

RESOLUTION NO. 2025-XX

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RIALTO, CALIFORNIA CERTIFYING THE FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SCH. 2024070224, AS RELATED TO A PROPOSED PROJECT CONSISTING OF A SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO (2) INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE BUILDINGS TOTALING 428,715 SQUARE FEET ON APPROXIMATELY 20.8 ACRES OF LAND (APN'S: 0264-211-15 & -20; 0264-212-44, -46, & -54; PORTIONS OF 0264-212-17 & -45); ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT RELATED THERETO, AS REQUIRED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081(a) AND CEQA GUIDELINES, SECTION 15091; APPROVE A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM RELATED THERETO, AS REQUIRED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081.6 AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15097; AND ADOPT THE STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS RELATED THERETO, AS REQUIRED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21081(b) AND CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15093.

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2024, the City Council/Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Rialto approved a Purchase and Sale Agreement, in cooperation with Lewis-Hillwood Rialto Company LLC, to facilitate the sale of five (5) parcels of land (APN's: 0264-211-15 & -20; 0264-212-44, -46, & -54) and portions of two (2) parcels of land (APN's 0264-212-17 & -45) to Newland Real Estate Equities LLC; and

WHEREAS, the land to be sold to Newland Real Estate Equities LLC encompasses the entirety of Planning Area 126 and Planning Area 133 of the Renaissance Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, as part of the Purchase and Sale Agreement, the City of Rialto and Lewis-Hillwood Rialto Company LLC (collectively “Applicant”) agreed to complete the following prior to finalizing the land sale transaction:

- An Amendment to the Renaissance Specific Plan to reconfigure Miro Way to extend from Linden Avenue to Ayala Drive, change the land use designation of Planning Area 123 to General Commercial with a Residential Overlay, and change the land use

1 designations of Planning Area 126 and Planning Area 133 to Business Center, thereby
2 eliminating the previous Public Park and School land use designations; and

3 • An Amendment to the Development Agreement between the City of Rialto and
4 Lewis-Hillwood Rialto Company LLC to eliminate provisions related to the
5 construction of a public park on Planning Area 126 and Planning Area 133; and
6 • Preparation of all necessary California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”)
7 approvals related to the Specific Plan Amendment and DA Amendment; and

8 **WHEREAS**, the applicant has submitted Specific Plan Amendment No. 2024-0005 (“SPA
9 No. 2024-0005”) to amend the Renaissance Specific Plan (“SPA Project”) as follows:

10 • Change the land use designation of Planning Area 123 from School to General
11 Commercial with a Residential Overlay with a maximum development potential of
12 112,167 square feet of commercial uses, 164 dwelling units, or a combination
13 thereof; and

14 • Change the land use designation of Planning Area 126 from Public Park to Business
15 Center with a maximum development potential of 378,972 square feet of industrial
16 uses; and

17 • Change the land use designation of Planning Area 133 from Employment with a
18 Public Park Overlay to Business Center with a maximum development potential of
19 74,052 square feet of industrial uses; and

20 • Reconfigure Miro Way to extend from Linden Avenue on the west to Ayala Drive
21 on the east; and

22 • Various textual and graphical amendments related to the changes listed above; and

23 **WHEREAS**, the site for the SPA Project consists of approximately 33 acres of land (APN's:
24 0264-211-15 & -20; 0264-212-12, -17, -30, -44, -45, -46, & -54; Portions of APN's: 0264-212-05 &
25 -06 located between Linden Avenue and Ayala Drive approximately 415 feet north of Baseline Road
26 (“Site”); and

1 **WHEREAS**, in conjunction with the SPA Project, a First Amendment to the Development
2 Agreement between the City of Rialto and Lewis-Hillwood Rialto Company LLC has been prepared
3 to remove provisions related to the public park eliminated by the Project (“DA Amendment”); and

4 **WHEREAS**, the City of Rialto (“City”) has undertaken review under the California
5 Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Public Resources Code Sections 21000, *et seq.* and
6 California Code of Regulations (“CEQA Guidelines”) Title 14, Sections 15000, *et seq.*; and

7 **WHEREAS**, the Applicant retained Kimley-Horn & Associates, Inc., an environmental
8 consulting firm, to prepare a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (“SEIR”) for the SPA
9 Project; and

10 **WHEREAS**, in addition to the analyzing the Project, the SEIR would also analyze the
11 future development of two (2) industrial warehouse buildings totaling 428,715 square feet in size
12 (53,640 square feet on Planning Area 133 and 375,075 square feet on Planning Area 126) (“Future
13 Development”); and

14 **WHEREAS**, on July 8, 2024, the City distributed a Notice of Preparation for Draft
15 Environmental Impact Report SCH. 2024070224, for the SPA Project and the Future
16 Development, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15082 and Public Resources Code Section
17 21080.4, providing a 30-day period during which responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and
18 members of the general public could provide comments to the City regarding the scope of the
19 proposed SEIR; and

20 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to the authority and criteria contained in CEQA and the City of
21 Rialto environmental guidelines, the City, as the Lead Agency, analyzed the SPA Project and the
22 Future Development and prepared a Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (“DSEIR”),
23 and determined that the proposed SPA Project and the Future Development would have significant
24 impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions from operations; and

25 **WHEREAS**, consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15085, upon
26 completing the DSEIR dated March 2025, the City filed a Notice of Completion on March 21,
27 2025 with the Office of Planning and Research; and

1 **WHEREAS**, on March 21, 2025 consistent with the requirements of the Public Resources
2 Code Section 21092 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15087, the City published a Notice of
3 Availability of the DSEIR in the San Bernardino Sun newspaper, and, on March 21, 2025, posted
4 the Notice of Availability at City Hall and mailed a Notice of Availability to all responsible and
5 trustee agencies, all organizations and individuals who had requested notice, and all property
6 owners located within a 1,000 foot radius of the Site; and

7 **WHEREAS**, the Notice of Availability and Notice of Completion noticed all agencies,
8 organizations, and the public that they had 45 days to provide comments on the contents of the
9 DSEIR, which was available in hard copy for in-person review at City Hall – the Community
10 Development Building - and available for download on the City of Rialto website, throughout the
11 comment period; and

12 **WHEREAS**, at the conclusion of the 45-day public review and comment period related to
13 the DSEIR, the City directed the preparation of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report
14 dated August 2025 (“FSEIR”) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088, 15089 and 15132,
15 which included the DSEIR, responses to public comments on the DSEIR, and a Mitigation
16 Monitoring and Reporting Program; and

17 **WHEREAS**, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the FSEIR is required to be
18 completed in compliance with CEQA, and pursuant to Section 21092.5 of CEQA, on October 14,
19 2024, the City sent via mail the FSEIR, including written responses to comments, to all agencies,
20 organizations, and persons that commented on the DSEIR; and

