is served by the CVWD sewer system, which has waste treated by the Inland Empire Utilities Agency at the RP-4 treatment plant located within Rancho Cucamonga and RP-1 located within City of Ontario, neither of which is at capacity. No impacts are anticipated.
- f) Solid waste disposal will be provided by the current City contracted hauler who disposes the refuse at a permitted landfill with sufficient capacity to handle the City's solid waste disposal needs. The impact is considered less than significant.
- g) This project complies with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding solid waste. The City of Rancho Cucamonga continues to implement waste reduction procedures consistent with AB 939. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	()	()	()	(✓)
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)?	()	()	(✓)	()
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	()	(✓)	()	()

Comments:

- a) The project site is located in an area developed with industrial and office uses. The site has been previously disrupted during construction of metal building and a partial parking lot. According to the General Plan Figure RC-4, and Section 4.4 of the General Plan FPEIR, the project site is within an area of sensitive biological resources: the project site is in the vicinity of potential habitat for the Delhi Sands flower loving fly soils area. Accordingly, a Habitat Suitability Evaluation (Ecological Sciences, July 11, 2018) was performed to evaluate the suitability of the site to support the endangered Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. The project site is located in the Ontario Recovery Unit, areas that contain Delhi Sands flower loving flies or have restorable habitat.

Ecological Sciences conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey on the subject site to evaluate potential habitat for DSFF on March 31 and June 16, 2018. The survey was conducted by Scott Cameron; Principal Biologist of Ecological Sciences, Inc. Mr. Cameron holds a federal permit to conduct focused survey for this species (TE-808642-8). The site was examined on foot by walking a series of meandering transects across the subject property. Dominant plant species and other habitat characteristics present at the site were identified to assess the overall habitat value. Weather conditions included hazy skies, 0-1 breezes, and an ambient temperature of 82-86 °F. The site is characterized as an industrial/commercial site that contains an abandoned building, asphalt parking lot, and associated infrastructure in the southern half and disturbed open areas in the northern half. Substrate consists of loamy sands with scattered gravel and extensive debris dumping. Existing development surrounds the site.

Based on results of the June 2016 habitat suitability evaluation, existing conditions present at the site are not consistent with those known or expected to support DSFF. No exposed natural or semi-natural open areas with unconsolidated wind-worked granitic soils or dunes are present. Exposure to historic and recurring substrate disturbances have

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

substantial negative effects on potential DSFF habitat and may also prevent potentially suitable DSFF microhabitat soil conditions from developing. Substrate conditions are not consistent with those most often correlated with potential DSFF habitat. Although a few native plant species are present that are often associated with potential DSFF habitat, the context in which these species occur (e.g., scattered within highly disturbed site conditions) does not constitute a native plant community most commonly associated with potential DSFF habitat.

There is no connectivity to the subject site from the nearest known (to us) DSFF population (+/- 3 miles southeast of the site) due to the presence of existing commercial development that entirely surrounds the site. While this species likely has the capability of dispersing over relatively large distances of seemingly unsuitable habitats under certain circumstances, it would be reasonable to assume (based on our current knowledge of the species) that the likelihood of DSFF dispersing to the subject site from the nearest known off-site occupied site would not be expected despite the fact that variables such as the length, width, and structural characteristics of dispersal corridors are not fully understood. Accordingly, the subject site would not be considered a viable property for preservation or restoration due to its geographic location and current/surrounding land uses which have fragmented potential DSFF habitat in the area.

