DRAFT

Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

Etiwanda Creek Community Park Expansion Project

August 2021

dav Agency:

RANCHO CUCAMONGA

10500 Civic Center Drive

Rancho Cucamonga, California 91729

Prepared by:

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

215 North Fifth Street

Redlands, California 92374

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
ETIWANDA CREEK COMMUNITY PARK EXPANSION PROJECT

Lead Agency: City of Rancho Cucamonga

Project Proponent: City of Rancho Cucamonga
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91729

Project Location: The project site is located at 5939 East Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91739.

Project Description:

The Proposed Project would construct new recreational and community facilities and supporting infrastructure at Etiwanda Creek Community Park.

Recreational Facilities

Proposed recreational facilities include two new sport fields, a tennis court, and an interactive water feature. The proposed sports fields would be located at the northeast corner of the park, east of the existing soccer field, and would accommodate configurations for baseball, softball, soccer, and football. The sport fields would include light-emitting diode (LED) sports lighting similar to the existing fields. Spectator seating areas would also be provided at the perimeter of the fields. The proposed seating areas would not include bleachers and instead would provide space for visitors to bring their own chairs.

A tennis court with a pickleball overlay would also be constructed south of the proposed sport fields. An interactive water feature would be located north of the proposed tennis court and south of the proposed sports fields. The water feature would be designed with a sports theme and would have low water use and maintenance requirements. This interactive water feature would not be a splash pad.

The existing sports fields would not be modified by the Proposed Project. However, the existing dog play area located at the northwest corner of the park would be removed. Basic park amenities would be installed at this location. Amenities may include shade structure(s), seating, drinking fountain(s), walking path, parking, play structure, and/or exercise equipment.

Community Facilities

Community facilities included with the Proposed Project include a concession and storage space, a shade structure, and a restroom. Concession and storage space would also be provided south of the proposed sport fields for the use of youth sport leagues and community events. The concession space would include counter space with a sink and power receptacles. The Proposed Project would also construct a four-sided shade structure adjacent to the concession and storage space. The shade structure is not intended for picnic use; therefore, no tables or benches would be provided. A restroom would also be provided in this area.

Supporting Infrastructure

The Proposed Project would also construct supporting infrastructure to serve the expanded recreational and community facilities. A second park entrance, accessible at the intersection of Banyan Street and Golden Lock Place, would be provided. An entry monument sign would be installed. This second entrance would lead to a new parking lot with approximately 74 spaces. Other supporting infrastructure would include a new trash enclosure and a service yard to store park maintenance equipment and materials. The service yard would be fully enclosed and accessible only to the City's Public Works staff and contractors. The existing maintenance road located at the center of the park would be extended to the east to the proposed service yard. The existing maintenance yard located just north of the existing park entrance would remain in place. However, during final project design it may be fully relocated to the proposed maintenance yard at the northeast corner of the park.

The Proposed Project would also include landscaping located around the proposed facilities and infrastructure improvements.

Public Review Period: September 3, 2021 to September 22, 2021

Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Project to Avoid Significant Effects:

Biological Resources

BIO-1: Preconstruction Coastal California Gnatcatcher Survey: A preconstruction survey shall be conducted for coastal California Gnatcatcher no more than 14 days prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal activities. The preconstruction survey shall take place regardless of nesting bird season timing and shall focus on identifying the presence of coastal California gnatcatcher within the project site and 500-foot buffer within suitable habitat for this species.

If coastal California gnatcatcher are detected during the preconstruction survey, additional mitigation measures may need to be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to this species, and consultation between the City of Rancho Cucamonga and the appropriate agency may be required (CDFW, USFWS). Mitigation measures for the federally listed coastal California gnatcatchers would be included to ensure that impacts to these species do not occur during vegetation removal. Mitigation measures for coastal California gnatcatcher if habitat is determined to be occupied will include (at the discretion of the monitoring biologist) additional focused surveys, biological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal activities, the establishment of a minimum 500-foot non-disturbance buffer around active nest locations during construction activities, and/or noise monitoring to ensure that noise levels will not exceed 60 decibels.

BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey: A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be completed within the project site between 14 and 30 days prior to construction activities in accordance with the CDFW *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (2012). A second pre-construction survey shall be conducted no more than 24 hours prior to the start of construction. If burrowing owls are observed during either of the preconstruction surveys, implementation of

additional measures may be necessary to reduce impacts to a level that is less than significant, including seasonal work restrictions, no-work buffers established around active burrows, passive relocation of burrowing owls, and/or a specific mitigation methodology determined in coordination with CDFW.

BIO-3: Pre-construction Nesting Bird Survey: If construction or other Project activities are scheduled to occur during the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that active bird nests will not be disturbed or destroyed. The survey shall be completed no more than three days prior to initial ground disturbance. The nesting bird survey shall include the project site and adjacent areas where Project activities have the potential to affect active nests, either directly or indirectly due to construction activity or noise. If an active nest is identified, a qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate disturbance limit buffer around the nest using flagging or staking. Construction activities shall not occur within any disturbance limit buffer zones until the nest has fledged or has been deemed inactive by the qualified biologist.

Cultural Resources

CUL-1: If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural and/or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 60-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for pre-contact and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately, and no agency notifications are required.
- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County of San Bernardino Coroner Office and the applicable landowner. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
- If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill [AB] 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the San Bernardino County Coroner (per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely

Descendant (MLD) for the project (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

CUL-2: In the event that 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, regarding any pre-contact finds 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.

CUL-3: If significant pre-contact cultural 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.

CUL-4: 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.

Geology and Soils

GEO-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resource: If paleontological resources (i.e., fossil remains) are discovered during excavation activities, the contractor will notify the City and cease excavation within 100 feet of the find until a qualified paleontological professional can provide an evaluation of the site. The qualified paleontological professional will evaluate the significance of the find and recommend appropriate measures for the disposition of the site (e.g. fossil recovery, curation, data recovery, and/or monitoring). Construction activities may continue on other parts of the construction site while evaluation and treatment of the paleontological resource takes place.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City of Rancho Cucamonga (or its contractor) shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure proper access to residences and businesses in the area by emergency vehicles during construction and to maintain traffic flow. The Traffic Control Plan shall be approved by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Transportation Services Manager prior to any lane closures.

Noise

NOI-1: The Project improvement and building plans will include the following requirements for construction activities:

- Construction contracts must specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state-required noise attenuation devices.
- A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall be posted at the Project construction site providing a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. This sign shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities. In conjunction with this required posting, a noise disturbance coordinator will be identified to address construction noise concerns received. The coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the disturbance coordinator shall notify the City within 24 hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (starting too early, malfunctioning muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the City. All signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator.
- Identification of construction noise reduction methods. These reduction methods may include shutting off idling equipment (5 minutes), installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and using electric air compressors and similar power tools.
- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.
- Per Section 17.66.050 of the City's Municipal Code, construction shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a national holiday.

NOI-2: In order to reduce construction noise, during the site preparation, grading and building construction phases, a temporary noise barrier or enclosure shall be used along the northern property line to break the line of sight between the construction equipment and the adjacent residence. The temporary noise barrier shall have a sound transmission class (STC) of 35 or

greater in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials Test Method E90, or at least 2 pounds per square foot to ensure adequate transmission loss characteristics. The temporary noise barrier shall consist of a solid plywood fence at least 7/16-inch and/or flexible sound curtains, such as an 18-ounce tarp or a 2-inch-thick fiberglass blanket, attached to chain link fencing. The length, height, and location of noise control barrier walls shall be adequate to assure proper acoustical performance. All noise control barrier walls shall be designed to preclude structural failure due to such factors as winds, shear, shallow soil failure, earthquakes, and erosion.

Tribal Cultural Resources

TCR-1: The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-2, of any pre-contact cultural 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.

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.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
APE	Area of Potential Effect
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH_4	Methane
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_2e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
CO Plan	Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide
CRHR	California Register of Historic Places
CWA	California Water Act
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIC	Eastern Information Center
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GHGs	Greenhouse Gases
LSTs	Localized Significance Thresholds
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MMT	Million Metric Tons
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MSHCP	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
$MTCO_2eq$	Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
ND	Negative Declaration
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

N_2O	Nitrous Oxide
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OHV	Off-Highway Vehicle
OPR	California Office of Planning and Research
PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$	Particulate Matter
PPV	Peak Particle Velocity
RCPG	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SP	Service Population
SoCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SR	State Route
SRA	Sensitive Receptor Area
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
VMT	Vehicle miles travelled

SECTION 1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 Summary

Project Title:	Etiwanda Creek Community Park Expansion Project
Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Rancho Cucamonga 10500 Civic Center Drive Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730
Contact Person and Phone Number:	Tabe van der Zwaag, Associate Planner 10500 Civic Center Drive Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730
Project Location:	The project site is located at 5939 East Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91739.
General Plan Designation:	Parks
Zoning:	Park (P), Very Low Residential (VL)

1.2 Introduction

The City of Rancho Cucamonga is the Lead Agency for this Initial Study. The Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the Etiwanda Creek Community Park Expansion Project (Proposed Project). This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 *et seq.*) and State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 *et seq.*). CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those Projects. A CEQA Initial Study is generally used to determine which CEQA document is appropriate for a Project (Negative Declaration [ND], Mitigated Negative Declaration [MND], or Environmental Impact Report [EIR]).

1.3 Surrounding Land Uses/Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project is located within the City of Rancho Cucamonga in southwest San Bernardino County (Figure 1). The project site consists of a seven-acre area at Etiwanda Creek Community Park. Etiwanda Creek Community Park measures approximately 18.6 acres and contains 11.6 acres of developed park areas and 7 acres of undeveloped land, where the Proposed Project would be located. The project site is located northeast of the intersection of East Avenue and Banyan Street north of Summit Intermediate School (Figure 2). As shown on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute Cucamonga

Peak, California topographic quadrangle map (1996), the project site is located in the northeastern quarter of Section 28 of Township 1 north, Range 6 west of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian.

The project site is approximately 1.5 miles west of Interstate 15 (I-15). The project site is surrounded by residential development to the north, open space to the east, Summit Intermediate School to the south, and Etiwanda Colony Elementary School to the west. Surrounding land uses are described in the table below.

Table 1.3-1. Surrounding Zoning and Land Use Designations

	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Existing Land Use
Project Site	Parks	Park (P), Very Low Residential (VL)	Public Park
North	Very Low Density Residential (VL)	VL - Very Low Residential	Single Family Homes
East	Flood Control/Utility Corridor	FC - Flood Control UC - Utility Corridor	Flood Control/Utility Corridor
South	Schools, Very Low Density Residential (VL)	Schools, Very Low Residential (VL)	Schools, Single Family Homes
West	Schools, Very Low Density Residential (VL)	Schools, Very Low Residential (VL)	Schools, Single Family Homes

Source: City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a

Location: N:\2019\2019-140.001 RC Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project\MAPS\location vicinity\RC_ECP_Vicinity.mxd (AA)-mapping_guest 8/12/2019

Map Date: 8/12/2019

Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Figure 1. Regional Project Location

2019-140.001 Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project

Location: N:\2019\2019-140.001 RC Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project\MAPS\location_vicinity\RC_ECP_Location_V2.mxd (A4)-mguidry 12/18/2020

Map Date: 12/18/2020
Photo Source: NAIP 2016

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Figure 2. Project Location

2019-140.001 Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Characteristics

The Proposed Project would construct new recreational and community facilities and supporting infrastructure at Etiwanda Creek Community Park. The project site consists of an approximately 18.6-acre area containing 11.6 acres of a developed, modern park, and 7 acres of undeveloped land east of the park. See Figure 3 for a conceptual plan depicting proposed facilities and infrastructure improvements.

Recreational Facilities

Proposed recreational facilities include two new sport fields, a tennis court, and an interactive water feature. The proposed sports fields would be located at the northeast corner of the park, east of the existing soccer field, and would accommodate configurations for baseball, softball, soccer, and football. The sport fields would include light-emitting diode (LED) sports lighting similar to the existing fields. Spectator seating areas would also be provided at the perimeter of the fields. The proposed seating areas would not include bleachers and instead would provide space for visitors to bring their own chairs.

A tennis court with a pickleball overlay would also be constructed south of the proposed sport fields. An interactive water feature would be located north of the proposed tennis court and south of the proposed sports fields. The water feature would be designed with a sports theme and would have low water use and maintenance requirements. This interactive water feature would not be a splash pad.

The existing sports fields would not be modified by the Proposed Project. However, the existing dog play area located at the northwest corner of the park would be removed. Basic park amenities would be installed at this location. Amenities may include shade structure(s), seating, drinking fountain(s), walking path, parking, play structure, and/or exercise equipment.

Community Facilities

Community facilities included with the Proposed Project include a concession and storage space, a shade structure, and a restroom. Concession and storage space would also be provided south of the proposed sport fields for the use of youth sport leagues and community events. The concession space would include counter space with a sink and power receptacles. The Proposed Project would also construct a four-sided shade structure adjacent to the concession and storage space. The shade structure is not intended for picnic use; therefore, no tables or benches would be provided. A restroom would also be provided in this area.

Supporting Infrastructure

The Proposed Project would also construct supporting infrastructure to serve the expanded recreational and community facilities. A second park entrance, accessible at the intersection of Banyan Street and Golden Lock Place, would be provided. An entry monument sign would be installed. This second entrance would lead to a new parking lot with approximately 74 spaces.

Other supporting infrastructure would include a new trash enclosure and a service yard to store park maintenance equipment and materials. The service yard would be fully enclosed and accessible only to the City's Public Works staff and contractors. The existing maintenance road located at the center of the park would be extended to the east to the proposed service yard. The existing maintenance yard located just north of the existing park entrance would remain in place. However, during final project design it may be fully relocated to the proposed maintenance yard at the northeast corner of the park.

The Proposed Project would also include landscaping located around the proposed facilities and infrastructure improvements.

2.2 Project Timing

It is estimated that construction of the Proposed Project would last approximately 12 months beginning in 2022.

Location: N:\2019\2019-140.001 RC Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project\MAPS\Borders\ECP_site_plan.mxd (AA, 8/12/2019) - mapping_guest

Map Date: 8/12/2019
Source: Albert A. Webb Associates 2017

Figure 3. Site Plan

2019-140.001 Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project

ECORP Consulting, Inc.
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Figure 3. Project Site Plan

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2.3 Regulatory Requirements, Permits, and Approvals

The following approvals and regulatory permits would be required for implementation of the Proposed Project:

- City of Rancho Cucamonga Grading Permit; Building Permit

2.4 Consultation With California Native American Tribe(s)

The following California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area have been notified of the project:

- San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
- Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians

The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1. A summary of the consultation process, including the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, is provided in Section 4.18 of this Initial Study.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

3.1 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

☐ Aesthetics	☒ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Transportation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☒ Cultural Resources	☒ Noise	☐ Wildfire
☐ Energy	☒ Paleontological Resources	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐ Geology and Soils	☐ Population and Housing	
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Public Services	

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	☐
I find that although the 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 Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	☐
I find that the Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	☐
I find that although the Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the Project, nothing further is required.	☐

Tabe van der Zwaag — *9/2/2021*

Tabe van der Zwaag
Associate Planner

Date

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Aesthetics

4.1.1 Environmental Setting

Regional Setting

Major scenic resources in the City of Rancho Cucamonga include the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains and foothills, vistas of the City from hillside areas, and other views of special vegetation and permanent open space features. These north-south views are particularly prominent along the straight alignments of Archibald, Haven, and Etiwanda Avenues. Views of the mountains are available from most areas in the City and provide a visual backdrop for the project site and surrounding communities.

State Scenic Highways

The California Scenic Highway Program protects and enhances the scenic beauty of California's highways and adjacent corridors. A highway can be designated as scenic based on how much natural beauty can be seen by users of the highway, the quality of the scenic landscape, and if development impacts the enjoyment of the view (Caltrans 2019). No officially designated state scenic highways are located in or near the City of Rancho Cucamonga (Rancho Cucamonga 2010b). The nearest designated scenic highway is State Route (SR) 138, located in the San Gabriel Mountains approximately 11.5 miles north of the project site.

Visual Character of the Project Site

The Etiwanda Creek Community Park currently consists of a dog park, tot lot, two soccer fields, surface parking lot, restrooms, and associated landscaping. The project site consists of an approximately 18.6-acre area containing 11.6 acres of a developed, modern park, and 7 acres of undeveloped land east of the park. The project site is bordered by the Etiwanda Educational Center directly to the south; vacant land to the west; single-family homes to the north; and vacant undeveloped land to the east. The dominant scenic views from the project site and the surrounding area include the San Gabriel Mountains to the northwest and the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and northeast. Existing light sources include streetlights along Banyan Street and East Avenue, parking lot lighting, building exterior lights, and pathway lights.

4.1.2 Aesthetics (I) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The dominant scenic views from the project site and the surrounding area include the San Gabriel Mountains to the northwest and the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and northeast. The

mountains are clearly visible from Banyan Street (south of the project site) and East Avenue (east of the project site).

Short-term construction activities could potentially temporarily degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and surroundings. In all, the project would involve grading activities and construction of the new sports field, structures, and amenities. During the construction phase, various equipment, vehicles, building materials, stockpiles, disposal receptacles, and related activities could be potentially visible from several vantage points near the project site. However, construction-related activities would be short-term and temporary in nature. Once completed, all general construction activities would cease, along with any construction-related aesthetic impacts.