21 **WHEREAS**, on October 16, 2025, the City published a Notice of Public Hearing that the
22 Planning Commission would consider certification of the FSEIR and approval of the SPA Project
23 and DA Amendment at its November 5, 2025 meeting in the San Bernardino Sun newspaper,
24 posted the notice at City Hall, and mailed said notice to all property owners within a 1,000 foot
25 radius of the Site as well as all to all organizations and individuals who had requested notice; and

26 **WHEREAS**, on November 5, 2025, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing,
27 and considered the record of proceedings for the FSEIR, which includes, but is not limited to, the
28 following:

1 (1) The Notice of Preparation for the SPA Project and the Future Development (the
2 “NOP”), and all other public notices issued by the City in connection with the Project;
3 (2) The FSEIR dated August 2025;
4 (3) All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during any
5 public review comment period on the DSEIR;
6 (4) All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for
7 the SPA Project and DA Amendment at which such testimony was taken, including
8 without limitation, the Staff Report to the Planning Commission, including all
9 attachments, any and all presentations by City staff, the City’s consultants, the
10 Applicant and the Applicant’s consultants, the public, and any other interested party;
11 (5) The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project (the “MMRP”);
12 (6) The reports, studies and technical memoranda included and/or referenced in the DSEIR
13 and the FSEIR and or their appendices;
14 (7) All documents, studies, or other materials incorporated by reference in the DSEIR and
15 the FSEIR;
16 (8) All Ordinances and Resolutions presented to and/or to be adopted by the City in
17 connection with the SPA Project and DA Amendment; and all documents incorporated
18 by reference therein, specifically including, but not limited to, this Resolution and its
19 exhibit;
20 (9) Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited, to federal, state,
21 and local laws and regulations, adopted City plans, policies (including but not limited
22 to the 2010 Rialto General Plan and the Renaissance Specific Plan), and the
23 professional qualifications of City staff members and consultants;
24 (10) Any documents expressly cited in this Resolution and its exhibit, the Staff Report to
25 the Planning Commission, the FSEIR which includes the DSEIR; and
26 (11) Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings under Section
27 21167.6(e) of the Public Resources Code; and
28

1 **WHEREAS**, on November 5, 2025, following the public hearing, the Planning
2 Commission considered and discussed the adequacy of the proposed FSEIR as an informational
3 document and applied their own independent judgement and analysis to review said FSEIR, and
4 desired to take action to recommend that the City Council certify the FSEIR, as having been
5 completed in compliance with CEQA, based on the findings found herein; and

6 **WHEREAS**, on November 5, 2025, following the public hearing, the Planning
7 Commission also considered and decided whether to recommend approval or rejection of the SPA
8 Project and DA Amendment to the City Council at that time; and

9 **WHEREAS**, on November 5, 2025, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 (2 absences) to
10 recommend approval of the FSEIR and the SPA Project and DA Amendment to the City Council;
11 and

12 **WHEREAS**, on January 13, 2026, the City Council conducted a public hearing, and
13 considered the record of proceedings for the FSEIR, which includes, but is not limited to, the
14 following:

- 15 (1) The Notice of Preparation for the SPA Project and the Future Development (the
16 “NOP”), and all other public notices issued by the City in connection with the Project;
- 17 (2) The FSEIR dated August 2025;
- 18 (3) All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during any
19 public review comment period on the DSEIR;
- 20 (4) All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for
21 the SPA Project and DA Amendment at which such testimony was taken, including
22 without limitation, the Staff Report to the City Council, including all attachments, any
23 and all presentations by City staff, the City’s consultants, the Applicant and the
24 Applicant’s consultants, the public, and any other interested party;
- 25 (5) The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project (the “MMRP”);
- 26 (6) The reports, studies and technical memoranda included and/or referenced in the DSEIR
27 and the FSEIR and or their appendices;

1 (7) All documents, studies, or other materials incorporated by reference in the DSEIR and
2 the FSEIR;

3 (8) All Ordinances and Resolutions presented to and/or to be adopted by the City in
4 connection with the SPA Project and DA Amendment; and all documents incorporated
5 by reference therein, specifically including, but not limited to, this Resolution and its
6 exhibit;

7 (9) Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited, to federal, state,
8 and local laws and regulations, adopted City plans, policies (including but not limited
9 to the 2010 Rialto General Plan and the Renaissance Specific Plan), and the
10 professional qualifications of City staff members and consultants;

11 (10) Any documents expressly cited in this Resolution and its exhibit, the Staff Report to
12 the City Council, the FSEIR which includes the DSEIR; and

13 (11) Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings under Section
14 21167.6(e) of the Public Resources Code; and

15 **WHEREAS**, the City has not pre-committed to approving the SPA Project, DA
16 Amendment, or the FSEIR, and will not commit to any approval related to the SPA Project until
17 the Planning Commission and City Council consider and certify the FSEIR for the SPA Project
18 based upon all evidence presented; and

19 **WHEREAS**, on January 13, 2026, following the public hearing, the City Council
20 considered and discussed the adequacy of the proposed FSEIR as an informational document and
21 applied their own independent judgment and analysis to review said FSEIR, and hereby desire to
22 take action to certify the FSEIR, as having been completed in compliance with CEQA, based on
23 the findings found herein; and

24 **WHEREAS**, at its November 5, 2025 meeting, following the public hearing, the City
25 Council also considered and decided whether to approve or reject the SPA Project and DA
26 Amendment at this time; and

27 **WHEREAS**, CEQA requires in Public Resources Section 21081 the following:
28

1 “Section 21081. Findings necessary for approval of project. Pursuant to the policy stated
2 in Sections 21002 and 21002.1, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for
3 which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more
4 significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried
5 out unless both of the following occur:

6 (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each
7 significant effect:

8 (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project
9 which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.

10 (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of
11 another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other
12 agency.

13 (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations,
14 including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly
15 trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified
16 in the environmental impact report.

17 (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3)
18 of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social,
19 technological, or other benefits of the Project outweigh the significant effects on the
20 environment.”

21 **WHEREAS**, all legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

22 **NOW, THEREFORE**, the City Council hereby finds, determines, and resolves as follows:

23 **SECTION 1: RECITALS.** The City Council hereby specifically finds all of the facts set
24 forth in the recitals above this Resolution are true, correct, and incorporated herein.

25 **SECTION 2: FINDINGS.** The FSEIR available at the Community Development
26 Department office and provided concurrently with this Resolution, includes the DSEIR SCH No.
27 2024070224 dated March 2025 and all related appendices, the Response to Comments, and all
28 related appendices and attachments to the FSEIR. The City Council finds, based upon the

1 substantial evidence in the record of proceedings and the whole record before it, in the exercise of
2 its independent judgment and analysis, that the FSEIR is, procedurally and substantively, in
3 compliance with the requirements of CEQA:

4 a. *Procedural Compliance*: The FSEIR was prepared in procedural
5 compliance with the requirements of CEQA:

6 1. Notice of Preparation. As described in the Recitals hereto, a Notice
7 of Preparation was prepared in accordance with Section 15082 of
8 CEQA.