Under current conditions, the site would be considered prohibitive to DSSF occupation. The underlying soil environment appears to be the most definitive factor of whether an area could potentially support DSFF. Quality of Delhi soils present within the study area was rated for its potential to support DSFF. The area mapped as Delhi soils was visually inspected and rated based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the best quality and most suitable habitat in the permitted biologist's judgment:

1. Soils dominated by heavy deposits of alluvial material including coarse sands and gravels with little or no Delhi sands and evidence of soil compaction. Unsuitable.
2. Delhi sands are present but the soil characteristics include a predominance of alluvial materials (Tujunga Soils). Very Low Quality.
3. Although not clean, sufficient Delhi sands are present to prevent soil compaction. Some sandy soils exposed on the surface due to fossorial animal activity. Low Quality.
4. Abundant clean Delhi sands with little or no alluvial material or Tujunga soils present. Moderate abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative cover. Evidence of moderate degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. Moderate Quality
5. Sand dune habitat with clean Delhi sands. High abundance of exposed sands on the soil surface. Low vegetative cover. Evidence (soil surface often gives under foot) of high degree of fossorial animal activity by vertebrates and invertebrates. High Quality

Based on the above ratings and existing site conditions, the site would be considered Unsuitable for DSFF. In view of the site's highly degraded condition, exposure to long standing disturbances, and analyses of correlative habitat information from a wide range

Issues and Supporting Information Sources:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

(e.g., relatively disturbed to more natural habitats) of occupied DSFF habitats in the region, the +/- 2.76-acre site does not contain habitat suitable to support or sustain a DSFF population. It would be contrary to expectation that the FWS would require a focused protocol survey on such a degraded site. No impacts to DSFF are expected and no mitigation is required for less than significant impacts under CEQA.

- b) If the proposed project were approved, the applicant would be required to develop the site in accordance with the City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan. The 2010 General Plan was adopted along with the certification of a Program FEIR, Findings of Fact, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for significant adverse environmental effects of build-out in the City and Sphere-of-Influence. The City made findings that adoption of the General Plan would result in significant adverse effects to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Climate Change and Mineral Resources. Mitigation measures were adopted for each of these resources; however, they would not reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. As such, the City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations balancing the benefits of development under the General Plan Update against the significant unavoidable adverse impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15092 and 15096(h)). These benefits include less overall traffic volumes by developing mixed-use projects that will be pedestrian friendly and conservation of valuable natural open space. With these findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations, no further discussion or evaluation of cumulative impacts is required.

It should also be noted that significant conservation efforts have taken place within the geographic area of the Etiwanda Fan from Deer Creek to San Sevaine Creek and include the following conservation areas:

North Etiwanda Preserve. In 1998, the County of San Bernardino created a 763-acre conservation area in response to impacts to AFSS from the Foothill Freeway (SR-210) project. The Preserve and surrounding lands also contain significant amounts of other rare and threatened habitats that include Sycamore Alluvial Woodland, California Walnut Woodland, and Fresh Water Marsh.

North Etiwanda Preserve Expansion Area. In 2009 an additional 440 acres of land was set aside for conservation purposes adjacent to the North Etiwanda Preserve and within the San Sevaine Creek area. Along with the original 763 acre preserve, these lands are managed with the intent of permanently protecting the alluvial scrub and other native communities and species that occupy the North Etiwanda Preserve.

U.S. Forest Service Conservation Area. This 880-acre conservation area is located adjacent to the western edge of the North Etiwanda Preserve and includes land purchased by the Metropolitan Water District along Day Canyon and Day Creek as mitigation for the MWD's Inland Feeder Project. The land has been transferred to the U.S. Forest Service and is a part of the San Bernardino National Forest. The majority of this conservation area extends beyond the City's Sphere of Influence, into unincorporated territory.

San Sevaine Preserve. This 137-acre conservation area was established by San Bernardino County as mitigation for floodwater diversion structures and debris basins.

Day Creek Preserve. A 200-acre conservation area was set aside through a conservation easement to the San Bernardino County Flood Control District as mitigation for impacts from sand and gravel operations.

Tract 16072 Mitigation Area. This mitigation area consists of 335 acres that will be conserved as habitat mitigation for Tentative Tract 16072. This area is within the Day Creek watershed and contains various habitats that include alluvial fan sage scrub, white sage scrub, chaparral, and riparian habitat.