Upon completion, the park would feature new sports fields, park features, tennis court, shade structures, interactive water features, landscaping, and parking. Since the proposed improvements are compatible with the existing park uses, the aboveground structures are anticipated to have a positive aesthetic impact on the park. Impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The nearest designated scenic highway is SR-138, located in the San Gabriel Mountains approximately 11.5 miles north of the project site. The seven-acre park expansion would include baseball/softball fields, shade structures, concessions, a public works yard, interactive water features, park play features, tennis court, soccer field, and associated parking and other infrastructure upgrades. There are no historically significant buildings on the site that could be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, no adverse impacts on scenic resources would result from the Proposed Project's implementation. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is currently designated for Parks by the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan. Overall, the Proposed Project would not significantly change the visual character of the park. New developments

would be consistent and compatible with the existing public facilities within the park and would in fact enhance existing visual character of the area. No impact to applicable zoning and regulations would occur and no further analysis of this topic is required.

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would include light fixtures for parking lots, pedestrian pathways, sports fields, and landscaping. These light fixtures would provide increased visibility and highlight elements of buildings and trees. The sport fields would include LED sports lighting similar to the existing fields. Light fixtures at the edge of the project site would be shielded and directed downward to avoid spillover effects on surrounding properties.

Glare impacts from the proposed structures are not anticipated. Architectural glass with low glare characteristics would be used to minimize glare impacts on surrounding properties. Compliance with City Municipal Code Chapter 17.58 Outdoor Lighting Standards would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

4.2.1 Environmental Setting

Although the entire City of Rancho Cucamonga was once an agricultural area, few large areas remain in active production today. Much of the City is characterized by industrial, residential, and commercial land uses. Farmland in eastern Rancho Cucamonga is concentrated in Etiwanda; these farmland areas were designated by the Department of Conservation due to their local historical importance. However, most of the Etiwanda area is planned for development, and is not intended to be retained as farmland (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a).

The Proposed Project would be located at the existing Etiwanda Creek Community Park, an area designated and zoned for parks, recreation, and open space which does not contain any agricultural uses or areas designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is located on Urban and Built-up Land and is not under a Williamson Act Contract (CDC 2017). Therefore, there are no local policies for agricultural resources that apply to the project site.

4.2.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources (II) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is currently designated for open space and does not contain any agricultural land. According to the California Department of Conservation (CDC) the site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (CDC 2017). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a conflict with an agricultural zoning designation. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed above, no land on or near the project site is currently under agricultural production, nor are any parcels zoned for agricultural uses. The site is not designated for agricultural use nor is it listed under a Williamson Act contract (CDC 2017). No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is currently developed and is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production. There is no forestland or timber in the vicinity, nor are there any parcels zoned for forestland or timberland. No impact would occur.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed above, the project site is currently developed and does not contain forestland or timberland, thus it would not convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site and the surrounding properties are not currently used for agriculture. As discussed above, the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

4.2.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.3 Air Quality

An Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment was completed for the Proposed Project (ECORP 2020a; Appendix A). The results of the assessment are summarized in the following sections.

4.3.1 Environmental Setting

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) divides the state into air basins that share similar meteorological and topographical features. Rancho Cucamonga lies in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties and all of Orange County. The air basin is on a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills and is bounded by the Pacific Ocean on the southwest, with high mountains forming the remainder of the perimeter (SCAQMD 1993).

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the CARB have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. These ambient air quality standards are levels of contaminants representing safe levels that avoid specific adverse health effects associated with each pollutant. The ambient air quality standards cover what are called "criteria" pollutants because the health and other effects of each pollutant are described in criteria documents. The six criteria pollutants are ozone (O_3) (O_3

precursor emissions include nitrogen oxide (NOx) and reactive organic gases (ROG)), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and lead. Areas that meet ambient air quality standards are classified as attainment areas, while areas that do not meet these standards are classified as nonattainment areas. The Los Angeles County portion of the SoCAB region is designated as a nonattainment area for the federal O_3, fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead standards and is also a nonattainment area for the state standards for O_3, coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}), and $PM_{2.5}$. (It is noted that lead is not emitted from standard land use developments such as that proposed by the Project.)

The local air quality agency affecting the SoCAB is the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which is charged with the responsibility of implementing air quality programs and ensuring that national and state ambient air quality standards are not exceeded and that air quality conditions are maintained in the SoCAB. In an attempt to achieve national and state ambient air quality standards and maintain air quality, the air district has completed several air quality attainment plans and reports, which together constitute the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the portion of the SoCAB encompassing the Proposed Project.

The following is a list of noteworthy SCAQMD rules that are required of construction activities associated with the Proposed Project:

- **Rule 201 & Rule 203 (Permit to Construct & Permit to Operate)** – Rule 201 requires a "Permit to Construct" prior to the installation of any equipment "the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants . . ." and Regulation II provides the requirements for the application for a Permit to Construct. Rule 203 similarly requires a Permit to Operate.
- **Rule 402 (Nuisance)** – This rule prohibits the discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. This rule does not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.
- **Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust)** – This rule requires fugitive dust sources to implement best available control measures for all sources, and all forms of visible PM are prohibited from crossing any property line. This rule is intended to reduce PM_{10} emissions from any transportation, handling, construction, or storage activity that has the potential to generate fugitive dust. PM_{10} suppression techniques are summarized below.

    a) Portions of a construction site to remain inactive longer than a period of three months will be seeded and watered until grass cover is grown or otherwise stabilized.
    b) All onsite roads will be paved as soon as feasible or watered periodically or chemically stabilized.
    c) All material transported offsite will be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

d) The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations will be minimized at all times.

e) Where vehicles leave a construction site and enter adjacent public streets, the streets will be swept daily or washed down at the end of the workday to remove soil tracked onto the paved surface.

- **Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings)** – This rule requires manufacturers, distributors, and end-users of architectural and industrial maintenance coatings to reduce Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) emissions from the use of these coatings, primarily by placing limits on the ROG content of various coating categories.
- **Rule 1401 (New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants)** – This rule requires new source review of any new, relocated, or modified permit units that emit TACs. The rule establishes allowable risks for permit units requiring permits pursuant to Rules 201 and 203 discussed above.

4.3.2 Air Quality (III) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As part of its enforcement responsibilities, the USEPA requires each state with nonattainment areas to prepare and submit a SIP that demonstrates the means to attain the federal standards. The SIP must integrate federal, state, and local plan components and regulations to identify specific measures to reduce pollution in nonattainment areas, using a combination of performance standards and market-based programs. Similarly, under state law, the CCAA requires an air quality attainment plan to be prepared for areas designated as nonattainment with regard to the NAAQS and CAAQS. Air quality attainment plans outline emissions limits and control measures to achieve and maintain these standards by the earliest practical date.

As previously mentioned, the project site is located within the SoCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD is required, pursuant to the CAA, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the SoCAB is in nonattainment. In order to reduce such emissions, the SCAQMD drafted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The 2016 AQMP establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving state (California) and national air quality standards. The 2016 AQMP is a regional and multi-agency effort including the SCAQMD, CARB, SCAG, and the USEPA. The plan's pollutant control strategies are based on the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including SCAG's 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG's latest growth forecasts. (SCAG's latest growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans.) The Proposed Project is subject to the SCAQMD's AQMP.

According to the SCAQMD, in order to determine consistency with SCAQMD's air quality planning, two main criteria must be addressed.

Criterion 1:

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

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

As shown in Tables 4.3-1, 4.3-3, and 4.3-4, the Proposed Project would result in emissions that would be below the SCAQMD regional and localized thresholds during both construction and operations. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations and would not have the potential to cause or affect a violation of the ambient air quality standards.

b) Would the project delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP?

As shown in Tables 4.3-1 and 4.3-4, the Proposed Project would be below the SCAQMD regional thresholds for construction and operations. Since the Proposed Project would result in less than significant regional emission impacts, it would not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or AQMP emissions reductions.

Criterion 2:

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

a) Would the project be consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections utilized in the preparation of the 2016 AQMP?

A project is consistent with regional air quality planning efforts in part if it is consistent with the population, housing, and employment assumptions that were used in the development of the SCAQMD air quality plans. Generally, three sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions in Rancho Cucamonga. Specifically, SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) provides regional population forecasts for the region and SCAG's *2016 RTP/SCS* provides socioeconomic forecast projections of regional population growth. The General Plans of cities within the region are

referenced by SCAG in order to assist forecasting future growth in the region, including the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

The project site has a General Plan designation of *Parks*. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan and is therefore consistent with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned for the site vicinity in the 2016 RTP/SCS and RCPG.

b) Would the project implement all feasible air quality mitigation measures?

In order to further reduce emissions, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with emission reduction measures promulgated by the SCAQMD, such as SCAQMD Rules 402, 403, and 1113. SCAQMD Rule 402 prohibits the discharge, from any source whatsoever, in such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires fugitive dust sources to implement Best Available Control Measures for all sources, and all forms of visible PM are prohibited from crossing any property line. SCAQMD Rule 403 is intended to reduce PM_{10} emissions from any transportation, handling, construction, or storage activity that has the potential to generate fugitive dust. SCAQMD Rule 1113 requires manufacturers, distributors, and end-users of architectural and industrial maintenance coatings to reduce ROG emissions from the use of these coatings, primarily by placing limits on the ROG content of various coating categories. As such, the Proposed Project meets this consistency criterion.

c) Would the project be consistent with the land use planning strategies set forth by SCAQMD air quality planning efforts?

The AQMP contains air pollutant reduction strategies based on SCAG's latest growth forecasts, and SCAG's growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans. The Proposed Project is consistent with the land use designation and development density presented in the City's General Plan and therefore, would not exceed the population or job growth projections used by the SCAQMD to develop the AQMP.

In conclusion, the determination of AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of a project on air quality. The Proposed Project would not result in a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet state and federal air quality standards. The Proposed Project's long-term influence would also be consistent with the goals and policies of the SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Project Construction-Generated Criteria Air Quality Emissions

Regional Construction Significance Analysis

Construction-generated emissions are temporary and short-term but have the potential to represent a significant air quality impact. Three basic sources of short-term emissions would be generated through construction of the Proposed Project: operation of the construction vehicles (i.e., excavators, trenchers, dump trucks), the creation of fugitive dust during clearing and grading, and the use of asphalt or other oil-based substances during paving activities. Construction activities such as excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed soils would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive PM emissions that affect local air quality at various times during construction. Effects would be variable depending on the weather, soil conditions, the amount of activity taking place, and the nature of dust control efforts. The dry climate of the area during the summer months creates a high potential for dust generation. Construction activities would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403, which, as previously described, requires taking reasonable precautions to prevent the emissions of fugitive dust, such as using water or chemicals, where possible, for control of dust during the clearing of land and other construction activities.

Construction-generated emissions associated the Proposed Project were calculated using the CARB-approved CalEEMod computer program, which is designed to model emissions for land use development projects, based on typical construction requirements.

Predicted maximum daily construction-generated emissions for the Proposed Project are summarized in Table 4.3-1. Construction-generated emissions are short-term and of temporary duration, lasting only as long as construction activities occur, but would be considered a significant air quality impact if the volume of pollutants generated exceeds the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance.

Table 4.3-1. Construction-Related Emissions (Regional Significance Analysis)

Construction Year	Pollutant (pounds per day)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Construction 2021	**4.49**	**40.55**	**40.80**	**0.08**	**8.16**	**5.21**
Construction 2022	4.06	33.09	39.89	**0.08**	2.91	1.78
SCAQMD Regional Significance Threshold	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Exceed SCAQMD Regional Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to the Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment (ECORP 2020a; Appendix A) for Model Data Outputs.

Notes: Emission reduction/credits for construction emissions are applied based on the required implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403. The specific Rule 403 measures applied in CalEEMod include the following: sweeping/cleaning adjacent roadway access areas daily; washing equipment tires before leaving the construction site; water exposed surfaces three times daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. Reductions percentages from the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (Tables XI-A through XI-E) were applied. **Bolded** text equals the highest maximum daily emissions construction, paving, and painting are assumed to occur simultaneously. Construction emissions taken from the season (summer or winter) with the highest output.

As shown in Table 4.3-1, emissions generated during Proposed Project construction would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional thresholds of significance. Therefore, criteria pollutant emissions generated during Proposed Project construction would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Localized Construction Significance Analysis

As previously stated, nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are residences directly adjacent to the project site boundary to the northwest and south. In order to identify localized, air toxic-related impacts to sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD recommends addressing localized significance threshold (LSTs) for construction. LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards' Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (I-4). The SCAQMD provided the *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (dated June 2003 [revised 2008]) for guidance. The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized impacts associated with project-specific level proposed projects.

For this Proposed Project, the appropriate source receptor area (SRA) for the localized significance thresholds is the Northwest San Bernardino Valley, SRA 32. LSTs apply to CO, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The SCAQMD has produced lookup tables for projects that disturb one, two, and five acres. The SCAQMD has also issued guidance on applying the CalEEMod emissions software to LSTs for projects greater than five acres. The Proposed Project would disturb a total of seven acres. Since CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily soil disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment, Table 4.3-2 is used to determine the maximum daily disturbed-acreage for comparison to LSTs.

Table 4.3-2. Equipment-Specific Grading Rates

Construction Phase	Equipment Type	Acres Graded/Disturbed per 8-Hour Day	Equipment Quantity	Operating Hours per Day	Acres Graded per Day
Site Preparation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0.5	3	8	1.5
	Tractors/ Loaders/ Backhoes	0.5	4	8	2.0
				Total	**3.5**
Grading	Excavators	0.0	1	8	0.0
	Rubber Tired Dozer	0.5	1	8	0.5
	Graders	0.5	1	8	0.5
	Tractors/ Loaders/ Backhoes	0.5	3	8	1.5
				Total	**2.5**
				Maximum Total Acres Graded per Day	3.5

As shown in Table 4.3-2, Proposed Project implementation could potentially disturb up to 3.5 acres daily during the site preparation phase of construction, and 2.5 acres daily during the grading phase of construction. Thus, the LST threshold value for a 3.5-acre construction site were sourced from the LST

lookup tables for site preparation and the LST threshold value for a 2.5-acre construction site were sourced from the LST lookup tables for Project grading activities.

LST thresholds are provided for distances to sensitive receptors of 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500 meters. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the school and park area located to the west and the residences located northwest and south of the project site; all within 25 meters. Notwithstanding, the SCAQMD Methodology explicitly states: *It is possible that a project may have receptors closer than 25 meters. Projects with boundaries located closer than 25 meters to the nearest receptor should use the LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters*. Therefore, LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters were utilized in this analysis.

The SCAQMD's methodology clearly states that "offsite mobile emissions from a project should not be included in the emissions compared to LSTs." Therefore, for purposes of the construction LST analysis, only emissions included in the CalEEMod "onsite" emissions outputs were considered. Table 3.4-3 presents the results of localized emissions. The LSTs reflect a maximum disturbance of the entire project site daily during site preparation activities and grading activities at 25 meters or less from sensitive receptors.

Table 4.3-3. Construction-Related Emissions (Localized Significance Analysis)

Activity	Pollutant (pounds per day)			
	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Project Site Preparation	40.49	21.15	8.03	5.17
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (3.5 acres of disturbance)	*220.00*	*1,712.50*	*11.00*	*7.00*
Project Site Grading	24.73	15.85	3.33	2.18
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (2.5 acres of disturbance)	*186.67*	*1,392.17*	*7.67*	*5.67*
Exceed SCAQMD Localized Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to the Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment (ECORP 2020a; Appendix A) for Model Data Outputs.

Notes: Emission reduction/credits for construction emissions are applied based on the required implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403. The specific Rule 403 measures applied in CalEEMod include the following: sweeping/cleaning adjacent roadway access areas daily; washing equipment tires before leaving the construction site; water exposed surfaces three times daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. Reductions percentages from the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (Tables XI-A through XI-E) were applied. Emissions were taken from the season (winter or summer) with the highest output.

Table 4.3-3 shows that the emissions of these pollutants on the peak day of construction would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, significant impacts would not occur concerning LSTs during construction activities. LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards' Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative. The SCAQMD Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative program seeks to ensure that everyone has the right to equal protection from air pollution. Therefore, significant impacts would not occur concerning LSTs during construction activities.

Project Operations Criteria Air Quality Emissions

Regional Operational Significance Analysis

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in long-term operational emissions of criteria air pollutants such as PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CO, and SO_2 as well as ozone precursors such as ROGs and NO_X. As previously described, operational air pollutant emissions were based on the project site plans and the estimated traffic trip generation rates from KOA (2020).

Long-term operational emissions attributable to the Proposed Project are identified in Table 4.3-4 and compared to the regional operational significance thresholds promulgated by the SCAQMD.