9 2. Public Review. As described in the Recitals hereto, the City held
10 multiple public review periods pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

11 3. Notice of Completion. As described in the Recitals hereto, the City
12 has complied with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15085, 15086,
13 15087, and 15105 by providing a Notice of Completion of the DEIR
14 to the State Clearinghouse and a Notice of Availability to
15 responsible and trustee agencies and other persons and agencies as
16 required.

17 4. Written Comments. As described in the Recitals hereto, the City
18 has evaluated and responded to all written comments received
19 during the public review period and included both comments and
20 responses as part of the FSEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines
21 Section 15088.

22 b. *Findings Regarding Significant Effects that Can be Mitigated to Less
23 Than Significant*. The FSEIR identifies potentially significant effects on
24 the environment that could result if the SPA Project or Future
25 Development were adopted without changes or alterations to the SPA
26 Project or Future Development and imposition of mitigation measures and
27 further finds that changes, alterations, and mitigation measures have been
28 or will be incorporated into, or imposed as conditions of approval on, the

1 SPA Project and the Future Development. The City Council adopts the
2 statements and findings in Exhibit A (Section 5.0, titled “Findings
3 Regarding Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts which can be
4 Mitigated to a Level of Less than Significant”) to this Resolution, which
5 is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. These
6 avoidable significant effects are identified in Exhibit A (Section 5.0) and
7 include potentially significant impacts to air quality, biological resources,
8 cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and tribal
9 cultural resources. However, mitigation measures can be implemented to
10 reduce these impacts to a level that is less than significant; changes have
11 been required in, or incorporated into, the SPA Project and Future
12 Development through the imposition of mitigation measures as described
13 in Exhibit A (Section 5.0). These mitigation measures identified in
14 Exhibit B will be imposed pursuant to the MMRP found in Section 4.0
15 (“Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program”) of the FSEIR. These
16 changes, alterations, and mitigation measures are fully enforceable
17 because they have either resulted in an actual change to the SPA Project
18 and Future Development as proposed or they will be imposed as
19 conditions of approval on the SPA Project and Future Development.

20 c. *Findings Regarding Unavoidable Significant Impacts.* The City Council
21 adopts the statements and findings in Exhibit A (Section 6.0, titled
22 “Findings Regarding Significant and Unavoidable Environmental
23 Impacts which cannot be Mitigated to a Level of Less than Significant”) to
24 this Resolution, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by
25 this reference. The SPA Project and the Future Development have
26 significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level
27 through the imposition of mitigation measures. These significant effects
28 are identified in Exhibit A (Section 6.0). Specific economic, legal, social,

1 technological, or other considerations are found to make the Proposed
2 SPA Project and Future Development acceptable notwithstanding that
3 even with the required mitigation measures, and consideration of project
4 alternatives identified in the FSEIR for the significant impacts identified
5 in Exhibit A (Section 8.0, titled “Findings Regarding Project
6 Alternatives”) all impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant levels,
7 including those based upon the findings in Exhibit A (Section 6.0) to this
8 resolution, and the findings in Exhibit A (Section 8.0) regarding the
9 proposed alternatives. Therefore, those impacts are found to be
10 significant and unavoidable.

11 d. *Findings Regarding Less than Significant Impacts.* In the course of the
12 DSEIR evaluation, certain environmental impacts of the SPA Project and
13 the Future Development were found not to be significant. Any and all
14 potential significant impacts discussed in the FSEIR that are not subject
15 to paragraph 2(b) or 2(c), above, as either an avoidable significant impact,
16 or as an unavoidable significant impact, are insignificant impacts to the
17 environment. There exists no fair argument that the environmental
18 conditions that were found not to be significant in the DSEIR will pose a
19 significant environmental impact, due to the inability of a project of this
20 scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics
21 producing significant effects of this nature.

22 **SECTION 3: FEIR REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED.** The City Council has reviewed
23 and considered the information contained in the FSEIR and finds that the FSEIR has been
24 completed in compliance with CEQA.

25 **SECTION 4: ALTERNATIVES.** The FSEIR identified potential environmental impacts
26 of separate project alternatives compared to impacts from the proposed SPA Project and Future
27 Development. These alternatives were selected based upon their ability to avoid or substantially
28 lessen the significant effects of the proposed SPA Project and Future Development, while still

1 achieving the primary SPA Project and Future Development objectives. Most alternatives are
2 hereby found infeasible due to lack of alternative site availability, failure to meet basic SPA Project
3 and Future Development objectives, or the fact that some alternatives would still have the same
4 types of significant and unavoidable impacts as the SPA Project and the Future Development. The
5 City Council hereby adopts the Statement of Findings on rejection of Project Alternatives in
6 Exhibit A (Section 8.0, titled “Findings Regarding Project Alternatives”) to this Resolution, which
7 is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

8 **SECTION 5: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS.** The City
9 Council finds, pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, that the
10 specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the SPA Project and Future
11 Development outweigh the SPA Project's and Future Development's unavoidable adverse
12 environmental impacts, and therefore, the impacts are acceptable. The City Council hereby adopts
13 the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Exhibit A (Section 11.0, titled “Statement of
14 Overriding Considerations”) to this Resolution, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein
15 by this reference. The City Council finds that each of the Significant and Unavoidable Impacts
16 identified in Exhibit A (Section 6.0) may be considered acceptable for the reasons cited.

17 **SECTION 6: MITIGATION MONITORING.** The City as lead agency adopts the
18 MMRP for the changes made to the SPA Project and Future Development that it has adopted in
19 order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. Pursuant to Public Resources
20 Code Section 21081.6, the MMRP set forth as Section 4.0 of the FSEIR to this Resolution, which
21 is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this reference, is hereby adopted to
22 ensure that all mitigation measures adopted for the SPA Project and Future Development are fully
23 implemented. The City Council hereby adopts the MMRP to ensure compliance with mitigation
24 measures during SPA Project and Future Development implementation. As required by Public
25 Resources Code Section 21081.6, the MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for
26 the implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in the FEIR. The MMRP will remain
27 available for public review during the compliance period.

SECTION 7: CERTIFICATION. Based on the above facts and findings, the City Council hereby certifies the FSEIR for the SPA Project and Future Development as accurate and adequate. The City Council further certifies that the FSEIR was completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION 8: The Mayor shall sign the passage and adoption of this resolution and thereupon the same shall take effect and be in force.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 13th day of January, 2026.