Rancho Etiwanda/Henderson Creek Mitigation Area. This 308-acre property is surrounded by the North Etiwanda Preserve and San Bernardino National Forest. The Site was part of the mitigation requirements for the Rancho Etiwanda Estates Project and the Henderson Creek Project. The 308 acre Site is protected by a conservation easement.

The above conservation areas total more than 3,000 acres and are managed primarily for species and habitat values. The project will result in the loss of approximately 25.48 acres of scrub vegetation that is a functionally isolated remnant of a historically broader extent of alluvial scrub vegetation, namely RAFSS, associated with the Etiwanda Fan and the Day Creek wash. The habitat at the Project site has been disturbed over the years, such that the site is dominated by California buckwheat, giving the site the appearance of alluvial scrub vegetation in an earlier stage of ecological succession. However, due to the extent of development and flood control improvements, the project site is functionally isolated from the degree of flood scour that would be necessary to naturally sustain characteristic RAFSS habitat in the future. Further, residential/commercial development and flood control improvements over time have eliminated the majority of the alluvial scrub vegetation south of the 210 Freeway (as well as north of the Freeway), leaving only scattered remnant patches along the Day Creek Channel and in a few other locations.

For the proposed 58k building at 10234 Fourth Street on a site of less than 3 acres that is surrounded by industrial and office development, cumulative impacts are considered less than significant.

- c) Development of the site for the proposed 58k building at 10234 Fourth Street on a site of less than 3 acres that is surrounded by industrial and office development under the existing General Plan land use designation and zoning would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. The Initial Study identifies construction-related emissions of criteria pollutants as having a potentially significant impact; therefore, proposed mitigation measures in the Air Quality Section are included and will reduce emission levels and cumulative impacts to less than significant. Additionally, impacts to air quality resulting from construction activities would be short-term and would cease once construction activities were completed.

A Noise Impact Study (Kunzman Associates, July 2018) was submitted for the project that reviewed impacts from traffic and construction noise, and potential impacts from vibration levels. The report concludes potential impacts from noise and vibration are less than significant with the incorporation of best management practices and mitigation measures from the Project Description. According to the Noise Impact Analysis, demolition activities may reach 59 dBA Leq at the property line and 53 dBA Leq at the multi-family attached residential dwelling units to the south with implementation of all project best management measures listed in the project description. Project construction will need to comply with the City's allowed hours for construction activities and implementation of all project best management measures listed in the project description to reduce demolition related construction noise to below significance. Standard mitigation measures from the General Plan FEIR are included to ensure that construction noise impacts remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated. With inclusion of the mitigation measures in the Noise Analysis Section, cumulative noise impacts will be less than significant.

EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier PEIR or Negative Declaration per Section 15063(c)(3)(D). The effects identified above for this project were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the following earlier document(s) pursuant to applicable legal standards, and such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis. The following earlier analyses were utilized in completing this Initial Study and are available for review in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, Planning Division offices, 10500 Civic Center Drive:

- (✓) General Plan FPEIR
(SCH#2000061027, Certified May 19, 2010)
- (✓) General Plan FEIR
(SCH#2000061027, Certified October 17, 2001)
- (✓) Master Environmental Assessment for the 1989 General Plan Update
(SCH #88020115, certified January 4, 1989)
- (✓) Industrial Area Specific Plan EIR
(Certified September 19, 1981)
- (✓) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Health Risk Assessment Impact Analysis
(Kunzman Associates, Inc., March 31, 2018)
- (✓) Habitat Suitability Evaluation for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly
(Ecological Sciences, July 11, 2018)
- (✓) Cultural Resources Assessment
(First Carbon Solutions, September 13, 2018)
- (✓) Noise Impact Analysis
(Kunzman Associates, July 5, 2018)
- (✓) Trip Generation Comparison
(Kunzman Associates, June 29, 2018)

APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I certify that I am the applicant for the project described in this Initial Study. I acknowledge that I have read this Initial Study and the proposed mitigation measures. Further, I have revised the project plans or proposals and/or hereby agree to the proposed mitigation measures to avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant environmental effects would occur.

Applicant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Print Name and Title: _____