Table 4.3-4. Operational-Related Emissions (Regional Significance Analysis)

Emission Source	Pollutant (pounds per day)					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer Emissions						
Area	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.42	2.70	4.64	0.01	1.32	0.36
Total:	**0.49**	**2.71**	**4.66**	**0.01**	**0.32**	**0.36**
SCAQMD Regional Significance Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Exceed SCAQMD Regional Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Winter Emissions						
Area	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.37	2.70	4.11	0.01	1.32	0.36
Total:	**0.43**	**2.71**	**4.13**	**0.01**	**1.32**	**0.36**
SCAQMD Regional Significance Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Exceed SCAQMD Regional Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to the Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment (ECORP 2020a; Appendix A) for Model Data Outputs.
Notes: Emissions projections account for a trip generation rate identified by KOA (2020). Specifically, KOA estimates the park expansion would generate 214 more trips than it does under existing conditions. The traffic fleet mix defaults contained in the CalEEMod model are based on the average fleet mix of San Bernardino County.

As shown in Table 4.3-4, the Proposed Project's emissions would not exceed any SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutants during operation.

The San Bernardino County portion of the SoCAB is listed as a nonattainment area for federal O_3 and PM_{10} standards and is also a nonattainment area for the state standards for O_3, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. O_3 is a health threat to persons who already suffer from respiratory diseases and can cause severe ear, nose and throat

irritation and increases susceptibility to respiratory infections. PM can adversely affect the human respiratory system. As shown in Table 4.3-4, the Proposed Project would result in increased emissions of the O_3 precursor pollutants ROG and NO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, however, the correlation between a project's emissions and increases in nonattainment days, or frequency or severity of related illnesses, cannot be accurately quantified. The overall strategy for reducing air pollution and related health effects in the SCAQMD is contained in the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP. The AQMP provides control measures that reduce emissions to attain federal ambient air quality standards by their applicable deadlines such as the application of available cleaner technologies, best management practices, incentive programs, as well as development and implementation of zero and near-zero technologies and control methods. The CEQA thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD are designed to meet the objectives of the AQMP and in doing so achieve attainment status with state and federal standards. As noted above, the Proposed Project would increase the emission of these pollutants, but would not exceed the thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for purposes of reducing air pollution and its deleterious health effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Localized Operational Significance Analysis

According to the SCAQMD localized significance threshold methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a proposed project only if the project includes stationary sources (e.g., smokestacks) or attracts heavy-duty trucks that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site (e.g., warehouse or transfer facilities). The Proposed Project does not include such uses. Therefore, in the case of the Proposed Project, the operational phase LST protocol does not need to be applied.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over age 65, children under age 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the existing school and associated park area located immediately to the west, and residences located to the northwest. There are also residences just south of the proposed driveway entrance across Banyan Street. The surrounding residences are as close as 10 to 25 meters from the project site.

Construction-Generated Air Contaminants

Construction-related activities would result in temporary, short-term Proposed Project-generated emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), ROG, NOx, CO, and PM_{10} from the exhaust of off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment for site preparation (e.g., clearing, grading); soil hauling truck traffic; paving;

and other miscellaneous activities. However, as shown in Tables 4.3-1 and 4.3-3, the Proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD regional or localized emission thresholds. The portion of the SoCAB which encompasses the project area is designated as a nonattainment area for O_3 and $PM_{2.5}$ under the federal standards and O_3, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ under the state standards (CARB 2018). Thus, existing O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ levels in the SoCAB are at unhealthy levels during certain periods.

The health effects associated with O_3 are generally associated with reduced lung function. Because the Proposed Project would not involve construction activities that would result in O_3 precursor emissions (ROG or NOx) in excess of the SCAQMD thresholds, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to substantially contribute to regional O_3 concentrations and the associated health impacts.

CO tends to be a localized impact associated with congested intersections. In terms of adverse health effects, CO competes with oxygen, often replacing it in the blood, reducing the blood's ability to transport oxygen to vital organs. The results of excess CO exposure can include dizziness, fatigue, and impairment of central nervous system functions. The Proposed Project would not involve construction activities that would result in CO emissions in excess of the SCAQMD thresholds. Thus, the Proposed Project's CO emissions would not contribute to the health effects associated with this pollutant.

Particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) contains microscopic solids or liquid droplets that are so small that they can get deep into the lungs and cause serious health problems. Particulate matter exposure has been linked to a variety of problems, including premature death in people with heart or lung disease, nonfatal heart attacks, irregular heartbeat, aggravated asthma, decreased lung function, and increased respiratory symptoms such as irritation of the airways, coughing, or difficulty breathing. For construction activity, DPM is the primary toxic air contaminant (TAC) of concern. Particulate exhaust emissions from diesel-fueled engines (i.e., DPM) were identified as a TAC by the CARB in 1998. The potential cancer risk from the inhalation of DPM outweighs the potential for all other health impacts (i.e., non-cancer chronic risk, short-term acute risk) and health impacts from other TACs. Based on the emission modeling conducted, the maximum onsite construction-related daily emissions of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$, considered a surrogate for DPM, would be 0.82 pounds/day. $PM_{2.5}$ exhaust is considered a surrogate for DPM because more than 90 percent of DPM is less than 1 micron in diameter and therefore is a subset of particulate matter under 2.5 microns in diameter (i.e., $PM_{2.5}$). Most $PM_{2.5}$ derives from combustion, such as use of gasoline and diesel fuels by motor vehicles. As with O_3 and NOx, the Proposed Project would not generate emissions of PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ that would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 described above, which limits the amount of fugitive dust generated during construction. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions are not expected to cause any increase in related regional health effects for these pollutants.

Additionally, Table 4.3-3 above shows that the emissions of these pollutants on the peak day of construction would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors as determined through the SCAQMD LST protocol. Therefore, significant impacts would not occur concerning LSTs during construction activities. LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards' Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative. The SCAQMD Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative program seeks to ensure that everyone has the right to equal protection from air pollution. The Environmental Justice Program is divided into three categories, with the LST protocol promulgated under

Category I: *Further-Reduced Health Risk*. Thus, the fact that onsite Proposed Project construction emissions would be generated at rates below the LSTs for NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ demonstrates that the Proposed Project would likely not adversely impact the neighboring community to the southwest.

In summary, the Proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant contribution to regional or localized concentrations of nonattainment pollutants and would not result in a significant contribution to the adverse health impacts associated with those pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operational Air Contaminants

Operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the development of any substantial sources of air toxics. There are no stationary sources associated with the operations of the Proposed Project; nor would the Proposed Project attract additional heavy-duty trucks that spend long periods queuing and idling at the site. Onsite Proposed Project emissions would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. As shown in Table 4.3-4, the maximum operation-related emissions of exhaust $PM_{2.5}$, considered a surrogate for DPM, would be 0.013 pounds per day, produced by the estimated 214 trips generated per day by the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be a source of TACs and there would be no impact as a result of the Proposed Project during operations. The Proposed Project would not have a high carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic risk during operation.

Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots

It has long been recognized that CO exceedances are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at intersections. Concentrations of CO are a direct function of the number of vehicles, length of delay, and traffic flow conditions. Under certain meteorological conditions, CO concentrations close to congested intersections that experience high levels of traffic and elevated background concentrations may reach unhealthy levels, affecting nearby sensitive receptors. Given the high traffic volume potential, areas of high CO concentrations, or "hot spots," are typically associated with intersections that are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS) during the peak commute hours. However, transport of this criteria pollutant is extremely limited, and CO disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. Furthermore, vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly more stringent in the last 20 years. Currently, the CO standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams per mile for passenger cars (requirements for certain vehicles are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the Project vicinity have steadily declined.

Accordingly, with the steadily decreasing CO emissions from vehicles, even very busy intersections do not result in exceedances of the CO standard. The analysis prepared for CO attainment in the SCAQMD's *1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide* in Los Angeles County can be used to demonstrate the potential for CO exceedances. The SCAQMD CO hot spot analysis was conducted for four busy intersections in Los Angeles County during the peak morning and afternoon time periods. The intersections evaluated included Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway (Lynwood), Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue (Westwood), Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue (Hollywood), and La Cienega Boulevard and Century Boulevard (Inglewood). The busiest intersection evaluated was at Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, which has a traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day. The

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority evaluated the Level of Service in the vicinity of the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection and found it to be "Level of Service E" at peak morning traffic and Level of Service F at peak afternoon traffic (Level of Service E and F are the two least efficient traffic Level of Service ratings). Even with the inefficient Level of Service and volume of traffic, the CO analysis concluded that there was no violation of CO standards (SCAQMD 1992).

According to the estimated trip generation rates prepared for the Proposed Project (KOA 2020), the Proposed Project is expected to generate 214 vehicle trips per day. Thus, the Proposed Project would not generate traffic volumes at any intersection of more than 100,000 vehicles per day, there is no likelihood of the Proposed Project traffic exceeding CO values.

In summary, the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Typically, odors are regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache).

With respect to odors, the human nose is the sole sensing device. The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the population and overall is quite subjective. Some individuals have the ability to smell minute quantities of specific substances; others may not have the same sensitivity but may have sensitivities to odors of other substances. In addition, people may have different reactions to the same odor; in fact, an odor that is offensive to one person (e.g., from a fast-food restaurant) may be perfectly acceptable to another. It is also important to note that an unfamiliar odor is more easily detected and is more likely to cause complaints than a familiar one. This is because of the phenomenon known as odor fatigue, in which a person can become desensitized to almost any odor and recognition only occurs with an alteration in the intensity.

Quality and intensity are two properties present in any odor. The quality of an odor indicates the nature of the smell experience. For instance, if a person describes an odor as flowery or sweet, the person is describing the quality of the odor. Intensity refers to the strength of the odor. For example, a person may use the word "strong" to describe the intensity of an odor. Odor intensity depends on the odorant concentration in the air. When an odorous sample is progressively diluted, the odorant concentration decreases. As this occurs, the odor intensity weakens and eventually becomes so low that the detection or recognition of the odor is quite difficult. At some point during dilution, the concentration of the odorant reaches a detection threshold. An odorant concentration below the detection threshold means that the concentration in the air is not detectable by the average human.

According to the SCAQMD, land uses commonly considered to be potential sources of obnoxious odorous emissions include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Proposed Project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

4.3.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.4 Biological Resources

A General Biological Report for the Proposed Project was prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA) in May 2017 (GLA 2017a; Appendix B). A general biological survey was conducted to identify potential issues and ensure compliance with state and federal regulations regarding listed, protected, and sensitive species. This report describes the existing conditions associated with project site, including a general description of habitat types at the site, and identifies potential constraints associated with developing the property.

As recommended by the 2017 General Biological Report, GLA performed a focused trapping for the federally endangered San Bernardino kangaroo rat (SBKR) (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*) on the project site and in adjacent areas (GLA 2017b; Appendix C). GLA conducted the focused trapping of the survey area from August 30 to September 4, 2017. To determine the presence/absence of SBKR, focused trapping occurred for five consecutive nights within the selected most suitable habitat locations based on the previous habitat assessment (relatively open habitat, sandy substrates, potential kangaroo rat burrows).

GLA also performed focused plant surveys in 2018 (GLA 2019; Appendix D). A literature search was conducted to obtain a list of special status plants with the potential to occur within the project site. The review included the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) for the Cucamonga Peak quadrangle and surrounding quadrangles, a review of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) on-line inventory, and soil map review. Surveys were conducted by following meandering transects within target areas of suitable habitat. All plant species encountered during the field surveys were identified and recorded.

The results of these reports are summarized below and incorporated to the threshold analysis. It should be noted that the biological studies investigated a larger biological study area, which encompassed the project site and several adjacent parcels (see Exhibit 3 in Appendix B). The analysis presented below is focused on the biological conditions of the project site. References to biological conditions in adjacent areas are included when necessary for context.

4.4.1 Environmental Setting

Etiwanda Creek Community Park includes a parking lot, restroom facilities, a playground, soccer fields, and additional active use areas. The park is vegetated throughout with ornamental landscaping. The project site where the expansion of the park would occur measures approximately seven acres. These

approximately 7 acres includes 3.6 acres of Riversidean Alluvial Fan Sage Scrub (RAFSS) and 3.3 acres of disturbed areas. Disturbed areas are mostly composed of a maintenance yard associated with the operation of the park.

RAFSS vegetation communities are associated with alluvial surfaces subjected to infrequent, but severe flood events that scour the surface. RAFSS habitat within the project site and in adjacent areas to the east have been cut off from the active alluvial plain due to past flood control measures. As such, the project site and adjacent areas have not been affected by flood scour for many years. This lack of flooding has resulted in the establishment and expansion of larger evergreen shrubs. Over time in the absence of flooding, the habitat within the project site and in adjacent areas is expected to develop into more of a chaparral community, losing characteristics of RAFSS, as the larger evergreen scrubs will continue to expand and push out species typical of "younger" RAFSS communities (GLA 2017a).

Potential Waters of the U.S.

The project site does not contain any waters subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The project area was at a time part of the active alluvial fan; however, past flood control measures modified the alluvial fan, including the construction of a series of levees and other flood control structures to the north, and the construction of a flood control channel to the east. The project site and areas adjacent to the east, contain a topographic feature that may be a remnant of an alluvial braid that at one time extended through the project area. However, flood control measures to the north have cut off of the feature, directing all flows to the east. The onsite feature does not exhibit any indicators of flow and does not support aquatic resources. As such, the feature is not be considered a jurisdictional water (GLA 2017a).

Special-Status Plants

The areas mapped as RAFSS within the project site have some potential to support special-status plants. Special-status plants associated with alluvial scrub vegetation communities with a potential to occur on the project site include Santa Ana River woolly star (*Eriastrum densifolium* ssp. *sanctorum*), slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecahema leptoceras*), and Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*). Focused plant surveys were completed on the project site (GLA 2019).

Special-Status Wildlife

Several special-status animals have the potential to occur within the project site, including two listed species: coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) and San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*). Other non-listed, special-status wildlife species have some potential to occur, including the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) (GLA 2017a).

4.4.2 Biological Resources (IV) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Special-Status Plants

The approximately 7-acre project site contains 3.6 acres of RAFSS with the remainder being classified as disturbed. The disturbed areas include a maintenance yard associated with the park and are not expected to support special-status plants. The areas mapped as RAFSS have some potential to support special-status plants associated with alluvial scrub vegetation communities including Santa Ana River woolly star, slender-horned spineflower, and Plummer's mariposa lily. Focused plant surveys were completed on the project site (GLA 2019).

Santa Ana River woolly star and slender-horned spineflower are two listed plant species associated with RAFSS habitats. Neither of these two species are likely to occur at the project site due to the vegetation type and density as a function of the habitat age relative to flooding (GLA 2017a). These two species were not detected in the focused plant surveys completed on the project site (GLA 2019). No impacts to these species are expected to occur.

One special-status plant, Plummer's mariposa lily, has a moderate potential to occur on the project site (GLA 2017a). Focused plant surveys detected several individuals of Plummer's mariposa lily within one parcel (APN 225-13-109) in the northeastern portion of the overall biological study area; however, none were detected within the project site, where the park expansion would occur (GLA 2019). As such, no impacts to this plant species are anticipated to occur.

Special-Status Wildlife

Several special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the project site, including two listed species (coastal California gnatcatcher and SBKR) and one non-listed special-status wildlife species (burrowing owl).

Coastal California Gnatcatcher

The coastal California gnatcatcher is a federally species listed as threatened and a California Species of Special Concern (SSC). The coastal California gnatcatcher has a relatively low potential for occurrence due to the densities of the larger evergreen shrubs within RAFSS habitat areas; however, its occurrence in the region, and the presence of shrubs associated with coastal sage scrub habitats allow some potential for the gnatcatcher to utilize the project site (GLA 2017a). If present during construction, direct impacts

through ground disturbance and indirect impacts from construction noise, vibrations, and increased human activity may occur. With the implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-1** impacts would be less than significant.

San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat

SBKR is federally listed as endangered and is a candidate for state listing under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). SBKR may be found within RAFSS habitat. A focused trapping survey for SBKR was performed on the project site and in adjacent areas (GLA 2017b). No SBKR were trapped as a result of this effort. Therefore, SBKR is considered absent from the project site and adjacent areas. Because the project site or adjacent areas are not connected to any large known populations of SBKR or high-quality habitat areas, it seems unlikely that the survey area would be naturally recolonized by SBKR in the future. Furthermore, flood control structures, that have been in place since at least 1959 north of the project site, have blocked any active hydrological processes resulting in a high density of shrub cover (GLA 2017b). No impacts to SBKR are anticipated to occur.

Burrowing Owls

The burrowing owl is a California SSC. The RAFSS habitat areas on the project site contain dense shrub cover and are not expected to support burrowing owls. However, areas of open habitat, including the eastern portion of the existing park, have a higher potential to support burrowing owls. Burrowing owls were not detected during the general biological survey (GLA 2017a). However, due to its highly mobile nature, there is potential for burrowing owl to use the project site before the start of construction due to the presence of open areas. If burrowing owls occupy the project site prior to construction potential direct impacts in the form of injury, mortality from entombing, and loss of habitat and indirect impacts from construction noise and vibrations may occur. Impacts to burrowing owl would be less than significant with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-2**.