JOE BACA, MAYOR

1 ATTEST:

5 BARBARA MCGEE, CITY CLERK

7 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

11 ERIC S. VAIL, CITY ATTORNEY

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO) ss
3 CITY OF RIALTO)
4

5 I, BARBARA MCGEE, City Clerk of the City of Rialto, do hereby certify that the foregoing
6 Resolution No. _____ was duly passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council
7 of the City of Rialto held on the _____ day of _____, 2026.

8 Upon motion of Councilmember _____, seconded by Councilmember
9 _____, the foregoing Resolution No. _____ was duly passed and adopted.

10 Vote on the motion:

11 AYES:

12 NOES:

13 ABSENT:

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the Official Seal of the City of
15 Rialto this _____ day of _____, 2026.

16
17
18
19
20 BARBARA MCGEE, CITY CLERK
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 EXHIBIT A

2 FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
3 CONSIDERATIONS PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL
4 QUALITY ACT FOR THE FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
5 FOR THE MIRO WAY AND AYALA DRIVE PROJECT
6 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2024070224

7
8 [See Following Pages]
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1

2

3 **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

4

5 **1.1 FINDINGS OF FACT**

6

7 The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the environmental impacts of a project be
8 examined and disclosed prior to approval of a project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), No
9 public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one
10 or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more
11 written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale
12 for each finding. The possible findings are:

13 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or
14 substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR [referred to
15 in these Findings as "Finding 1"].

16 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency
17 and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency
18 or can and should be adopted by such other agency [referred to in these Findings as "Finding 2"].

19 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of
20 employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures
21 or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR [referred to in these Findings as "Finding 3"].

22 Having received, reviewed and considered the Miro Way and Ayala Drive Project (Project), State
23 Clearinghouse (SCH) # 2024070224; as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this
24 matter, the following Findings regarding the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the
Project are hereby adopted by the City of Rialto (City).

25 **1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT**

26 These Findings have been categorized into the following sections:

27 1) Section 1.0 provides an introduction to these Findings.

28 2) Section 2.0 provides a summary of the Project, an overview of other discretionary actions
required for the Project, and a statement of Project objectives.

1) Section 3.0 provides a summary of those activities that have preceded the consideration of the
Findings for the Project as part of the environmental review process, and a summary of public
participation in the environmental review for the Project.

2) Section 4.0 sets forth findings regarding those potentially significant environmental impacts
identified in the SEIR which the City has determined would be less than significant or no
impacts would occur.

3) Section 5.0 sets forth findings regarding those significant or potentially significant
environmental impacts identified in the SEIR which the City has determined can feasibly be
mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures included
in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project.

4) Section 6.0 sets forth findings for significant and unavoidable project impacts.

1
2
3) Section 7.0 sets forth findings regarding growth-inducing impacts.
4) Section 8.0 sets forth findings regarding alternatives to the Project.
5) Section 9.0 contains findings regarding the MMRP for the Project.
6) Section 10.0 contains other relevant findings adopted by the City with respect to the Project.
7) Section 11.0 contains the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project.
8) Section 12.0 contains information pertaining to the certification of the SEIR.

9 The Findings set forth in each section herein are supported by findings and facts identified in the
10 administrative record of the Project.

11 **1.3 CUSTODIAN AND LOCATION OF RECORDS**

12 The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the City's actions
13 regarding the Project including the SEIR are located at the City of Rialto Community Development
14 Department, 150 S Palm Ave, Rialto, CA 92376. The City is the custodian of the administrative record for
15 the Project.

1

2

3 **2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY**

4

5 **2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION/LOCATION**

6

7 The proposed project site (Accessor Parcel Numbers [APN] 0264-211-15 and -20; 0264-212-12, -17; -30; -
8 44; -45; -46; -54; and portions of 0264-212-05 and -06) is located within the southern region of the
9 Renaissance Specific Plan (RSP) planning area. The RSP planning area is located within the City of Rialto,
10 California. The City of Rialto is located in western San Bernardino County, approximately 60 miles east of
11 Los Angeles and 100 miles north of San Diego. The proposed Project is an amendment to the approved
12 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment (RSPA) and the proposed project site is located within the
13 previously approved RSP planning area.

14 The project site is located within the western/central portion of the City, approximately 0.65 miles south
15 of State Route (SR) 210. Specifically, the project site is located directly west of Ayala Drive, approximately
16 450 feet north of Baseline Road, and east of Linden Avenue within the 2016 RSPA area.

17 The Project would allow for the development of two industrial warehouse buildings ranging from
18 approximately 53,640 square feet (sf) to 375,075 sf, for a total of approximately 399,715 sf of warehouse
19 space and 29,000 sf of ancillary office space on approximately 20.76 acres. The warehouse development
20 is comprised of Planning Areas 126 and 133.

21 The Project would require a Specific Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designations of
22 Planning Areas 126 and 133 to Business Center, and Planning Area 123 to General Commercial with a
23 Residential overlay.

24 **2.2 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS**

25 The City is the Lead Agency under CEQA and is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of
26 the SEIR for the Project. It is expected that the City, at a minimum, would consider the data and analyses
27 contained in the SEIR when making their permit determinations. Prior to development of the Project,
28 discretionary permits and approvals must be obtained from local, state and federal agencies, as listed
below.

18 **City of Rialto**

19

- 20 ▪ Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment: the Project proposes to change the existing land use
21 designations of Planning Areas 126 and 133 to Business Center, and Planning Area 123 to
22 General Commercial with a Residential overlay.
- 23 ▪ Tentative Parcel Map
- 24 ▪ Conditional Development Permit
- 25 ▪ Amended Development Agreement
- 26 ▪ Precise Plan of Design

1

2

3 **Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)**

4

5

- National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Construction General Permit

6

7

8 **2.3 STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

9

10

11 The following objectives have been established for the Project by the City and Project applicant:

12

- To implement the approved Renaissance Specific Plan as amended;
- To facilitate the redevelopment of the former Rialto Municipal Airport;
- To implement and facilitate the rezone of Planning Area 123;
- To implement and facilitate the development of the Planning Area 126 and 133 industrial/warehouse development;
- To facilitate development through efficient land use planning and phased infrastructure design;
- To create a range of job and economic development opportunities for local individuals and businesses; and
- To continue to develop a master planned community that has a unique character and quality with a commitment to sustainability, flexible planning, high quality architecture and site design, and the provision of attractive on-site open space, public spaces, recreational facilities, and landscape design.

1

2

3 **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

4

5

6

7

8

9

The City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed Project on July 8, 2024 to affected agencies, interested parties, and the public. A scoping meeting was held on August 1, 2024 at 6:00 PM at the Rialto City Hall, Council Chambers. The scoping period occurred from July 8, 2024 to August 7, 2024. The City published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft Subsequent EIR (Draft SEIR) on March 21, 2025, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was also mailed to various agencies, organizations, and individuals that had previously requested such notice. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2024070224) pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The State-mandated public review of the Draft SEIR began on March 21, 2025 and concluded May 5, 2025 (45 days). The SEIR includes a Response to Comments section, which presents all written comments received during the public review period of the Draft SEIR and includes responses to these comments and associated changes made to the Draft SEIR.

The SEIR includes the Draft SEIR, the Final SEIR, all exhibits and appendices thereto, the list of persons, organizations and public agencies which commented on the Draft SEIR, the comments which were received by the City regarding the Draft SEIR, and the City's written responses to comments raised in the public review and comment process, all of which are incorporated herein and made a part hereof by reference (collectively, the SEIR). Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15084, the SEIR has been reviewed and analyzed by the City of Rialto as the lead agency with respect to the Project and the SEIR. The following findings for the Project and each fact in support of a finding are thus based upon substantial evidence in the record.

1

2

3 **4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

4 **DETERMINED TO HAVE NO IMPACTS OR BE LESS THAN**

5 **SIGNIFICANT**

6 The City finds, based upon the analysis presented in the SEIR, that the following environmental effects of
7 the Project either have no impact or are less than significant, and, therefore, no mitigation measures are
8 required. The City hereby finds that existing regulatory requirements, policies, and/or Project conditions
9 have been identified and incorporated into the Project which avoids or substantially lessens the
10 potentially significant effect on the environment to a less than significant level.

11 **4.1 AESTHETICS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.1)**

12 **IMPACT 4.1-1 (SCENIC VISTAS)**

13 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

14 The project site is located within an area designated by the General Plan as a Specific Plan area,
15 encompassing Planning Areas 123, 126, and 133 under the 2016 RSPA. Planning Area 123 is zoned for
16 School use, Planning Area 126 for Public Park use, and Planning Area 133 for Employment with a Park
17 overlay. Surrounding land uses include commercial development, residential neighborhoods, parkland,
18 and industrial uses. The site is not within an area designated by the City as a scenic vista. Although
19 development of the Project may partially obstruct distant views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino
20 Mountains to the north and the La Loma Hills, Jurupa Hills, and Box Spring Mountains to the south, such
21 views are already partially obstructed by intervening development including existing urban structures,
22 walls, landscaping, and utility lines. The Project design includes setbacks greater than the required
23 minimum and building heights below the 75-foot maximum allowed under the RSPA, thereby reducing
24 potential impacts to visual resources. Existing views from properties adjacent to the project site are
25 already limited and interrupted by existing urban development and would continue to be partially
26 obstructed. Therefore, with compliance to applicable zoning standards and thoughtful site planning, the
27 Project's impact on scenic vistas would be less than significant. Development of Planning Area 123 is not
28 included as part of the Project and would be subject to future CEQA compliance, as applicable.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not significantly affect scenic vistas. Potential aesthetic
impacts to scenic views are considered less than significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
required for this less than significant impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.1.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.1-2 (SCENIC RESOURCES)**

4

5 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

6

7 No adopted State of California (State) or San Bernardino County (County) scenic highways exist within the
8 City. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is approximately 30.3 miles east of the project
9 site and is identified as State Route (SR) 38. Therefore, construction and operation of the project site
10 would not damage or obstruct any scenic resources (e.g., trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings)
11 within a state scenic highway. Additionally, the 2010 RSP EIR concluded that future development
12 consistent with the 2010 RSP would not result in adverse aesthetic impacts. To support the proposed
13 Project, the Project includes redesignation of Planning Areas 126 and 133, from Public Park and
14 Employment to Business Center. Upon approval, the Project would conform to the Business Center
15 development standards as outlined in the 2016 RSPA. The proposed warehouse development would
16 comply with these standards, ensuring consistency with the Specific Plan's intended land uses and design
17 guidelines. Planning Area 123 is not part of the current Project scope and would be subject to CEQA
18 compliance as applicable if developed in the future. For these reasons and for the reasons discussed in
19 the Draft SEIR, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway,
20 and no mitigation relating to this issue is required.

21 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

22 The City hereby finds that the Project would not significantly affect scenic highways and corridors.
23 Potential aesthetic impacts to scenic highways and corridors are considered less than significant.
24 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact.

25 **Mitigation Program**

26 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

27 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

28 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.1.

1 **IMPACT 4.1-3 (APPLICABLE ZONING AND OTHER REGULATIONS**
2 **GOVERNING SCENIC QUALITY)**

3 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

4 The proposed Project would change the appearance of Planning Areas 126 and 133 from undeveloped
5 land to the two proposed warehouse buildings and associated on- and off-site improvements. The project
6 site design would comply with Business Center development standards included in the 2016 RSPA. The
7 proposed Project would include the use of colors and materials to create a cohesive and authentic
8 architectural style and include landscaping to complement the buildings. Warehouse development would
9 comply with Business Center development standards included in the 2016 RSPA. Development of Planning
10 Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123
11 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Although the
12 Project would comply with **MM AES-1** below, it is not required to reduce impacts to a less than significant
13 level.

14 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations
4 governing scenic quality. Potential impacts are considered less than significant. Consequently, no
mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact determination.

5 **Mitigation Program**

6 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures**

7 **AES-1** Pursuant to Section 15.32 of the City's Municipal Code Prior to the issuance of grading
8 permits, the project applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director,
evidence that all electrical distribution lines of 16,000 volts or less, telephone lines, cable
9 antenna television and similar service wires or cable, which provide direct service to the
property being developed, shall be installed underground.

10 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

11 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.1.

12 **IMPACT 4.1-4 (LIGHT OR GLARE)**

13 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

14 The Project would be developed on vacant property in an urbanized area. Developed and urbanized areas
15 often have higher levels of light and glare than rural or undeveloped areas. New sources of lighting on the
16 project site would include parking lot illumination and various security lights around the property for
17 safety and security concerns. Additional lighting would be included indoors and not visible to the
18 surrounding area. To reduce potential impacts associated with outdoor lighting, the Project would comply
19 with the 2016 RSPA Development Standards which require that all outdoor lighting be shielded and
20 directed away from adjoining properties and public right-of-way. The project vicinity includes existing
21 nighttime lighting from surrounding sources including vehicle headlights, streetlights, and intermittent
22 nighttime field lighting at Jerry Eaves Park. The Project would introduce additional nighttime lighting on
23 the warehouse development site, which would be visible from the surrounding area. The lighting used for
24 the warehouse development would be consistent with the existing sources of nighttime lighting in the
25 area from the surrounding uses and street lighting along Baseline Road, Cactus Avenue, and Ayala Drive.
Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level
in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Compliance with the Specific Plan and the City's zoning ordinance
would result in a less than significant impact.

26 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

27 The City hereby finds that the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which
28 would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Potential impacts are considered less than
significant. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this less than significant impact.

23 **Mitigation Program**

24 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

25 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

1
2
3 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.1.