Nesting Birds

The project site contains vegetation (trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation) with the potential to support nesting birds. Nesting birds and raptors protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code. If construction of the Proposed Project occurs during the bird breeding season (typically February 1 through August 31), ground-disturbing construction activities could directly affect birds protected by the MBTA and their nests through the removal of habitat on the project site and indirectly through increased noise, vibrations, and increased human activity. Impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant with the implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-3**.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As previously mentioned, the project site contains approximately 3.6 acres of RAFSS. RAFSS is State-designated as a S-1.1 (very threatened) natural plant community. The RAFSS habitat found on the project site has been cut off from the active alluvial plain due to past flood control measures (GLA 2017a). As such, the project site has not been affected by flood scour for many years, which has resulted in the establishment and expansion of larger evergreen shrubs. Over time in the absence of flooding, the RAFSS habitat within the project site is expected to develop into more of a chaparral community, losing characteristics of RAFSS, as the larger evergreen scrubs will continue to expand and push out species typical of "younger" RAFSS communities. Due to the alteration of the flood regime, species associated with earlier stages of RAFSS are not expected to occur on the project site, and the potential will further diminish over time (GLA 2017a). As such, the Proposed Project's expansion into approximately 3.6 acres of RAFSS habitat is not anticipated to substantially affect the broader RAFSS community. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any waters subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW. The project area was at time part of the active alluvial fan; however, past flood control measures modified the alluvial fan, including the construction of a series of levees and other flood control structures to the north, and the construction of a flood control channel to the east. The project site and areas adjacent to the east, contains a topographic feature that may be a remnant of an alluvial braid that at one time extended through the project area. However, flood control measures to the north have cut off the feature, directing all flows to the east. The onsite feature does not exhibit any indicators of flow and does not support aquatic resources. As such, the feature is not be considered a jurisdictional water (GLA 2017a). No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The concept of habitat corridors addresses the linkage between large blocks of habitat that allow the safe movement of mammals and other wildlife species from one habitat area to another. The definition of a corridor varies, but corridors may include such areas as greenbelts, refuge systems, underpasses, and biogeographic land bridges. In general, a corridor is described as a linear habitat, embedded in a dissimilar matrix, which connects two or more large blocks of habitat. Wildlife movement corridors are critical for the survivorship of ecological systems for several reasons. Corridors can connect water, food, and cover sources, spatially linking these three resources with wildlife in different areas. In addition, wildlife movement between habitat areas provides for the potential of genetic exchange between wildlife species populations, thereby maintaining genetic variability and adaptability to maximize the success of wildlife responses to changing environmental conditions. This is especially critical for small populations subject to loss of variability from genetic drift and effects of inbreeding. The nature of corridor usage and wildlife movement patterns vary greatly among species.

The project site is surrounded by residential development to the north, open space to the east, Summit Intermediate School to the south, and Etiwanda Colony Elementary School to the west. The approximately 7-acre project site contains 3.6 acres of RAFSS with the remainder being classified as disturbed. The disturbed areas are located adjacent to the existing park fields and are mainly composed of a maintenance yard, which is not conducive to wildlife movement. The approximately 3.6 acres of RAFSS habitat is located along the eastern boundary of the project site. This area is adjacent to undeveloped parcels to the northeast and east and could facilitate wildlife movement within these open areas. However, the proposed expansion area into the RAFSS habitat is along the periphery of the open space in the region and would not preclude wildlife from continuing to use open areas to the east and northeast for movement. As such, the Proposed Project would not interfere substantially with movement of wildlife species. A less than significant impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The City's Tree Preservation Ordinance in the Municipal Code (Chapter 17.80 Tree Preservation) purpose is to protect trees, considered to be a community resource, from indiscriminate cutting or removal.

Provisions within Chapter 17.80 are specifically intended to protect and expand the eucalyptus windrows. Heritage Trees, as defined in Municipal Code Section 17.16.080, are also protected are require a permit prior to removal. The proposed expansion area does not contain trees that would be required to be removed. However, if tree removal is required the City would comply with the Tree Preservation Ordinance and apply for the necessary permits. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Neither the City nor the project area lie within an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan area; therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted plan. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

4.4.3 Mitigation Measures

BIO-1: Preconstruction Coastal California Gnatcatcher Survey: A preconstruction survey shall be conducted for coastal California Gnatcatcher no more than 14 days prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal activities. The preconstruction survey shall take place regardless of nesting bird season timing and shall focus on identifying the presence of coastal California gnatcatcher within the project site and 500-foot buffer within suitable habitat for this species.

If coastal California gnatcatcher are detected during the preconstruction survey, additional mitigation measures may need to be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts to this species, and consultation between the City of Rancho Cucamonga and the appropriate agency may be required (CDFW, USFWS). Mitigation measures for the federally listed coastal California gnatcatchers would be included to ensure that impacts to these species do not occur during vegetation removal. Mitigation measures for coastal California gnatcatcher if habitat is determined to be occupied will include (at the discretion of the monitoring biologist) additional focused surveys, biological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities and/or vegetation removal activities, the establishment of a minimum 500-foot non-disturbance buffer around active nest locations during construction activities, and/or noise monitoring to ensure that noise levels will not exceed 60 decibels.

BIO-2: Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey: A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be completed within the project site between 14 and 30 days prior to construction activities in accordance with the CDFW *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (2012). A second pre-construction survey shall be conducted no more than 24 hours prior to the start of construction. If burrowing owls are observed during either of the preconstruction surveys, implementation of

additional measures may be necessary to reduce impacts to a level that is less than significant, including seasonal work restrictions, no-work buffers established around active burrows, passive relocation of burrowing owls, and/or a specific mitigation methodology determined in coordination with CDFW.

BIO-3: Pre-construction Nesting Bird Survey: If construction or other Project activities are scheduled to occur during the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to ensure that active bird nests will not be disturbed or destroyed. The survey shall be completed no more than three days prior to initial ground disturbance. The nesting bird survey shall include the project site and adjacent areas where Project activities have the potential to affect active nests, either directly or indirectly due to construction activity or noise. If an active nest is identified, a qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate disturbance limit buffer around the nest using flagging or staking. Construction activities shall not occur within any disturbance limit buffer zones until the nest has fledged or has been deemed inactive by the qualified biologist.

4.5 Cultural Resources

4.5.1 Environmental Setting

A Cultural Resources Inventory Report was prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc. (ECORP 2020b; Appendix E) for the Proposed Project to determine if cultural resources were present in or adjacent to the project site and assess the sensitivity of the project site for undiscovered or buried cultural resources. The cultural context of the project area including regional and local prehistory, ethnography, and regional and project area histories can be found in the report in Appendix E.

The analysis of cultural resources was based on a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) on January 27, 2020, at the South Central Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton, a literature review, and a field survey on February 21, 2020. The literature search included the results of previous surveys within a one-mile radius of the Proposed Project location.

A search of the Sacred Lands File by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento, California, was requested by ECORP on January 9, 2020. This search was requested to determine whether or not Sacred Lands have been recorded by California Native American tribes within the project area, because the Sacred Lands File is populated by members of the Native American community who have knowledge about the locations of tribal resources. A search of the Sacred Lands File by the NAHC showed that there are no Native American Sacred Lands within one mile of the project site.

4.5.2 Cultural Resources (V) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The records search revealed that no previously recorded resources are located within the project site; however, 25 previously recorded resources are located within a one-mile radius of the project site (ECORP 2020b). As a result of the field survey, ECORP identified one historic-period refuse deposit (EC-001) and one historic-period isolated find (EC-002-I) within the project site. No pre-contact sites or isolated finds were identified as a result of the survey. Details of the finds are provided below.

Resources EC-001 and EC-002-I were evaluated using California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) eligibility criteria and local criteria from the City of Rancho Cucamonga Historic Preservation Ordinance. As a result of this evaluation, EC-001 and EC-002-I were found to not be eligible for the CRHR nor are they eligible on the local level as historic landmarks or places of historical interest under any criteria. The Proposed Project would not result in impacts to known Historical Resources, as defined by CEQA. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Archaeological resources are defined as the physical remains of past human activities and can be either prehistorical or historical in origin. Archaeological sites are locations that contain evidence of human activity. In general, an archaeological site is defined by a significant accumulation, or presence, of one or more of the following: food remains, waste from the manufacturing of tools, concentrations or alignments of stones, modification of rock surfaces, unusual discoloration or accumulation of soil, or human skeletal remains.

The records search results show that there are no previously recorded cultural resources on the project site. However, 25 previously recorded resources are located within a one-mile radius of the project site. Although no Historical Resources, as defined by CEQA, were identified within the project site, the project area contains Holocene sediments that are contemporaneous with human occupation of the region. One precontact isolated find (P-36-060257) was previously recorded in the near vicinity of the project site. The project site is located near Etiwanda Creek, an area known to have been used by both pre-contact and historic occupants. Therefore, the potential for the project site to contain subsurface cultural resources is considered moderate (ECORP 2020b). As such, there is still a potential for ground-disturbing activities to

expose previously unrecorded cultural resources. CEQA requires the lead agency to address any unanticipated cultural resources discoveries during project construction. Therefore, implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3** would reduce potential adverse impacts to less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

No human remains or dedicated cemeteries were identified during the background research, field survey, and property significance evaluation. However, the possibility exists that human remains could be uncovered during construction of the Proposed Project. Implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-4** would ensure that impacts to human remains are less than significant.

4.5.3 Mitigation Measures

CUL-1: If subsurface deposits believed to be cultural and/or human in origin are discovered during construction, all work must halt within a 60-foot radius of the discovery. A qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for pre-contact and historic archaeologist, shall be retained to evaluate the significance of the find, and shall have the authority to modify the no-work radius as appropriate, using professional judgment. The following notifications shall apply, depending on the nature of the find:

- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does not represent a cultural resource, work may resume immediately, and no agency notifications are required.
- If the professional archaeologist determines that the find does represent a cultural resource from any time period or cultural affiliation, he or she shall immediately notify the County of San Bernardino Coroner Office and the applicable landowner. The agency shall consult on a finding of eligibility and implement appropriate treatment measures, if the find is determined to be a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agencies, through consultation as appropriate, determine that the site either: 1) is not a Historical Resource under CEQA, as defined in Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines; or 2) that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.
- If the find includes human remains, or remains that are potentially human, he or she shall ensure reasonable protection measures are taken to protect the discovery from disturbance (Assembly Bill [AB] 2641). The archaeologist shall notify the San Bernardino County Coroner (per § 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The provisions of § 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, § 5097.98 of the California PRC, and AB 2641 will be implemented. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American and not the result of a crime scene, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which then will designate a Native American Most Likely

Descendant (MLD) for the project (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). The designated MLD will have 48 hours from the time access to the property is granted to make recommendations concerning treatment of the remains. If the landowner does not agree with the recommendations of the MLD, the NAHC can mediate (§ 5097.94 of the PRC). If no agreement is reached, the landowner must rebury the remains where they will not be further disturbed (§ 5097.98 of the PRC). This will also include either recording the site with the NAHC or the appropriate Information Center; using an open space or conservation zoning designation or easement; or recording a reinternment document with the county in which the property is located (AB 2641). Work may not resume within the no-work radius until the lead agency, through consultation as appropriate, determines that the treatment measures have been completed to their satisfaction.

CUL-2: In the event that 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, regarding any pre-contact finds 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.

CUL-3: If significant pre-contact cultural 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.

CUL-4: 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.

4.6 Energy

4.6.1 Environmental Setting

Electricity/Natural Gas Services

Southern California Edison provides electrical services to Rancho Cucamonga through State-regulated public utility contracts. Southern California Edison, the largest subsidiary of Edison International, is the primary electricity supply company for much of Southern California. It provides 14 million people with electricity across a service territory of approximately 50,000 square miles.

The Southern California Gas Company provides natural gas services to the project area. Southern California Gas services approximately 21.6 million customers, spanning roughly 20,000 square miles of California.

Energy Consumption

Electricity use is measured in kilowatt-hours (kWh), and natural gas use is measured in therms. Vehicle fuel use is typically measured in gallons (e.g. of gasoline or diesel fuel), although energy use for electric vehicles is measured in kWh.

The electricity consumption associated with all non-residential uses in San Bernardino County from 2014 to 2018 is shown in Table 4.6-1. As indicated, the demand has increased since 2014.

Table 4.6-1. Non-Residential Electricity Consumption in San Bernardino County 2014-2018

Year	Residential Electricity Consumption (kWh)
2018	10,189,923,519
2017	10,079,280,332
2016	9,972,705,757
2015	9,826,231,162
2014	9,998,887,200

Source: ECDMS 2019

The natural gas consumption associated with all non-residential uses in San Bernardino County from 2014 to 2018 is shown in Table 4.6-2. As indicated, the demand has increased since 2014.

Table 4.6-2. Non-residential Natural Gas Consumption in San Bernardino County 2014-2018

Year	Residential Natural Gas Consumption (therms)
2018	268,614,328
2017	257,879,077
2016	259,752,692
2015	245,499,027
2014	238,061,850

Source: ECDMS 2019

Automotive fuel consumption in San Bernardino County from 2015 to 2019 is shown in Table 4.6-3. As shown, automotive fuel consumption has remained relatively constant in the county since 2015.

Table 4.6-3. Automotive Fuel Consumption in San Bernardino County 2015–2019

Year	Automotive Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2019	3,334,922,526
2018	3,385,160,075
2017	3,427,137,695

Table 4.6-3. Automotive Fuel Consumption in San Bernardino County 2015–2019

Year	Automotive Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2016	3,469,323,122
2015	3,336,730,022

Source: California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2019

4.6.2 Energy (VI) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The impact analysis focuses on the four sources of energy that are relevant to the Proposed Project: electricity, natural gas, the equipment-fuel necessary for project construction, and the automotive fuel use which would result from Project operations. Addressing energy impacts requires an agency to make a determination as to what constitutes a significant impact. There are no established thresholds of significance, statewide or locally, for what constitutes a wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy for a proposed land use project. For the purpose of this analysis, the amount of electricity and natural gas estimated to be consumed by the Proposed Project is quantified and compared to that consumed by non-residential land uses in San Bernardino County. Similarly, the amount of fuel necessary for Project construction and operations is calculated and compared to that consumed in San Bernardino County.

The analysis of electricity gas usage is based on modeling conducted by ECORP with the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) (see Appendix A which quantifies energy use for project operations). The amount of operational automotive fuel use was estimated using the CARB's EMFAC2017 computer program, which provides projections for typical daily fuel usage in San Bernardino County. The amount of total construction-related fuel use was estimated using ratios provided in the Climate Registry's General Reporting Protocol for the Voluntary Reporting Program, Version 2.1. Energy consumption associated with the Proposed Project is summarized in Table 4.6-4.

Table 4.6-4. Proposed Project Energy and Fuel Consumption

Energy Type	Annual Energy Consumption	Percentage Increase Countywide
Electricity Consumption[1]	23,047.5 kWh	0.0002 percent
Natural Gas Consumption[1]	0.406 therms	0.0000 percent
Automotive Fuel Consumption		

Table 4.6-4. Proposed Project Energy and Fuel Consumption

Energy Type	Annual Energy Consumption	Percentage Increase Countywide
• Project Construction[2]	87,528 gallons	0.0026 percent
• Project Operations[3]	29,000 gallons	0.0009 percent

Source: [1]ECORP Consulting (see Appendix F); [2]Climate Registry 2016; [3]EMFAC2017 (CARB 2019)
Notes: The Project increases in electricity and natural gas consumption are compared with all of the residential buildings in the respective service provider's service area in 2018, the latest data available. The Project increases in automotive fuel consumption are compared with the countywide fuel consumption in 2019, the most recent full year of data.

As shown in Table 4.6-4, the increase in electricity usage as a result of the Proposed Project would constitute 23,047.5 kWh, or a 0.0002 percent increase in the typical annual electricity consumption attributable to non-residential uses in San Bernardino County. Energy use by the Proposed Project during operation would be attributable primarily to use of the concession area and stadium lighting. Additionally, Proposed Project increases in non-residential natural gas usage across the County would be negligible, 0.406 therms, which equates to a 0 percent increase in use when accounting for rounding. For these reasons, the Proposed Project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy.

As further indicated in Table 4.6-4, the Proposed Project's gasoline fuel consumption during the construction period is estimated to be 87,528 gallons of fuel, which would increase the annual gasoline fuel use in the county by 0.0026 percent. As such, Proposed Project construction would have a nominal effect on local and regional energy supplies. No unusual project characteristics would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or the state. Construction contractors would purchase their own gasoline and diesel fuel from local suppliers and would conserve the use of their supplies to minimize costs and maximize profit. Additionally, construction equipment fleet turnover and increasingly stringent state and federal regulations on engine efficiency combined with state regulations limiting engine idling times and require recycling of construction debris, would further reduce the amount of transportation fuel demand during Project construction. For these reasons, it is expected that construction fuel consumption associated with the Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar development projects of this nature.

Lastly, as indicated in Table 4.6-4, Proposed Project operation is conservatively estimated to consume 29,000 gallons of automotive fuel per year, which would increase the annual countywide automotive fuel consumption by 0.0009 percent. The amount of operational fuel use was estimated using CARB's EMFAC2017 computer program, which provides projections for typical daily fuel usage in San Bernardino County. This analysis conservatively assumes that all 214 anticipated automobile trips (KOA 2020) projected to be generated by the Proposed Project would be novel to San Bernardino County. The Proposed Project would not result in any unusual characteristics that would result in excessive long-term operational automotive fuel consumption. Fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the Proposed Project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary in comparison to other similar developments in the region.