4 **4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION**
5 **5.4)**

6 **IMPACT 5.4-1 (CONVERT PRIME FARMLAND)**

7 **IMPACT 5.4-2 (CONFLICT WITH EXISITNG ZONING FOR AGRICULTURAL USE**
8 **OR A WILLIAMSON CONTRACT)**

9 **IMPACT 5.4-3 (CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR FOREST LAND)**

10 **IMPACT 5.4-4 (RESULT IN THE LOSS OF FOREST LAND)**

11 **IMPACT 5.4-5 (RESULT IN CONVERSION OF FARMLAND, TO NON-**
12 **AGRICULTURAL USE OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO**
13 **NON-FOREST USE)**

14 **NO IMPACT**

15 The project site does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide
16 Importance, there are no lands within the City that are currently under a Williamson Act contract, and
17 there is no forest or timberland present or zoned on the project site that could be lost from Project
18 implementation. Further, the surrounding properties feature urban land uses and are not zoned for forest
19 land uses and the project site is currently undeveloped. As such, development of the project site would
20 not result in conversion of the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land or agricultural uses to
21 non-forest or non-agricultural uses. As such, the Project would have no impact on agriculture and forestry
22 resources.

23 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

24 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts agriculture and forestry
25 resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No potential impacts are expected to occur.
26 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this no impact determination.

27 **Mitigation Program**

28 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

29 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

30 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

31 **4.3 AIR QUALITY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.2)**

32 **IMPACT 4.2-4 (OTHER EMISSIONS SUCH AS ODORS)**

33 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

34 While odors may be generated during construction activities, odors would be temporary, are not expected
35 to affect a substantial number of people, and would disperse rapidly. The Project would also be required

1
2
3 to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 to prevent occurrences
4 of public nuisances. The Project would also implement 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-8, requiring
5 the use of Super-Compliant Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Paints, which is not required to reduce
6 impacts to a less than significant level but would further reduce potential odor impacts during Project
construction. The Project does not involve any of the land uses that would result in emissions, such as
those leading to odors, that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, the Project
would not create objectionable odors, and no impact would occur during operations.

7 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

8 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from emissions such as
9 those leading to odors beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

10 **Mitigation Program**

11 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

12 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

13 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.2.

14 **4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.3)**

15 **IMPACT 4.3-2 (RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL
16 COMMUNITY)**

17 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

18 No jurisdictional drainage features, riparian/riverine areas, wetlands, or vernal pools were observed
19 within the project site during the field survey. Further, the Project would impact three vegetation
20 communities: developed, disturbed habitat, and disturbed Riversidian Sage Scrub. Developed land and
21 disturbed habitat are not considered native vegetation communities. Disturbed Riversidean sage scrub is
22 not considered a sensitive natural community under CEQA and impacts on this community are not
23 anticipated to be significant due to its abundance in the region. Therefore, impacts to native vegetation
24 communities resulting from the Project would be less than significant.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to riparian habitat or other
27 sensitive natural community beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
28 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

29 **Mitigation Program**

30 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

31 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

32 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3.

IMPACT 4.3-3 (WETLANDS)

NO IMPACT

The Project would not 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 as there are no jurisdictional aquatic resources within the project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to wetlands beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3.

IMPACT 4.3-6 (CONSERVATION PLANS)

NO IMPACT

The project site is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. No impact would occur, and no mitigation is required.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with established conservation plans beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3.

4.5 ENERGY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.5)

IMPACT 4.5-2 (RENEWABLE ENERGY/ENERGY EFFICIENCY PLANS)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Project would not conflict with any of the federal, State, or local plans for renewable energy and energy efficiency. Project design and operation of the Project will comply with State Building Energy

Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards. Development of the Project will not cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy use, and impacts will be less than significant. Additionally, the Project will be subject to compliance with all federal, State, and local requirements for energy efficiency. For all of the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in the SEIR, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The Project would not conflict with any of state or local plans. As such, a less than significant impact is expected.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts stemming from conflicts with established renewable energy or energy efficiency plans beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.5.

4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 5.4)

IMPACT 5.4-6i (RISK INVOLVING RUPTURE OF A KNOWN EARTHQUAKE FAULT)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no known active fault traverses the project site. The nearest fault zone is the San Jacinto Fault Zone, located approximately 2.6 miles east of the project site. In addition, the Project would be subject to the current California Building Code (CBC) guidelines, with respect to seismic design parameters to reduce potential seismic impacts. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not directly or indirectly cause adverse effects involving a known fault zone Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 5.4-6ii (STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING)**

4

5 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

6

7 The nearest fault zone to the project site is the San Jacinto Fault zone, located approximately 2.6 miles to
8 the northeast. During seismic events, the project site could experience moderate ground shaking
9 associated with the fault described above. The Project would be subject to the current CBC guidelines,
10 with respect to seismic design parameters. Conformance with these standard engineering practices and
11 design criteria would reduce the effects of seismic ground shaking. The project site is not located within
12 an active fault zone. As such, the potential for damage to occur because of ground shaking is considered
13 low. Following compliance with standard engineering practices and the CBC guidelines, the Project's
14 potential impacts concerning exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects involving
15 strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. Development of Planning Area 123 is not
16 proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be
17 evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Less than significant impacts
18 associated with strong seismic ground shaking would occur.

19 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

20 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts or adverse effects related
21 to strong seismic ground shaking beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts
22 are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

23 **Mitigation Program**

24 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

25 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

27 **IMPACT 5.4-6iii (SEISMIC-RELATED GROUND FAILURE)**

28 **NO IMPACT**

1 According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the residential and commercial
2 development at the Rialto Municipal Airport, groundwater depths on-site are approximately 450 feet
3 below ground surface (bgs). Additionally, the project site is not located within a liquefaction zone. The
4 project site also contains previously disturbed land. Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-
5 specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. No impacts associated with liquefaction would
6 occur.

7 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

8 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts or seismic-related ground
9 failure including liquefaction beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated.
10 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

11 **Mitigation Program**

12 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

1
2
3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

5 **IMPACT 5.4-6iv (LANDSLIDES)**

6 **NO IMPACT**

7 The project site is previously disturbed land and is relatively flat with elevations ranging from 1,385 feet
8 above mean sea level (amsl) to 1,420 feet amsl and is not located within a landslide zone. Development
9 of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to
10 Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.
11 No impacts related to landslides would occur.

12 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

13 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
14 the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this
15 impact.

16 **Mitigation Program**

17 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

18 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

19 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

20 **IMPACT 5.4-7 (SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL)**

21 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

22 The project site consists of previously disturbed land and is relatively flat. Given the project site's
23 topography and geology, the potential for loss of topsoil is considered low. The Project would be required
24 to implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), which would include general Best
25 Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion and sedimentation from leaving the project site. With
26 implementation of the SWPPP, the Project's potential to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil
27 would be less than significant. Additionally, it should be noted that development of Planning Area 123 is
28 not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would
be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

20 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

21 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
22 the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
23 required for this impact.

24 **Mitigation Program**

25 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

27 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 5.4-8 (LANDSLIDE, LATERAL SPREADING, SUBSIDENCE,**

4 **LIQUEFACTION OR COLLAPSE)**

5

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

7

8 As discussed above, the project site is not located in a liquefaction zone, and the potential for liquefaction
9 to occur is considered very low. As such, the potential for lateral spreading is also considered very low, as
10 lateral spreading is a type of liquefaction. Further, the Project would not be located on a geologic unit of
11 soil that would become unstable and potentially result in subsidence. Development of Planning Area 123
12 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would
13 be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less
14 than significant.

15 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

16 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
17 the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
18 required for this impact.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

23 **IMPACT 5.4-9 (EXPANSIVE SOIL)**

24 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

25 The project site is underlain by Tujunga gravelly loamy sand and Tujunga loamy sand, which are not
26 considered expansive soils. The Rialto Building Division would review construction plans to verify
27 compliance with standard engineering practices and the CBC guidelines. The Project would not create
28 substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property concerning expansive soils. Development of Planning
Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area
123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would
be less than significant.

15 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

16 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
17 the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
18 required for this impact.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 5.4-10 (SEPTIC TANKS)**

4

5 **NO IMPACT**

6 The Project would not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No
7 impact would occur.

8 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

9 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to the use of septic
10 tanks or wastewater alternatives beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated.
11 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

12 **Mitigation Program**

13 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

14 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

15 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

16 **IMPACT 5.4-11 (UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE)**

17 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

18 The project site is located within an urbanized portion of the City and includes portions of the previous
19 Rialto Municipal Airport, which ceased operations in 2014. As such, it is unlikely that existing
20 paleontological resources are still present on-site due to previous extensive development and demolition.
21 Further, the Project will comply with applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations. Development of
22 Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to
23 Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.
24 Impacts would be less than significant.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts on paleontological
27 resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
28 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

1

2

3 **4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.7)**

4 **IMPACT 4.7-1 (TRANSPORT, USE, OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS**

5 **MATERIALS)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

7 The Project involves constructing two warehouse buildings and associated improvements, requiring the
8 transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, paints, and solvents, which would not
9 be present in such a quantity or used in such a manner that would pose a significant hazard to the public.
10 While these materials pose potential hazards through accidental release, compliance with all federal,
11 State, and local regulations confirms proper handling, minimizing significant risks to the public and
12 environment. Construction staff are trained to manage spills or hazardous incidents, and all waste will be
13 transported to appropriately permitted waste facilities. During operations, the Project is expected to use
14 limited hazardous materials, which will also be managed in accordance with all applicable regulations,
15 resulting in less than significant impacts. Both construction and operation phases will adhere to stringent
16 safety measures and regulatory requirements, ensuring minimal hazard to the public and environment.
17 Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level
18 in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. With compliance with applicable federal, State, and regional
19 regulations, the Project would result in less than significant impacts during construction and operation.

20 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

21 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts through the routine
22 transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than
23 significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

24 **Mitigation Program**

25 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

27 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

28 **IMPACT 4.7-2 (RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS)**

1 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

2 The project site, previously the Rialto Municipal Airport, has historical contamination from aviation land
3 uses, but it has a cleanup status of "case closed." Evaluations of nearby sites did not identify any that
4 present a potential environmental risk to the subject property. No active regulated sites are within a 1-
5 mile radius, indicating no potential environmental concerns. During Project construction and operation,
6 typical hazardous materials like fuels, paints, and solvents will be in low quantities and managed according
7 to all regulations, ensuring less than significant impacts to the public and environment.

8 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

9 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts through the creation of a
10 significant hazard related to the release of hazardous materials beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR.

1
2
3 Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this
impact.

4 **Mitigation Program**

5 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

6 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

7 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

8 **IMPACT 4.7-3 (HAZARDOUS MATERIALS WITHIN ONE-QUARTER MILE OF
AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL)**

9 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

10 No existing or proposed schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest
11 operating school to the project site is 0.58 mile to the southeast. Therefore, impacts would be less than
12 significant. Upon approval of the proposed Specific Plan amendment, Planning Area 123 would change
13 from School to General Commercial with a Residential overlay, with future developments evaluated
14 individually. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-
specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site
15 are single-family residences (520 feet south) and Jerry Eaves Park (800 feet northeast). Combined
construction and operation risks associated with the Project are significantly below the threshold. Typical
hazardous materials, limited to cleaners, paints, solvents, and landscaping chemicals, will be limited in
16 quantity and concentrations, and managed per all applicable regulations, resulting in less than significant
17 impacts. No mitigation is required.

18 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

19 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts through emissions of
20 hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school beyond those concluded
21 in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
22 required for this impact.

23 **Mitigation Program**

24 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

25 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

27 **IMPACT 4.7-4 (ON A LIST OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES)**

28 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

The project site is not included on the hazardous sites list compiled pursuant to California Government
Code Section 65962.5. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on
a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant and
no mitigation is required.

1
2
3 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

4 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts related to hazardous
5 materials sites listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 beyond those concluded in the Draft
SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for
this impact.

6 **Mitigation Program**

7 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

9 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

10 **IMPACT 4.7-5 (SAFETY HAZARD OR EXCESSIVE NOISE WITHIN AN AIRPORT
LAND USE PLAN)**

11 **NO IMPACT**

12 The project site is not located in the vicinity of an existing public or public use airport. The closest airport
13 is the San Bernardino International Airport, which is approximately 8.75 miles southeast of the project
site. The Rialto Municipal Airport Final Comprehensive Plan (January 1991) is no longer applicable as the
airport closed in 2014. Therefore, no impact would occur.

14 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

15 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with public
16 or private airports beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently,
no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

17 **Mitigation Program**

18 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

19 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

20 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

21 **IMPACT 4.7-6 (INTERFERE WITH AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE
PLAN)**

22 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

23 The proposed Project will not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.
24 The City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan (MHFP) for emergency response and evacuation coordinates the
25 City's emergency response capabilities and no revisions to it are needed for the Project. Primary access to
all major roads will be maintained during construction and operation of the proposed Project, ensuring
no disruption to emergency services, as detailed in Section 4.12, Public Services, of the Draft SEIR. A Traffic
Construction Management Plan will manage construction traffic, minimizing any temporary disruptions.
The City's Development Impact Fee Program provides funding for necessary facilities, and future projects
in Planning Area 123 will undergo specific evaluation and CEQA compliance, as applicable. Consequently,

1
2
3 the impact on emergency response or evacuation plans will be less than significant, and no mitigation is
4 required.