For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would be designed in a manner that is consistent with relevant energy conservation plans designed to encourage development that results in the efficient use of energy resources. The project site is designated *Parks* by the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan and as such, the Proposed Project is consistent with the development projections for the area and would not induce population growth. The Proposed Project would comply with relevant energy conservation policies included in the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan; many of which are included in the *Resource Conservation Goals and Policies* section. A major overarching goal of this component of the General Plan is to ensure that development in the City aligns with the City's resource conservation goals. The Proposed Project would not conflict or obstruct any local or state plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.

4.6.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.7 Geology and Soils

4.7.1 Environmental Setting

Regional Seismicity and Fault Zones

An "active fault," according to California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, is a fault that has indicated surface displacement within the last 11,000 years. A fault that has not shown geologic evidence of surface displacement in the last 11,000 years is considered "inactive."

A major earthquake (7.0 magnitude) on the Cucamonga Fault, located approximately 2.5 miles north of the project site, is assumed to be the worst-case earthquake scenario for the City. Ground displacements of up to 9 feet could occur along the fault, intense ground shaking could last more than 30 seconds, and losses could be extensive (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). The Etiwanda Avenue Fault Scarp (potential for 6.5 magnitude earthquake) is considered capable of ground shaking at an intensity that presents unacceptable risks to proposed structures. This fault is located approximately 3,000 feet northwest of the project site.

Soils

The elevation of the project site ranges from 1,520 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) to 1,560 feet AMSL. It is located approximately 2,000 feet southwest of the East Etiwanda Creek, which emanates from the San Gabriel Mountains two miles to the north. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Web Soil Survey website (USDA 2020), two soil types are located within the project site: Tujunga gravelly

loamy sand (TvC), 0 to 9 percent slopes, and Soboba sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes. Both are well-drained soils.

The top 36 inches contain a gravelly loamy sand and gravelly sand extending down to 60 inches below surface. Vegetation within the project site consists primarily of dense nonnative grasses and weeds. Sediments within the area consist of Holocene quaternary alluvium. Surface sediments on the project site are highly disturbed due to removal of citrus trees, construction and removal of several structures, and use of the property as an agricultural complex throughout the years.

4.7.2 Geology and Soils (VII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

i) According to the City's General Plan, the nearest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone is the Etiwanda Avenue Fault Scarp, located approximately 3,000 feet north of the project site (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). In the event of an earthquake, strong ground shaking would occur. However, the Proposed Project would not increase the risk of exposing people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death due to the rupture of a known earthquake fault because the project area is already developed and no habitable structures would be built. Design of the Proposed Project would follow the recommendations of a registered civil, structural engineer, and/or engineering geologist and at a minimum meet current building standards and codes including those associated with protection from anticipated seismic events. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) As discussed above, in the event of an earthquake strong ground shaking is expected to occur on the project site. The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to strong seismic

ground shaking greater than what currently exists. Design and construction would comply with current building codes and standards which would reduce the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong ground shaking. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which water-saturated granular soil loses shear strength during strong ground shaking produced by earthquakes. The loss of soil strength occurs when cyclic pore water pressure increases below the groundwater surface. Potential hazards due to liquefaction include the loss of bearing strength beneath structures, possibly causing foundation failure and/or significant settlements.

According to the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan, the project site is not located in a zone of potential liquefaction (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). Additionally, the Proposed Project involves the construction of new park facilities and improvements. No occupied structures would be constructed with implementation of the Proposed Project. For these reasons, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to have adverse effects that could result in risk of loss, injury, or death due to liquefaction that may occur during a seismic event. No impact would occur.

iv) Landslides refer to a wide variety of processes that result in the perceptible downward and outward movement of soil, rock, and vegetation under gravitational influence. Common names for landslide types include slump, rockslide, debris slide, lateral spreading, debris avalanche, earth flow, and soil creep. Landslides may be triggered by both natural- and human-induced changes in the environment resulting in slope instability.

The project site and surrounding terrain are relatively flat and no hillsides exist in the immediate vicinity. According to the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan: Geologic Hazard Overlays, the project site does not lie in a region susceptible to landslides (San Bernardino County 2007). Additionally, the City's General Plan depicts the project site in an area with slopes less than 10 percent (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). As such, no impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The construction and operation of the Proposed Project would occur on the existing Etiwanda Creek Community Park site, as well as an expansion of approximately seven acres east of the park. Implementation of the Proposed Project would require ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, that could potentially result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. These exposed soils could potentially cause erosion impacts during windy conditions and from construction vehicles traveling through the project site. Heavy rains could cause the exposed soils to run off into public rights-of-way and/or storm drainage systems.

Construction of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the Construction General Permit, either through a waiver or through preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution

Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Best Management Practices (BMPs) included in the SWPPP would minimize soil erosion during construction. The Proposed Project's grading plan and SWPPP would also ensure that the proposed earthwork and storm water structures are designed to avoid soil erosion. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located on relatively flat and level ground. There are no significant slopes in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Project that would affect the project site. No impact from landslides would occur at the project site.

Lateral spreading is the horizontal movement or spreading of soil toward an open face, such as a streambank, the open side of fill embankments, or the sides of levees. The potential for failure from lateral spreading is highest in areas where there is a high groundwater table, where there are relatively soft and recent alluvial deposits, and where creek banks are relatively high. None of these conditions occur on the project site. Finally, since the project site is relatively flat, the potential for lateral spreading is nominal. As such, the Proposed Project would have no impact related to lateral spreading.

Land surface subsidence can be induced by both natural and human phenomena. Natural phenomena include subsidence resulting from tectonic deformations and seismically induced settlements, soil subsidence from consolidation, hydro compaction, rapid sedimentation subsidence from oxidation or dewatering of organic-rich soils, and subsidence related to subsurface cavities. The thick alluvial deposits underlying most of the City would be susceptible to subsidence should rapid groundwater withdrawal occur (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). Compliance with the City's Building Regulations would require the design and construction of structures and infrastructure to withstand anticipated levels of soil settlement, thereby reducing potential hazards related to collapsible soils to less than significant levels.

According to the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan, the project site is not located in an area susceptible to liquefaction (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). A less than significant impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Expansive soils can shrink and swell with drying and wetting. The shrink-swell potential of expansive soils can result in differential movement beneath foundations. The two primary soil types found on the project site, Tujunga gravelly loam, 0 to 9 percent slopes, and Soboba sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes, are both well-drained soils and are not considered expansive soils (NRCS 2019). A less than significant impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project involves the construction of new amenities, structures, and sports fields at an existing park. The Proposed Project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts related to soil compatibility with septic systems would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

According to the Rancho Cucamonga General Plan EIR, no direct evidence of paleontological resources has been found as a result of surveys in the City (Rancho Cucamonga 2010b).

A paleontological records search was completed by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC 2020). The project area has surficial sediments composed of younger Quaternary Alluvium, derived as alluvial fan deposits from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. These deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers, and they are coarser closer to the source area, but they may be underlain at relatively shallow depth by older and perhaps finer-grained sedimentary deposits that do contain significant fossil vertebrate remains (NHMLAC 2020).

The Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County's closest vertebrate fossil locality from somewhat similar deposits is LACM 8062, which is located south-southwest of the project site west of Mira Loma. LACM 8062 produced fossil specimens of undetermined elephant (*Proboscidea*), bear (*Ursus*), dog (*Canis dirus*), horse (*Equus*), camel (*Camelops*), and bison (*Bison*) at shallow but unstated depth. Slightly farther south-southwest of the project area the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County's older Quaternary locality LACM 7811 produced a fossil specimen of coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum*) at a depth of 9 to 11 feet below the surface (NHMLAC 2020). Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium exposed on the project site are unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper

excavations that extend down into older Quaternary deposits, however, may well encounter significant remains of fossil vertebrates (NHMLAC 2020).

Although no paleontological resources are known to exist on the project site, there is a possibility that paleontological resources exist at sub-surface levels on the project site and may be uncovered during grading and excavation activities. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would ensure that if any such resources are found during construction of the Proposed Project, they would be handled according to the proper regulations and any potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

4.7.3 Mitigation Measures

GEO-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resource: If paleontological resources (i.e., fossil remains) are discovered during excavation activities, the contractor will notify the City and cease excavation within 100 feet of the find until a qualified paleontological professional can provide an evaluation of the site. The qualified paleontological professional will evaluate the significance of the find and recommend appropriate measures for the disposition of the site (e.g. fossil recovery, curation, data recovery, and/or monitoring). Construction activities may continue on other parts of the construction site while evaluation and treatment of the paleontological resource takes place.

4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

4.8.1 Environmental Setting

Certain gases in the earth's atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the earth's surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth's atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth's surface and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth as low-frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to temperature. Because the earth has a much lower temperature than the sun, it emits lower-frequency radiation. Most solar radiation passes through GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead trapped, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on earth. Without the greenhouse effect, the earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are CO_2, methane (CH_4), and N_2O. Fluorinated gases also make up a small fraction of the GHGs that contribute to climate change. Fluorinated gases include chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride; however, it is noted that these gases are not associated with typical land use development. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed to be responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is "extremely likely" that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the

anthropogenic increase in GHG concentrations and other anthropogenic factors together (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2014).

Each GHG differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere based on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. CH_4 traps over 25 times more heat per molecule than CO_2, and N_2O absorbs 298 times more heat per molecule than CO_2 (IPCC 2014). Often, estimates of GHG emissions are presented in carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e), which weight each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO_2e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO_2 were being emitted.

Climate change is a global problem. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and TACs, which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas pollutants with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about one day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (one to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the globe. The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; it is sufficient to say the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature or to global, local, or microclimates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

4.8.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions (VIII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Contribution of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction

Construction-related activities that would generate GHG emissions include worker commute trips, haul trucks carrying supplies and materials to and from the project site, and off-road construction equipment (e.g., dozers, loaders, excavators). Table 4.8-1 illustrates the specific construction generated GHG emissions that would result from construction of the Proposed Project.

As shown in Table 4.8-1, construction of the Proposed Project would result in the generation of approximately 888 metric tons of CO_2e over the course of construction. Once construction is complete, the generation of these GHG emissions would cease. The amortized construction emissions are added to the annual average operational emissions consistent with SCAQMD recommendations.

Table 4.8-1. Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions Source	CO_2e (Metric Tons/ Year)
2021 Construction	476
2022 Construction	412
Total Emissions	**888**

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix A for Model Data Outputs.

Operations

Operation of the Proposed Project would result in GHG emissions predominantly associated with motor vehicle use. Long-term operational GHG emissions attributable to the Proposed Project are identified in Table 4.8-2 and compared to SCAQMD's interim screening level numeric bright-line threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e annually.

Table 4.8-2. Operational-Related GHG Emissions

Emissions Source	CO_2e (Metric Tons/ Year)
Construction Emissions (amortized over the 30-year life of the Project)	30
Area Source Emissions	0
Energy Source Emissions	8
Mobile Source Emissions	290
Solid Waste Emissions	4
Water Emissions	19
Total Emissions	**351**
SCAQMD Screening Threshold	*3,000*
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix A for Model Data Outputs.

As shown in Table 4.8-2, operation of the Proposed Project would result in the generation of approximately 351 metric tons of CO_2e annually and thus would not exceed the SCAQMD's numeric bright-line threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e annually. This threshold was developed to ensure at least 90 percent of new GHG emissions would be reviewed and assessed for mitigation, thereby contributing to the statewide GHG emissions reduction goals for the year 2020 promulgated under Assembly Bill 32 and the post-2020 reduction goals promulgated under Senate Bill 32. Thus, both cumulatively and individually, projects that generate less than 3,000 metric tons CO_2e per year have a negligible contribution to overall emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

City of Rancho Cucamonga Sustainable Community Action Plan

The Rancho Cucamonga Sustainable Community Action Plan (2017) is a strategic planning document that identifies sources of GHG emissions within the City's boundaries, presents current and future emissions estimates, identifies a GHG reduction target for future years, and presents strategic policies and actions to reduce emissions from the energy, transportation, land use, water use, and waste sectors. The GHG-reduction strategies in the Plan build on inventory results and key opportunities prioritized by City staff and members of the public. The Sustainable Community Action Plan strategies consist of strategies that identify the steps the City will take to support reductions in GHG emissions. The City will achieve these reductions in GHG emissions through a mix of voluntary programs and new strategic standards. All standards presented in the Sustainable Community Action Plan respond to the needs of development though achieving more efficient use of resources.

Both the existing and the projected GHG inventories in the Sustainable Community Action Plan were derived based on the land use designations and associated densities defined in the City 2010 General Plan. The Proposed Project is consistent with the land use designation and development density presented in the 2010 General Plan. As previously stated, the project site is designated by the City's General Plan as "*Parks*". Since the Proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan it is consistent with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned for the site vicinity in the General Plan. As a result, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the land use assumptions or exceed the population or job growth projections used by the City to develop the Sustainable Community Action Plan.

While the Sustainable Community Action Plan does not contain specific requirements for new developments like that the Proposed Project, all development in Rancho Cucamonga, including the Proposed Project, is required to adhere to all City-adopted policy provisions, including those contained in the adopted Sustainable Community Action Plan. The City ensures all feasible GHG-reducing strategies of the Sustainable Community Action Plan are incorporated into projects and their permits through development review and applications of conditions of approval as applicable.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHGs.

4.8.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

4.9.1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (IX) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As the Proposed Project would construct new park amenities with associated lighting, landscaping, walkways and parking areas, it would not transport, use, or dispose of any hazardous materials beyond those used for construction and maintenance during occupancy. Construction activities may involve limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Some examples of hazardous materials handled during construction include fueling and servicing construction equipment on-site and the use of paints and solvents during construction. These activities would be short-term and one-time events and would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements. A less than significant impact related to the use or transport of hazardous materials is expected to occur during construction.

Long-term operation of the Proposed Project would involve very little transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous material. Typical facility maintenance involves the limited use of hazardous materials through custodial, routine maintenance, and repair activities, including commercial cleansers, lubricants, paints, and pesticides/herbicides for landscaping purposes. These items would be stored in an appropriate place, such as a utility closet, with limited access only by appropriate employees of the park. Groundbreaking and construction activities at the site would not likely release any known toxins or contaminants onsite or convey hazardous materials offsite. Therefore, the Proposed Project would create a less than significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As described above, construction and operation activities would require the use of small amounts of hazardous materials (such as fertilizer and herbicides) and would be required to comply with federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding proper storage, application, and disposal. The proposed park amenities and facilities would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through

reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental release of hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. The Proposed Project is located within 0.25 mile of Etiwanda Colony Elementary School to the west and Summit Intermediate School to the south. However, as stated above, there would be no hazardous materials, substances, or waste associated with project development other than those typically used for routine maintenance. These substances would be required to comply with federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding proper storage, application, and disposal. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of a sensitive land use. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

A review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control's Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese List) indicated that the project site is not located on any identified hazardous materials sites (DTSC 2020). Additionally, a review of the State Water Resources Control Board's Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Geotracker database and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) EnviroMapper indicated that there are no listed hazardous material sites within the project vicinity (SWRCB 2020; EPA 2020). The Proposed Project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, therefore it is unlikely that hazards to the public or environment are present. Groundbreaking and construction activities at the site would not likely release any known toxins or contaminants onsite or convey hazardous materials offsite. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The City produced a Ready RC Guide in 2017 which provides essential tips on what to do before, during and after a disaster. The guide focuses primarily on fire, flood, earthquake, and wind disasters. This comprehensive booklet includes emergency kit checklists, evacuation route maps, shelter information and more (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2017).

Banyan Street is designated as an emergency access route by the Ready RC Guide. Emergency access to the site would be available via one entrance on East Avenue and a second proposed entrance on Banyan Street, thereby facilitating emergency response and evacuation, if necessary. However, construction and temporary lane closure along Banyan would be required to construct the park entrance. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**, impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed improvements do not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. These improvements are typical of a park expansion project and would not exacerbate fire risk or impacts to the environment. As such, impacts to this threshold would be less than significant.

4.9.2 Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the City of Rancho Cucamonga (or its contractor) shall prepare a Traffic Control Plan to ensure proper access to residences and businesses in the area by emergency vehicles during construction and to maintain traffic flow. The Traffic Control Plan shall be approved by the City of Rancho Cucamonga Transportation Services Manager prior to any lane closures.

4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

4.10.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is relatively flat and generally slopes from its highest point on the northwest to its lowest point on the southeast. The project site is occupied by a parking lot, restroom facilities, a playground, soccer fields, and additional active use areas. The Project would construct new recreational and community facilities, supporting infrastructure, and associated landscaping. Existing storm runoff conveyance occurs through surface flow in gutters located throughout the site parking.

4.10.2 Hydrology and Water Quality (X) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

During construction of the Proposed Project water quality impacts could occur without proper controls. Soils loosened during grading, spills of fluids or fuels from vehicles and equipment or miscellaneous construction materials and debris, if mobilized and transported offsite in overland flow, could degrade water quality. Because the area of ground disturbance affected by construction of the Proposed Project would exceed one acre, the Proposed Project would be subject to the requirements of the statewide NPDES stormwater permit for construction activity (Order 98-08 DWQ). The Proposed Project would implement a SWPPP listing BMPs to prevent construction pollutants and products from violating any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project does not involve the withdrawal of groundwater. The Proposed Project would result in an increase of approximately seven acres of usable park space. This would include both pervious (landscaped areas) and impervious (hardscapes) surfaces. The proposed grading plan and stormwater management system are designed and sized to adequately manage the volume of runoff generated from the project site. Runoff from the proposed park expansion would be directed to landscaped areas for infiltration. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

i) The Proposed Project would require grading of the project site which would affect the drainage patterns of the site. However, the site's drainage plan would be designed by a registered civil engineer to safely retain, detain, and/or convey stormwater runoff. Drainage patterns would remain similar to existing conditions. Implementation of BMPs would minimize the potential erosion or siltation from the site. A less than significant impact would occur.

ii) The Proposed Project would include both pervious (landscaped areas) and impervious (hardscapes) surfaces. The proposed grading plan and stormwater management system are designed and sized to adequately manage the volume of runoff generated form the project site. Runoff from the proposed park expansion would be directed to landscaped areas for infiltration. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) The Proposed Project would include both pervious (landscaped areas) and impervious (hardscapes) surfaces. The proposed grading plan and stormwater management system are designed and sized to adequately manage the volume and water quality of runoff generated form the project site. Runoff from the proposed park expansion would be directed to landscaped areas for infiltration. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) The proposed grading plan and stormwater management system are designed to prevent flooding conditions. According to the General Plan EIR Figure 4.9-3 Flood Hazard Zones, the project site is located within the 0.2 percent chance of annual flood zone. Runoff from the proposed park expansion would be directed to landscaped areas for infiltration. Proposed improvements would not impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project site, the project area is located within Flood Zone X. Flood Zone X is described as areas of minimal flood hazard (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] 2020). The Proposed Project would improve existing facilities at Etiwanda Creek Community Park. The project site's drainage would be designed so runoff would be captured at inlets, area drains and catch basins, conveyed through underground piping to the proposed infiltration system, and overflow when necessary to the existing public storm drains. Furthermore, the project site is located approximately 56 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. Due to the distance to the ocean the project site would not be subject to inundation from seiches or tsunamis. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located within the Cucamonga Groundwater Basin. According to the Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD) 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), CVWD predicts that it would have sufficient supply to meet water demands in the foreseeable future. To meet demand, the difference from reduced canyon flows, imported water restrictions and State mandated water reductions during a multi-dry year shall be made up from the district's stored groundwater from the Chino Basin, tier II imported water (if available), replenishment water (if available), and implementation of the water shortage contingency plan (CVWD 2016). The Proposed Project would comply with the Water Shortage Contingency Plan outlined in the UWMP, if implemented. For example, limits may be applied to the number of days, frequency and duration of outdoor watering at the park. It is anticipated that the

addition of seven acres of park space would not exceed the capacity of water supplies of the Cucamonga Basin. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would comply with the NPDES stormwater permit for construction activity (Order 98-08 DWQ), and as such would prepare a SWPPP to prevent groundwater contamination. By complying with all City and regional water conservation policies and regulations, impacts to water quality control and groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

4.10.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.11 Land Use and Planning

4.11.1 Environmental Setting

The Proposed Project is located within the City of Rancho Cucamonga in southwest San Bernardino County. It is surrounded by the cities of Upland, Ontario, Fontana, and the San Bernardino National Forest and parts of unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The City has a land area of approximately 40 square miles, with another 10 square miles in its Sphere of Influence (SOI). The SOI extends from the City's northern boundaries up to the San Bernardino National Forest.

The project site is located northeast of the intersection of East Avenue and Banyan Street and north of Summit Intermediate School, approximately 1.5 miles west of I-15. The project site is surrounded by East Avenue and Etiwanda Colony Elementary School to the west, residential development to the north, undeveloped parcels to the east, and the Etiwanda Education Center to the south. Surrounding land uses are summarized in Table 4.11-1 below.

Table 4.11-1. Surrounding Zoning and Land Use Designations

	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Existing Land Use
Project Site	Parks	Park (P), Very Low Residential (VL)	Public Park
North	Very Low Density Residential (VL)	VL - Very Low Residential	Single Family Homes
East	Flood Control/Utility Corridor	FC - Flood Control UC - Utility Corridor	Flood Control/Utility Corridor
South	Schools, Very Low Density Residential (VL)	Schools, Very Low Residential (VL)	Schools, Single Family Homes
West	Schools, Very Low Density Residential (VL)	Schools, Very Low Residential (VL)	Schools, Single Family Homes

Source: City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a

4.11.2 Land Use and Planning (XI) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project involves park improvements including baseball/softball fields, shade structures, concessions, a public works yard, interactive water features, park play features, tennis court, soccer field, and associated parking and other infrastructure upgrades at the Etiwanda Creek Community Park. Upon completion, the park would increase in size by approximately seven acres; however, the expansion would develop vacant land on the easterly side of the park. While there are residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the project site, no separation of uses or disruption of access between land uses around the site would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. All development associated with the Proposed Project would be confined to the project site and would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not affect any established community. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The 2010 General Plan assumes that future development and redevelopment in the City would lead to the conversion of vacant and undeveloped land to urban land uses and the redevelopment of underutilized lots. The Proposed Project is located in a Parks land use designation and would result in various park improvements at the existing Etiwanda Creek Community Park. In alignment with the goals outlined in the General Plan, the Proposed Project would increase usable park space by expanding the park into vacant land. Additionally, the Proposed Project would continue the same recreational land uses within the project site; therefore, it would not conflict with the City's land use plans. No impact would occur.

4.11.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.12 Mineral Resources

Approximately 2,422 acres of potential aggregate mineral resources are located within the City. The majority of this acreage is planned for Open Space, Conservation, Flood Control/Utility Corridor, or Hillside Residential, which represents a very low-density of development. As of 2009, approximately 437 acres of the sectors in the City have been developed. Consequently, land use conflicts between residential

uses and possible aggregate extraction is likely to occur in the City, particularly as residential use increases. The Sphere of Influence currently contains a rock crushing plant located within the Day Creek area, which is the only active aggregate operation in the Planning Area. As such, aggregate deposits available for recovery within the City may be limited due to conflicts between urban development, access, and the nature of typical surface mining operations (Rancho Cucamonga 2010a).

4.12.1 Mineral Resources (XII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the California Geological Survey (CGS) Updated Mineral Land Classification Map, the project site is located in Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2). MRZ-2 is defined as areas where geologic data indicate that significant PCC-Grade aggregate resources are present (CGS 2007). However, the Proposed Project consists of improvements to Etiwanda Creek Community Park and does not include mining activities. The project site is currently developed as a park and would remain as such. No impact to mineral resources would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are four coalescing alluvial fans in or near the City, comprising a significant local sand and gravel resource. From west to east these alluvial fans are known as the San Antonio, Cucamonga, Deer Creek, and Day Creek fans (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010a). According to the City's General Plan, the project site is not located in one of these regionally significant aggregate mineral resource areas. As discussed above, the Proposed Project consists of improvements to Etiwanda Creek Community Park and does not include mining activities. The project site is currently developed as a park and would remain as such. No impact to locally important mineral resources would occur.

4.12.2 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.13 Noise

A Noise Impact Assessment was completed for the Proposed Project (ECORP 2020c; Appendix G). The results of the assessment are summarized in the following sections.

4.13.1 Environmental Setting

Noise Fundamentals

Noise is generally defined as sound that is loud, disagreeable, or unexpected. The selection of a proper noise descriptor for a specific source is dependent on the spatial and temporal distribution, duration, and fluctuation of the noise. The noise descriptors most often encountered when dealing with traffic, community, and environmental noise include the average hourly noise level (in L_{eq}) and the average daily noise levels/community noise equivalent level (in L_{dn}/CNEL). The L_{eq} is a measure of ambient noise, while the L_{dn} and CNEL are measures of community noise. Each is applicable to this analysis and defined as follows:

- **Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq})** is the average acoustic energy content of noise for a stated period of time. Thus, the L_{eq} of a time-varying noise and that of a steady noise are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy to the ear during exposure. For evaluating community impacts, this rating scale does not vary, regardless of whether the noise occurs during the day or the night.
- **Day-Night Average (L_{dn})** is a 24-hour average L_{eq} with a 10-dBA "weighting" added to noise during the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am to account for noise sensitivity in the nighttime. The logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60 dBA 24-hour L_{eq} would result in a measurement of 66.4 dBA L_{dn}.
- **Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)** is a 24-hour average L_{eq} with a 5-dBA weighting during the hours of 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm and a 10-dBA weighting added to noise during the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively.

Noise can be generated by a number of sources, including mobile sources, such as automobiles, trucks and airplanes, and stationary sources, such as construction sites, machinery, and industrial operations. Sound spreads (propagates) uniformly outward in a spherical pattern, and the sound level decreases (attenuates) at a rate of approximately 6 dB for each doubling of distance from a stationary or point source. Sound from a line source, such as a highway, propagates outward in a cylindrical pattern, often referred to as cylindrical spreading. Sound levels attenuate at a rate of approximately 3 dB for each doubling of distance from a line source, such as a roadway, depending on ground surface characteristics (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] 2011). No excess attenuation is assumed for hard surfaces like a parking lot or a body of water. Soft surfaces, such as soft dirt or grass, can absorb sound, so an excess ground-attenuation value of 1.5 dB per doubling of distance is normally assumed. For line sources, an overall attenuation rate of 3 dB per doubling of distance is assumed (FHWA 2011).

Vibration Fundamentals

Ground vibration can be measured several ways to quantify the amplitude of vibration produced. This can be through peak particle velocity or root mean square velocity. These velocity measurements measure maximum particle at one point or the average of the squared amplitude of the signal, respectively. Vibration impacts on people can be described as the level of annoyance and can vary depending on an individual's sensitivity. Generally, low-level vibrations may cause window rattling but do not pose any threats to the integrity of buildings or structures.

Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to include those uses where noise exposure could result in health-related risks to individuals, as well as places where quiet is an essential element of their intended purpose. Residential dwellings are of primary concern because of the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to both interior and exterior noise levels. Additional land uses such as parks, historic sites, cemeteries, and recreation areas are considered sensitive to increases in exterior noise levels. Schools, churches, hotels, libraries, and other places where low interior noise levels are essential are also considered noise-sensitive land uses.

The project site is surrounded by a residential development to the north, vacant land with a residential development beyond to the east, Summit Intermediate School to the south, and Etiwanda Creek Community Park space to the west. The nearest noise sensitive land use to the project site is the residential land uses to the north with the closest residence located approximately 30 feet distant, measured from the project site's northern property line. Etiwanda Creek Community Park, also considered a noise-sensitive land use, is located directly adjacent to the proposed improvements but noise related impacts at the existing park are not analyzed as the Proposed Project is increasing the existing park space.

Existing Ambient Noise Environment

The City of Rancho Cucamonga, which encompasses the project site, is affected by various noise sources. It is subject to typical urban noise such as noise generated by traffic, heavy machinery, and day-to-day outdoor activities as well as noise generated from the various land uses (i.e., residential, commercial, institutional, and recreational and parks activities) throughout Rancho Cucamonga that generate stationary source noise. Mobile sources of noise, especially cars and trucks, are the most common source of noise in the community. The noise surveys conducted in 2009 for the City's General Plan concluded that the ambient noise environment in Rancho Cucamonga is largely influenced by roadway noise. The project site is located adjacent to, and with the implementation of the Proposed Project would connect with, Banyan Street. The City's General Plan identifies Banyan Street, located south of the project site, and East Avenue, located west of the project site, as Tertiary Travel Corridors which are more locally oriented and are more locally traveled. Additionally, the project site is located approximately 0.6 mile south of Interstate 210 (I-210) and approximately one mile southeast of Interstate 15 (I-15). These roadways are identified as key transportation corridors in the City's General Plan and areas adjacent to these roadways experience noise levels up to 70 to 75 dBA CNEL. Additionally, noise measurements done in 2009 for the General Plan EIR, approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site, identified an ambient noise level of 48.9 L_{eq}. This noise measurement location was conducted at a park and adjacent to a residential development similar to the Proposed Project. Furthermore, previous noise measurements conducted by ECORP staff at park uses range from 54.9 to 58.4 dBA.

The existing park consists of two athletic fields with LED sports lighting, a dog park and supporting infrastructure. The dog park is proposed for removal to accommodate the proposed improvements.

4.13.2 Noise (XIII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Construction noise associated with the Proposed Project would be temporary and would vary depending on the nature of the activities being performed. Noise generated would primarily be associated with the operation of off-road equipment for onsite construction activities as well as construction vehicle traffic on area roadways. Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending on the nature or phase of construction (e.g., building construction, paving). Noise generated by construction equipment, including earthmovers, material handlers, and portable generators, can reach high levels. 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. Other primary sources of acoustical

disturbance would be random incidents, which would last less than one minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts). During construction, exterior noise levels could negatively affect sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the construction site.

Nearby noise-sensitive land uses consist of a residential development to the north, vacant land with a residential development beyond to the east, Summit Intermediate School to the south, and Etiwanda Creek Community Park space to the west. The nearest noise sensitive land use to the project site is the residential development with the closest residence located approximately 30 feet north of the project site boundary. As previously described in Section 17.66.050 of the City's Municipal Code, construction activity is exempted provided that noise generating activity does 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, and provided noise levels created do not exceed the noise standard of 65 dBA when measured at the adjacent property line.

To estimate the worst-case construction noise levels that may occur at the nearest noise-sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity, the construction equipment noise levels were calculated using the Roadway Noise Construction Model for the site preparation, grading and building construction, paving and architectural coating. The anticipated short-term construction noise levels generated for the necessary equipment is presented in Table 4.13-1.

Table 4.13-1. Construction Average (dBA) Noise Levels at Nearest Receptor

Equipment	Estimated Exterior Construction Noise Level @ Nearest Residence	Construction Noise Standards (dBA Leq)	Exceeds Standard at Nearest Residence?
Site Preparation			
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (4)	58.7 (each)	*65*	**No**
Rubber Tired Dozers (3)	56.4 (each)	*65*	**No**
Combined Site Preparation Equipment	66.3	*65*	**Yes**
Grading			
Excavators (1)	55.4	*65*	**No**
Rubber Tired Dozers (1)	56.4	*65*	**No**
Graders (1)	59.7	*65*	**No**
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (3)	58.7 (each)	*65*	**No**
Combined Grading Equipment	66.0	*65*	**Yes**
Building Construction/ Paving/ Architectural Coating			
Crane (1)	51.3	*65*	**No**
Forklifts (3)	58.1 (each)	*65*	**No**
Generator Sets (1)	56.3	*65*	**No**
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (3)	58.7 (each)	*65*	**No**
Welders (1)	48.7	*65*	**No**
Pavers (2)	52.9 (each)	*65*	**No**
Rollers (2)	51.7 (each)	*65*	**No**

Table 4.13-1. Construction Average (dBA) Noise Levels at Nearest Receptor

Equipment	Estimated Exterior Construction Noise Level @ Nearest Residence	Construction Noise Standards (dBA Leq)	Exceeds Standard at Nearest Residence?
Paving Equipment (2)	61.2 (each)	*65*	**No**
Air Compressors (1)	52.4	*65*	**No**
Combined Building Equipment	69.2	*65*	**Yes**

Source: Construction noise levels were calculated by ECORP Consulting, Inc. using the FHWA Roadway Noise Construction Model (FHWA 2006). Refer to Appendix G for Model Data Outputs.

Notes: Construction equipment used during construction derived from CalEEMod 2016.3.2. CalEEMod is designed to calculate air pollutant emissions from construction activity and contains default construction equipment and usage parameters for typical construction projects based on several construction surveys conducted in order to identify such parameters. The distance to the nearest sensitive receptor was calculated from the center of the project site (approximately 580 feet). Building construction, paving and architectural coating are assumed to occur simultaneously.

As shown, no individual piece of construction equipment would exceed 65 dBA at the closest residence. However, as shown above, all cumulative construction equipment would exceed 65 dBA at the closest residence. Currently, the residences of concern located to the north have an approximate 6-foot-tall masonry wall at the property line, adjacent to where construction activates would occur. A solid wall or berm generally reduces noise levels by 10 to 20 dBA (FHWA 2011). A reduction of 10 dBA all cumulative and individual construction equipment would result in Project construction noise falling below the 65 dBA threshold.

However, a site visit was not conducted to accurately inspect the masonry wall and it is unknown if the wall is free of degrading holes or gaps that would offer a noise reduction. Additionally, the residents which are considered sensitive to elevated noise are located directly adjacent and in extremely close proximity to where construction activities would take place. As such, to comply with the City's Development Code Section 17.66.050 and to protect the safety and health of the existing residents, noise source control would be imposed on the northern side of the project site. Noise source control is the most effective method of controlling construction noise. Source controls, which limit noise, are the easiest to oversee on a construction project. Mitigation at the source reduces the problem everywhere, not just along one single path or for one receiver. Noise path controls are the second method in controlling noise. Barriers or enclosures can provide a substantial reduction in the nuisance effect in some cases. Path control measures include moving equipment farther away from the receiver; enclosing especially noisy activities or stationary equipment; erecting noise enclosures, barriers, or curtains; and using landscaping as a shield and dissipater.

Noise barriers or enclosures can provide a sound reduction 35 dBA or greater (WEAL 2000). To be effective, a noise enclosure/barrier must physically fit in the available space, must completely break the line of sight between the noise source and the receptors, must be free of degrading holes or gaps, and must not be flanked by nearby reflective surfaces. Noise barriers must be sizable enough to cover the entire noise source and extend lengthwise and vertically as far as feasibly possible to be most effective. The limiting factor for a noise barrier is not the component of noise transmitted through the material, but rather the amount of noise flanking around and over the barrier. In these cases, the enclosure/barrier is only required on the northern side of the project site where the closest residences are located.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2** would substantially reduce construction-generated noise levels. As previously described, noise barriers or enclosures such as that required by **Mitigation Measure NOI-2** can provide a sound reduction 35 dBA or greater (WEAL 2000), which would be a reduction robust enough to maintain construction noise levels less than 65 dBA. Therefore, project construction activities would not expose persons to and generate noise levels in excess of City standards with implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2**.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Excessive groundborne vibration impacts result from continuously occurring vibration levels. Once operational, the Proposed Project would not be a source of groundborne vibration. Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the Proposed Project would be primarily associated with short-term, construction-related activities. Construction on the project site would have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and the operations involved. Ground vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance.

Construction-related ground vibration is normally associated with impact equipment such as pile drivers, jackhammers, and the operation of some heavy-duty construction equipment, such as dozers and trucks. Pile drivers are not anticipated to be necessary for Project construction in the case of the Proposed Project. Vibration decreases rapidly with distance and it is acknowledged that construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to sensitive receptors. Groundborne vibration levels associated with typical construction equipment are summarized in Table 4.13-2.

Section 17.66.070 of the City's Development Code exempts all vibration associated with temporary construction. However, a discussion of construction vibration is included for full disclosure purposes. For comparison purposes, the Caltrans (2013a) recommended standard of 0.2 inch per second peak particle velocity (PPV) with respect to the prevention of structural damage for normal buildings is used as a threshold. This is also the level at which vibrations may begin to annoy people in buildings.

Table 4.13-2. Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment Type	Peak Particle Velocity at 20 Feet (inches per second)
Large Bulldozer	0.124
Caisson Drilling	0.124
Loaded Trucks	0.106
Rock Breaker	0.115
Jackhammer	0.049

Table 4.13-2. Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment Type	Peak Particle Velocity at 20 Feet (inches per second)
Small Bulldozer/Tractor	0.004

Source: FTA 2018; Caltrans 2013a

It is acknowledged that construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to the nearest structure. The nearest structures of concern to the construction site are residences with the closest physical building being approximately 70 feet away. Based on the vibration levels presented in Table 4.13-2, ground vibration generated by heavy-duty equipment would not be anticipated to exceed approximately 0.124 inch per second PPV at 20 feet. Thus, the structures located at 70 feet would not be negatively affected.

Project operations would not include the use of any stationary equipment that would result in excessive groundborne vibration levels. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is located approximately 7.3 miles southwest of the LA/Ontario International Airport, located in the City of Ontario. Although aircraft flight patterns fall within Rancho Cucamonga's boundaries, noise from aircrafts is not a significant issue in the City. As discussed in the 2010 General Plan EIR, the City is well outside the 65 dBA CNEL noise contours for the LA/Ontario International Airport. Aircraft noise does not significantly impact the City of Rancho Cucamonga and the Proposed Project would not expose people visiting or working on the project site to excess airport noise levels. No impact would occur.

4.13.3 Mitigation Measures

NOI-1: The Project improvement and building plans will include the following requirements for construction activities:

- Construction contracts must specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state-required noise attenuation devices.
- A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall be posted at the Project construction site providing a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the

construction process and register complaints. This sign shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities. In conjunction with this required posting, a noise disturbance coordinator will be identified to address construction noise concerns received. The coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the disturbance coordinator shall notify the City within 24 hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (starting too early, malfunctioning muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the City. All signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator.

- Identification of construction noise reduction methods. These reduction methods may include shutting off idling equipment (5 minutes), installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and using electric air compressors and similar power tools.
- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.
- Per Section 17.66.050 of the City's Municipal Code, construction shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a national holiday.

NOI-2: In order to reduce construction noise, during the site preparation, grading and building construction phases, a temporary noise barrier or enclosure shall be used along the northern property line to break the line of sight between the construction equipment and the adjacent residence. The temporary noise barrier shall have a sound transmission class (STC) of 35 or greater in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials Test Method E90, or at least 2 pounds per square foot to ensure adequate transmission loss characteristics. The temporary noise barrier shall consist of a solid plywood fence at least 7/16-inch and/or flexible sound curtains, such as an 18-ounce tarp or a 2-inch-thick fiberglass blanket, attached to chain link fencing. The length, height, and location of noise control barrier walls shall be adequate to assure proper acoustical performance. All noise control barrier walls shall be designed to preclude structural failure due to such factors as winds, shear, shallow soil failure, earthquakes, and erosion.

4.14 Population and Housing

The City of Rancho Cucamonga incorporated in 1977 with a population of approximately 44,600 persons (Rancho Cucamonga 2010b). The City's population has risen to over 177,000 persons as of 2017. According to the General Plan EIR, the City's housing stock consisted of 42,134 housing units in 2000. In January 2009, the housing stock increased to 55,716 housing units. Since 2000, the City and the County have both experienced positive growth of their housing stock; however, the annual growth rates experienced between 2000 to 2006 were higher in the City than in the County and, in 2007 and 2008, the housing stock in the County increased at a more rapid pace (Rancho Cucamonga 2010b).

4.14.1 Population and Housing (XIV) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would construct new recreational and community facilities and supporting infrastructure at Etiwanda Creek Community Park. The Proposed Project does not propose the construction of new housing or businesses and therefore is not anticipated to directly or indirectly induce population growth in the area. The Proposed Project is not expected to generate a substantial permanent increase in employment opportunities, as construction activities would be temporary and the park would likely be maintained by existing City employees. Thus, the Proposed Project would not be capable of inducing population growth. A less than significant impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project involves improvements to existing facilities within Etiwanda Creek Community Park, construction of new sports fields and structures, parking, and landscaping. There are currently no habitable structures on site. Development activities would be contained within the project site and would not displace housing. No impact would occur.

4.14.2 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.15 Public Services

4.15.1 Environmental Setting

Police Services

Since incorporation of Rancho Cucamonga in 1977, law enforcement services in the City have been provided through a contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. The Department is made of two divisions: the Traffic Division, which facilitates the safe and effective movement of traffic; and the Patrol Division, which carries out basic law enforcement services (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2019a).

Fire Services

The Rancho Cucamonga Fire District provides fire protection and emergency medical response services to approximately 50 square miles in and around the City limits. The Fire District maintains seven fire stations throughout the City. The nearest fire station to the project site is East Avenue Fire Station 176, located approximately 300 feet northwest of the project site (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2019b).

Schools

Primary public education services are provided by the Alta Loma School District, which serves the northwestern section of the City; the Central School District, which serves the west-central portions; the Cucamonga School District, which serves the southern portions; and the Etiwanda School District, which serves the eastern portion of the City and a portion of the City of Fontana. The unincorporated sphere of influence area to the north is served by the Alta Loma School District and Etiwanda School District (Rancho Cucamonga 2010b). There are three schools within the vicinity of the project site: Etiwanda Colony Elementary School, Summit Intermediate School, and Frost Early Education Center. Summit Intermediate School is directly adjacent to the southern edge of the site. All three schools are located within one mile of the project site.

Parks

The City owns and operates 30 public parks and seven recreational facilities, as well as 130 acres of undeveloped parkland not including undeveloped trail acreage. Private recreational facilities complement the City's parks, trails, and bikeways and include the 128-acre Red Hill Country Club Golf Course and Tennis Center and the 144-acre Empire Lakes Golf Course.

4.15.2 Public Services (XV) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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:				
Fire Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would not create a substantial new fire or public safety hazard. The Proposed Project involves improvements to existing facilities within Etiwanda Creek Community Park, construction of a new park play features, new sports fields, and other amenities. The Proposed Project would be beneficial to the local community by providing new and updated public facilities. The improvements are not expected to induce population growth; therefore, there would be no additional demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities. No significant increase in police protection services are anticipated. The Proposed Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives. As such, impacts to public services would be less than significant.

4.15.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.16 Recreation

4.16.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Rancho Cucamonga has approximately 347.6 acres of parkland and recreational facilities. These include 25 neighborhood parks, 3 community parks, and 8 special use facilities. In addition, the City's Multi-Use Regional and Community Trails add approximately 295 acres of land for recreational use. The trails provide a network of interconnecting off-road, urban, and wilderness trails that allow horseback riding, hiking, jogging, running, and walking into open space areas and connect the residential areas to commercial activity centers (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2010b).

4.16.2 Recreation (XVI) Materials Checklist

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project would demolish the existing dog play area located at the northwest corner of the park and replace it with basic park amenities such as shade structure(s), seating, drinking fountain(s),

walking path, parking, play structure, and/or exercise equipment. The Proposed Project would also construct two sports fields, a tennis court, and other amenities. The new improvements would increase usable park space by approximately seven acres resulting in a beneficial impact to the community. The Proposed Project does not involve residential uses and would not cause a direct increase in the population of the project area. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐

As stated in the response to question XVI. a) above, the Proposed Project would construct new park facilities and increase park open space by approximately seven acres. The environmental impacts of construction and operation of the Proposed Project, including required mitigation measures, are discussed in this Initial Study. Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to the mitigation measures listed in this Initial Study.

4.16.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.17 Transportation

4.17.1 Transportation (XVII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Construction Impacts

The Proposed Project would generate short-term construction related vehicle trips. However, traffic generated by construction of the Proposed Project would be temporary and would not conflict with the City of Rancho Cucamonga's Circulation Element. Based on the trip generation analysis, no more than 50 2-way peak hour trips would be added to local roadways (KOA 2020). Impacts would be less than significant.

Operational Impacts

Operational impacts are anticipated to be similar to existing conditions because the Proposed Project would continue an existing use and no substantial increases in building square footages would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

According to the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on SB 743, many local agencies have developed screening thresholds to indicate when detailed traffic analysis is needed. Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of vehicle miles travelled (VMT), or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than significant transportation impact (OPR 2018). Based on the project type being a local serving community institution, no impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Proposed Project would construct new recreational and community facilities and supporting infrastructure at Etiwanda Creek Community Park. The project site consists of a developed modern park and seven acres of undeveloped land east of the park. A second park entrance, accessible at the intersection of Banyan Street and Golden Lock Place, would be provided. An entry monument sign would be installed. Improvements have been designed by a registered civil engineer to meet the City of Rancho Cucamonga's development standards. No impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Vehicular access to the project site would be provided via one existing entrance located on East Avenue that now serves as access to the existing park. A second monument sign and park entrance, accessible at the intersection of Banyan Street and Golden Lock Place, would be provided. No offsite roadway improvements would interfere with emergency access, response times, or impede circulation of

emergency vehicles on surrounding roadways. All construction vehicles and equipment would be stationed in a designated area on-site within the project site boundaries. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**, as described in Section 4.9 of this Initial Study, access along surrounding roadways would be maintained throughout Project construction activities.

During the course of the City of Rancho Cucamonga's required review of the Proposed Project's applications, the site plan has been reviewed to ensure that adequate access to and from the site and around the proposed buildings is provided for emergency vehicles. Compliance with City approved site plan and subsequent City reviewed and approved construction documents would ensure that potential impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.

4.17.2 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is listed in Section 4.9.2 of this Initial Study.

4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

4.18.1 Regulatory Setting

Assembly Bill 52

Effective July 1, 2015, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) amended CEQA to require that: 1) a lead agency provide notice to those California Native American tribes that requested notice of projects proposed by the lead agency; and 2) for any tribe that responded to the notice within 30 days of receipt with a request for consultation, the lead agency must consult with the tribe. Topics that may be addressed during consultation include Tribal Cultural Resources (TCRs), the potential significance of project impacts, type of environmental document that should be prepared, and possible mitigation measures and project alternatives.

Pursuant to AB 52, Section 21073 of the Public Resources Code defines California Native American tribes as "a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of the Statutes of 2004." This includes both federally and non-federally recognized tribes.

Section 21074(a) of the Public Resource Code defines TCRs for the purpose of CEQA as:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes (geographically defined in terms of the size and scope), sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
    a. included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; and/or
    b. included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1; and/or
    c. 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 Section

> 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Because criteria a and b also meet the definition of a historical resource under CEQA, a TCR may also require additional consideration as a historical resource. TCRs may or may not exhibit archaeological, cultural, or physical indicators.

Recognizing that California tribes are experts in their tribal cultural resources and heritage, AB 52 requires that CEQA lead agencies provide tribes that requested notification an opportunity to consult at the commencement of the CEQA process to identify TCRs. Furthermore, because a significant effect on a TCR is considered a significant impact on the environment under CEQA, consultation is used to develop appropriate avoidance, impact minimization, and mitigation measures.

4.18.2 Summary of AB 52 Consultation

On April 14, 2020 the City sent project notification letters to the following California Native American tribes, which had previously submitted general consultation request letters pursuant to 21080.3.1(d) of the Public Resources Code:

- San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
- Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians

Only one response to the City's notification letters was received.

On May 15, 2020 the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) e-mailed City staff to discuss the Proposed Project. The response stated that the project area exists within Serrano ancestral territory and, therefore, is of interest to the Tribe. However, due to the nature and location of the Proposed Project, and given the CRM Department's present state of knowledge, the SMBMI does not have any concerns with the Proposed Project's implementation. The response also included the tribe's suggested cultural resource and tribal cultural resource mitigation measures for the City to consider and requested a copy of the final project/permit/plan conditions. On October 29, 2020 the City sent a letter to the SMBMI to conclude consultation. The City agreed to the requests of the SMBMI. SMBMI's suggested cultural resource and tribal cultural resource mitigation measures have been incorporated into this IS/MND as Mitigation Measures CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, TCR-1, and TCR-2.

4.18.3 Tribal Cultural Resources (XVIII) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

i) As discussed in the response to question a of Section 4.5, the records search revealed that no previously recorded resources are located within the project site (ECORP 2020b). As a result of the field survey, one historic-period refuse deposit (EC-001) and one historic-period isolated find (EC-002-I) were identified within the project site. No pre-contact sites or isolated finds were identified as a result of the survey (ECORP 2020b). Resources EC-001 and EC-002-I have been evaluated using CRHR eligibility criteria and local criteria from the City of Rancho Cucamonga Historic Preservation Ordinance. As a result of this evaluation, EC-001 and EC-002-I are not eligible for the CRHR nor are they eligible on the local level as historic landmarks or places of historical interest under any criteria. The Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on known Historical Resources under CEQA. No impact would occur.

ii) No TCRs were identified within the project area during AB 52 consultation. The Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to known TCRs. However, during AB 52 consultation the project area was identified as being sensitive and has the potential to contain unknown TCRs. Significant impacts may occur from the disturbance of unknown TCRs during ground disturbing construction activities associated with the Proposed Project. Impacts to unknown TCRs would be less than significant with the implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-1** and **TCR 2**.

4.18.4 Mitigation Measures

TCR-1: The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in Mitigation Measure CUL-2, of any pre-contact cultural 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.

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.

4.19 Utilities and Service Systems

4.19.1 Environmental Setting

Water Service

Cucamonga Valley Water District (CVWD) provides the City of Rancho Cucamonga, including the project site, with water services. CVWD's service area includes the City of Rancho Cucamonga, portions of the cities of Fontana, Ontario, and Upland and some unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The CVWD has a diverse water supply consisting of the Cucamonga Basin and Chino Basin aquifers, four local canyon watersheds, and imported water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta through the State Water Project. The CVWD's water system consists of 711 miles of distribution lines, 28 groundwater wells, 34 storage reservoirs, three water treatment plants, 48,516 meters of various sizes and the service lines associated with the meters.

According to the CVWD 2018 Water Quality Report, 59 percent of the water delivered to CVWD consumers in 2018 was imported from Northern California via the State Water Project. This water is treated at CVWD's Lloyd W. Michael Water Treatment Plant. 37 percent of the water delivered to CVWD consumers in 2018 was groundwater pumped from the Cucamonga Basin and Chino Basin aquifers. Four percent of the water delivered to CVWD's consumers in 2018 was local canyon and tunnel water including Cucamonga Canyon, Deer Canyon, Day Canyon, East Etiwanda Canyon, and a number of tunnels in the local San Gabriel Mountains. This water is treated at CVWD's Arthur H. Bridge or Lloyd Michael Treatment Plants and then flows into storage reservoirs and then into the distribution system to consumers (CVWD 2018).

Wastewater

Wastewater services for the City of Rancho Cucamonga are also provided by CVWD. CVWD currently operates and maintains approximately 421 miles of wastewater collection system ranging from 8 to 36

inches in diameter. Wastewater that is generated by CVWD's customers is transported through this collection system and sent to Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) Wastewater Treatment facilities where it is processed into recycled water.

The IEUA operates the wastewater Regional Plant No. 4 located at the intersection of 6th Street and Etiwanda Avenue in Rancho Cucamonga. This wastewater plant has been in operation since 1997 and treats an annual flow of seven million gallons per day, with an ultimate build-out capacity of 28 million gallons per day.

Solid Waste

Burrtec Waste Industries is the single franchised waste hauler for the City of Rancho Cucamonga and is responsible for providing recycling, refuse, and green waste services for residents, commercial and industrial customers. Burrtec Waste Industries is the only business permitted to haul solid waste in the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

In July 2001, the County of San Bernardino contracted Burrtec to operate and maintain their solid waste disposal facilities located throughout the County. This includes both active and closed landfills, transfer stations and community collection centers. Solid waste generated in the City is transferred to Burrtec's West Valley Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), located immediately southeast of the City at 13373 Napa Street in Fontana. Solid waste that is not diverted is primarily disposed at Mid-Valley Landfill, a County Class III (i.e., municipal waste) landfill located at 2390 North Alder Avenue in Rialto. It is permitted for 7,500 tons per day (TPD) maximum with 67,520,000 cubic yards remaining. The landfill has enough projected capacity to serve residents and businesses until approximately 2053 (CalRecycle 2019).

Electricity

Southern California Edison provides electricity to over 15 million people in 50,000 square miles of service area, encompassing 15 counties in central, coastal, and southern California. SCE would extend electric service to the Proposed Project in accordance with rules and policies for extension of service on file with the California Public Utilities Commission.

Natural Gas

The Southern California Gas Company provides natural gas services to the area and would extend service to the project site at the time contractual arrangements are made in accordance with SoCalGas policies and extension rules on file with the California Public Utilities Commission.

4.19.2 Utilities and Service Systems (XIX) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the	☐	☐	☒	☐

construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				

Water and Wastewater

The Proposed Project would construct new facilities including a concession and storage space, a shade structure, and a restroom. The Proposed Project would also include landscaping located around the proposed facilities and infrastructure improvements. An interactive water feature would be located north of the proposed tennis court and south of the proposed sports fields. The water feature would be designed with a sports theme and would have low water use and maintenance requirements.

The Proposed Project would not result in significant additional demand on water or wastewater as future development has been previously accounted for and analyzed in the General Plan EIR and would not result in the need for new or expanded utilities. Connection fees would be collected by CVWD to help offset the cost of providing a domestic water and wastewater connection to the project site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not significantly impact existing water or wastewater facilities.

Storm Drainage

The Proposed Project would construct new storm drainage infrastructure to serve the park expansion. The environmental effects of these improvements are discussed thorough this Initial Study.

Electricity and Natural Gas

As discussed in Section 4.6 Energy, the increase in electricity usage as a result of the Proposed Project would constitute 23,047.5 kWh, or a 0.0002 percent increase in the typical annual electricity consumption attributable to non-residential uses in San Bernardino County. Energy use by the Proposed Project during operation would be attributable primarily to use of the concession area and stadium lighting. Additionally, Project increases in non-residential natural gas usage across the County would be negligible, 0.406 therms, which equates to a 0 percent increase in use when accounting for rounding. For these reasons, the Proposed Project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of building energy.

Overall, the proposed facilities are not expected to require relocation or reconstruction of existing utilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project would construct an interactive water feature north of the proposed tennis court and south of the proposed sports fields. The water feature would be designed with a sports theme and would

have low water use and maintenance requirements. The Proposed Project would include landscaping located around the proposed facilities and infrastructure improvements.

The project site is located within the Chino Groundwater Basin. According to the CVWD 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), CVWD predicts its water demands to be 58,900 acre-feet (AF) in 2020 and 61,300 AF in 2025 during normal year conditions. Water supplies during normal years would be 60,500 AF in 2020 and 63,100 AF in 2025. In single dry year and multiple dry year scenarios, water supplies would also be 60,500 AF in 2020 and 63,100 AF in 2025 (CVWD 2016).

In foreseeable multiple dry years, CVWD predicts that it would have sufficient supply to meet water demands. To meet demand, the difference from reduced canyon flows, imported water restrictions and State mandated water reductions during a multi-dry year shall be made up from the district's stored groundwater from the Chino Basin, tier II imported water (if available), replenishment water (if available), and implementation of the water shortage contingency plan (CVWD 2016). The Proposed Project would comply with the Water Shortage Contingency Plan outlined in the UWMP, if implemented. For example, limits may be applied to the number of days, frequency and duration of outdoor watering at the park. By complying with all city and regional water conservation policies and regulations, impacts on water supplies would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐

CVWD owns and operates the local sewer systems within its service area. Ultimately, all wastewater generated within CVWD's service area is conveyed to regional trunk and interceptor sewers, which are owned and operated by the IEUA. From there, the wastewater is treated at facilities the IEUA owns and operates.

IEUA operates four regional water recycling plants spread throughout its service area: Regional Plant No. 1 (RP-1), Regional Plant No. 4 (RP-4), Regional Plant No. 5 (RP-5), and the Carbon Canyon Water Reclamation Facility. Of those facilities, RP-1 and RP-4 provide wastewater services to CVWD. RP-1 treats an annual average flow of 28.3 million gallons per day (mgd) and RP-4 treats an annual average flow of 9.7 mgd. Capacity at RP-1 and RP-4 are expected to be adequate to serve the City's wastewater requirements through year 2035 (CVWD 2016).

Wastewater would be conveyed into the existing sewer line connected to the park. The negligible increase in wastewater production from the Proposed Project would be collected and treated in the existing CVWD sewer infrastructure without the need for expanded facilities. Impacts to wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The City of Rancho Cucamonga is required by state law to reduce the amount of material that is hauled to landfills. To reach this goal, the City created the Construction and Demolition (C&D) Waste Diversion Program to divert materials generated from construction or demolition projects from landfill disposal to recycling or reuse. This program requires documentation that at least 65 percent of the total waste generated was diverted from the landfill by recycling or reuse.

Construction waste would likely be disposed of at the Mid Valley Landfill in the City of Rialto, which is permitted to accept commercial waste. It is permitted for 7,500 tons per day (TPD) maximum with 67,520,000 cubic yards remaining. The landfill has enough projected capacity to serve residents and businesses until approximately 2053 (CalRecycle 2019). However, other landfills in San Bernardino County and neighboring counties would also be available to accept solid waste from the project site.

Due to the relatively small size of the proposed demolition and construction, the Proposed Project would not substantially contribute solid waste in amounts in excess of the capacity of local landfills. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not interfere with implementation of existing solid waste disposal regulations. A less than significant impact would occur.

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Waste generated by the Proposed Project would comply with solid waste statues and regulations. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with all Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Regulations, including Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), as well as City of Rancho Cucamonga waste reduction programs. Additionally, the Project would comply with City requirements for receptacles, solid waste collection, and provisions regarding service rates, fees, and charges. The implementation of these programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated be the Proposed Project and diverted to landfills. No impact to waste management and reduction statutes would occur.

4.19.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.20 Wildfire

4.20.1 Environmental Setting

Government Code 51175-89 directs the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) to identify areas of very high fire hazard severity zones within Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). Mapping of the areas, referred to as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ), is based on data and models of potential fuels over a 30 to 50-year time horizon and their associated expected fire behavior, and expected burn probabilities to quantify the likelihood and nature of vegetation fire exposure to buildings. According to the CAL FIRE Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, the project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2008).

4.20.2 Wildfire (XX) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐

According to the CAL FIRE Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, the project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2008). However, the Proposed Project would not substantially impair any adopted emergency response plans. The City produced a Ready RC Guide which provides essential tips on what to do before, during and after a disaster. The guide focuses primarily on fire, flood, earthquake, and wind disasters. This comprehensive booklet includes emergency kit checklists, evacuation route maps, shelter information and more (City of Rancho Cucamonga 2017).

Banyan Street is designated as an emergency access route by the Ready RC Guide. Emergency access to the site would be available via one entrance on East Avenue and a second proposed entrance on Banyan Street, thereby facilitating emergency response and evacuation, if necessary. However, construction and temporary lane closure along Banyan would be required to construct the park entrance. With implementation of **Mitigation Measure HAZ-1**, impacts to emergency response and evacuation plans would be less than significant.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located on relatively flat a terrain. Emergency access to the site would be available via one existing entrance on East Avenue and one proposed entrance on Banyan Street. In addition, the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the slope, wind patterns, or other factors that could exacerbate wildfire risks. The project site would serve an existing recreational use and would not build habitable structures onsite. Thus, the Project would not expose park visitors to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area and would require utility connections to serve the proposed recreational use, however such connections would not exacerbate fire risk. The Proposed Project would construct supporting infrastructure to serve the expanded recreational and community facilities. A second park entrance, accessible at the intersection of Banyan Street and Golden Lock Place, would be provided and an entry monument sign would be installed. This second entrance would lead to a new parking lot with approximately 74 spaces.

Other supporting infrastructure would include a new trash enclosure and a service yard to store park maintenance equipment and materials. The service yard would be fully enclosed and accessible only to the City's Public Works staff and contractors. The existing maintenance road located at the center of the park would be extended to the east to the proposed service yard. The existing maintenance yard located just north of the existing park entrance would remain in place. However, during final project design it may be fully relocated to the proposed maintenance yard at the northeast corner of the park.

Overall, these improvements are typical of a park expansion project and would not exacerbate fire risk or impacts to the environment. As such, impacts to this threshold would be less than significant.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is relatively flat and is not likely to cause downstream flooding or landslides. Additionally, no habitable structures are proposed onsite. The Project would not substantially alter the drainage patterns of the site, and thus would not expose people or structures to significant risks from runoff or post-fire instability. A less than significant impact would occur.

4.20.3 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

4.21.1 Mandatory Findings of Significance (XXI) Environmental Checklist and Discussion

Does the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils (paleontological resources), and tribal cultural resources are discussed in the respective sections of this Initial Study. Impacts would be less than significant with **Mitigation Measures BIO-1** through **BIO-3**, **CUL-1** through **CUL-4**, **GEO-1,** and **TCR-1** through **TCR-2**.

Does the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Impacts from the Proposed Project on transportation, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise are discussed in corresponding sections of this Initial Study. As discussed in their respective sections of this Initial Study document, no significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas, or traffic have been identified. Cumulative impacts associated with noise would be less than significant with implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** and **NOI-2.** Consequently, Project impacts when considered with identified cumulative projects would not be cumulatively considerable.

Does the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Direct and indirect impacts to human beings would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures listed in this Initial Study.

SECTION 5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

5.1 City of Rancho Cucamonga

Lead Agency

Tabe van der Zwaag, Associate Planner

Jeff Benson, Management Analyst II

5.2 ECORP Consulting, Inc.

CEQA Documentation/Air Quality/Cultural Resources/Greenhouse Gas/Energy/Noise

Alfredo Aguirre, Project Manager

Wendy Blumel, RPA, Senior Archaeologist

Robert Cunningham, Staff Archaeologist

Lindsay Liegler, Associate Environmental Planner

Paige Liss, Assistant Archaeologist

Seth Myers, Senior Air Quality/GHG/Noise Analyst

Freddie Olmos, QA/QC

Rosemary Worden, Assistant Environmental Planner

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 6.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

[CAL FIRE]

2008 Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA. Available at https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5948/rancho_cucamonga.pdf. Accessed October 1, 2019.

[CalRecycle]

2019 SWIS Facility Detail Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill. Available at https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail. Accessed October 11, 2019.

[Caltrans] California Department of Transportation

2019 List of eligible and officially designated State Scenic Highways. Available at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways. Accessed on September 30, 2019.

CAPCOA

2017 California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2016.3.2.

2013 *Health Effects*. http://www.capcoa.org/health-effects/.

CARB

2019a Air Quality Data Statistics. http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/index.html.

2019b *California Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory 2019 Edition*. https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm.

2018 State and Federal Area Designation Maps. http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

2017 California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.

2008 *Climate Change Scoping Plan Appendices* (Appendix F).

2005 *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*.

[CDC] California Department of Conservation

2017 San Bernardino Important Farmland 2016: Sheet 2 of 2. Published August 2017. Available at https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/SanBernardino.aspx/. Accessed September 30, 2019.

City of Rancho Cucamonga

2010a City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan. Available at https://www.dropbox.com/sh/jq8ppqh277lswqq/AABgaDSgPfG8T9CC5_V3Ybbla/General%20Plan?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1. Accessed October 17, 2019.

2010b City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan EIR. Available at https://www.dropbox.com/sh/jq8ppqh277lswqq/AABgaDSgPfG8T9CC5_V3Ybbla/General%20Plan?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1. Accessed October 17, 2019.

2017 Ready RC: Before, During and After a Disaster in Rancho Cucamonga. Available at https://www.cityofrc.us/sites/default/files/2019-08/ReadyRCRevisedMarch2017.pdf. Accessed October 11, 2019.

2019a Police Department. Available at https://www.cityofrc.us/public-safety/police. Accessed October 1, 2019.

2019b Fire District. Available at https://www.cityofrc.us/public-safety/fire. Accessed October 1, 2019.

[CGS] California Geological Survey

2007 Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Claremont-Upland Production-Consumption (P-C) Region, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, California. Published 2007. Available at ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_202/. Accessed October 11, 2019.

[CVWD] Cucamonga Valley Water District

2016 Cucamonga Valley Water District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Published June 2016. Available at https://www.cvwdwater.com/DocumentCenter/View/1955/2015-Urban-Water-Management-Plan---CVWD?bidId=. Accessed October 11, 2019.

2018 2018 Water Quality Report. Available at https://www.cvwdwater.com/DocumentCenter/View/3415/2018-Water-Quality-Report. Accessed October 11, 2019.

[DTSC] Department of Toxic Substances Control

2020 Hazardous Waste and Substances List (Cortese List). Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/. Accessed June 10, 2020.

[ECORP] ECORP Consulting, Inc.

2020a Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Assessment Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project. June 2020.

2020b Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation Report Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion. April 2020.

2020c Noise Impact Assessment Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project. June 2020.

[FEMA] Federal Emergency Management Agency

2020 FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address. Available at https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=etiwanda%20creek%20park#searchresultsanchor. Accessed June 12, 2020.

[GLA] Glenn Lukos Associates

2017a General Biological Report for the Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project Located in Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County, California.

2017b San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat Trapping Results for the Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project, Rancho Cucamonga, California.

2019 Results of 2018 Focused Plant Surveys Performed for the Etiwanda Creek Park Expansion Project, City of Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County, California.

[IPCC] International Panel on Climate Change

2014 *Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report: Approved Summary for Policymakers*. http://www.ipcc.ch/.

2013 *Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. http://www.climatechange2013.org/ images/report/WG1AR5_ALL_FINAL.pdf.

[KOA] KOA Corporation

2020 Traffic Study- Memorandum of Understanding.

[NHMLAC] Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County

2020 Paleontological resources for the proposed Etiwanda Creek Expansion Project, ECORP Project # 2019-140.001, in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County, project area. January 23, 2020.

[NRCS] Natural Resources Conservation Service

2019 "Web Soil Survey" from http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov. Accessed October 1, 2019.

[OPR] California Governor's Office of Planning and Research

2018 Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. Available at https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf. Accessed June 12, 2020.

San Bernardino County

2007 San Bernardino County General Plan. Available at http://countywideplan.com/. Accessed October 4, 2019.

[SCAG] Southern California Association of Governments

2016 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Adopted April 2016. http://scagrtpscs.net/Pages/FINAL2016RTPSCS.aspx.

2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan. http://www.scag.ca.gov/NewsAndMedia/Pages/RegionalComprehensivePlan.aspx.

[SCAQMD] South Coast Air Quality Management District

2009 *Localized Significance Threshold Appendix C – Mass Rate LST Look-Up Tables*. Revised October 21, 2009. http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html.

2008 *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (dated June 2003 [revised 2008]).

1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook.

1992 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide.

[SWRCB] State Water Resources Control Board

2020 GeoTracker database. Available at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/. Accessed on June 10, 2020.

[USEPA] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

2020 EnviroMapper database. Available at https://www.epa.gov/emefdata/em4ef.home. Accessed on June 11, 2020.

2018 *Status of SIP Required Elements for California Designated Areas*.

2018b *Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants*.

2016a *Climate Change – Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Carbon Dioxide*. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/co2.html.

2016b *Methane*. https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/ch4.html.

2016c *Nitrous Oxide*. https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/n2o.html.

2002 Health Assessment Document for Diesel Engine Exhaust. https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=300055PV.TXT.

SECTION 7.0 LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A – Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment

Appendix B – General Biological Report

Appendix C – San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat Trapping Report

Appendix D – Focused Plant Survey Report

Appendix E – Cultural Resources Assessment

Appendix F – Energy Consumption Analysis

Appendix G – Noise Impact Assessment

APPENDIX A

Appendix A – Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment

APPENDIX B

General Biological Report

APPENDIX C

San Bernardino Kangaroo Rat Trapping Report

APPENDIX D

Focused Plant Survey Report

APPENDIX E

Cultural Resources Assessment

APPENDIX F

Energy Consumption Analysis

APPENDIX G

Noise Impact Assessment