5 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.
6
7

8 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding impaired
9 implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency
10 evacuation plan beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
11 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

12 **Mitigation Program**

13 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

14 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

15 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

16 **IMPACT 4.7-7 (WILDLAND FIRES)**

17 **NO IMPACT**

18 Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs), mapped by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
19 (Cal Fire), identify areas under federal, State, or local fire protection responsibility. Cal Fire manages State
20 Responsibility Areas, which exclude federally owned land, incorporated areas, high housing densities,
21 agricultural land, ornamentals, and most desert lands. Local agencies, like the Rialto Fire Department,
22 handle wildfire protection in Local Responsibility Areas. The project site and its surroundings are not
23 designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ). Therefore, the proposed Project will have
24 no impact related to wildfire risk.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts involving the exposure of
27 people or structures to the risk of wildland fires beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are
28 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

29 **Mitigation Program**

30 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

31 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

32 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.7.

33 **4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.8)**

34 **IMPACT 4.8-1 (GROUNDWATER QUALITY)**

35 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

36 Construction activities for the proposed Project will involve typical methods used in warehouse
37 developments and may require water for dust control, creating runoff that may affect water quality
38 temporarily. The Project must obtain a NPDES Construction General Permit and prepare a SWPPP with

site-specific BMPs to control and prevent pollutants in runoff. BMPs will include stabilizing soil, establishing vegetation, using silt fences, diverting runoff, protecting storm drains, and managing construction materials properly. For operations, a stormwater quality management plan (SWQMP) must be approved by the City Engineer for developments over 100,000 sf. The project's SWQMP will utilize subsurface infiltration basins for stormwater capture and treatment. Compliance with permit requirements and BMPs will minimize construction and operational impacts on water quality, resulting in less than significant impact. Additionally, the development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to water quality beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

IMPACT 4.8-2 (GROUNDWATER SUPPLY)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Project will add impervious surfaces, and will also include subsurface infiltration basins that will detain, infiltrate, and treat stormwater, supporting groundwater recharge. Groundwater depth, estimated between 300 and 450 feet below ground, is not a concern for the Project. Landscaping covering approximately 154,929 sf of the project site will further aid stormwater infiltration. As such, the Project would not significantly impact local groundwater recharge or management. The 2020 IRUWMP confirms adequate water supplies for 2025-2045, even in dry years; therefore, the Project would not affect groundwater supplies. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. No impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from the reduction of groundwater resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.8-3i (ALTER THE DRAINAGE PATTERN RESULTING IN EROSION)**

4

5 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

6

7 Project construction would alter the project site's existing drainage pattern. Each of the proposed
8 warehouse buildings would have a minimum of one subsurface infiltration basin. Building 2 would utilize
9 three subsurface infiltration basins. The proposed drainage facilities have been sized to adequately treat
10 runoff water from the project site, and the project site does not include discharge to any streams or rivers.
11 The Project has prepared grading plans as a part of the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) application and would
12 also be required to prepare a SWPPP, which would include BMPs to minimize on-site and off-site erosion
13 and siltation. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future
14 development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in
15 compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

16 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

17 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to existing drainage patterns
18 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no
19 mitigation measures are required for this impact.

20 **Mitigation Program**

21 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

23 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

24 **IMPACT 4.8-3ii (ALTER THE DRAINAGE PATTERN RESULTING IN
FLOODING)**

25 **IMPACT 4.8-3iii (ALTER THE DRAINAGE PATTERN RESULTING IN RUNOFF
EXCEEDING THE CAPACITY OF THE STORMWATER
DRAINAGE SYSTEMS)**

26 **IMPACT 4.8-3iv (ALTER THE DRAINAGE PATTERN, RESULTING IN
IMPEDING OR REDIRECTING FLOOD FLOW)**

27 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

28 The proposed Project involves the development of two warehouse buildings, along with on- and off-site
improvements, on previously disturbed vacant land classified as Zone X, an area of minimal flooding. This
development will increase surface runoff, altering absorption rates and drainage patterns. To manage the
runoff, the Project development will feature subsurface infiltration basins that will capture and treat
runoff through a system of roof drains, trench drains, and underground storm drain networks. An
underground storage facility will detain and mitigate peak flow rates, with outlet pipes discharging 100-
year overflows into an existing storm drain along Miro Way. The site does not collect off-site flows from
adjacent properties. To provide water quality, sediment bays and underground chambers will pretreat
pollutants via infiltration. With implementation of the proposed drainage improvements, impacts would

1
2
3 be less than significant. Future developments in Planning Area 123 are not included in this Project but will
be individually evaluated in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

4 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

5 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to existing drainage patterns
6 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no
mitigation measures are required for this impact.

7 **Mitigation Program**

8 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

9 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

10 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

11 **IMPACT 4.8-4 (INUNDATION IN FLOOD HAZARD, TSUNAMI, OR SEICHE
12 ZONES)**

13 **NO IMPACT**

14 The project site is classified as Zone X, which includes areas of minimal flooding. Seiches are the oscillation
15 of large bodies of standing water, such as lakes, that can occur in response to ground shaking. The project
site is approximately 47 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and there are no nearby bodies of standing water.
Therefore, due to location, the Project would not be subject to seiche or tsunami related inundation that
would risk the release of pollutants. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the
Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-
specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. No impact would occur.

16 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

17 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from release of pollutants
18 from Project inundation beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated.
Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

23 **IMPACT 4.8-5 (CONFLICT WITH A WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN OR
24 SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN)**

25 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

26 The proposed Project would require the preparation of a SWPPP, which would include BMPs to reduce
27 potential impacts associated with construction-related sources of pollution. Additionally, as required by
28 Section 12.60.260 of the Municipal Code, the Project is required to implement a SWQMP. A SWQMP has
been prepared for the proposed Project, which includes additional BMPs to control pollutants during

construction and operation activities. With implementation of the Project-specific SWPPP and SWQMP, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to existing water quality beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.8.

4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.9)

IMPACT 4.9-1 (PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY)

NO IMPACT

The warehouse development is bordered by vacant land and industrial uses to the north, industrial and commercial uses to the south, Ayala Drive to the east, and Linden Avenue to the west. The project site does not currently provide any connection to existing neighborhoods in the general area, nor does it provide connectivity or accessibility to other neighboring uses. As such, neither the residential development south of Baseline Road, Jerry Eaves Park to the east, or other existing or planned communities proximate to the project site would be physically divided by the proposed Project. The proposed Project does not include features such as a highway or above-ground infrastructure that preclude or impede movement through the project site, such that a permanent disruption in the physical arrangement of the surrounding community or isolation of that community would occur. Therefore, the Project would not physically divide an established community, and no impact would occur.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to established communities beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.9.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.9-2 (CONFLICT WITH ANY PLAN, POLICY, OR REGULATION**

4 **ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING OR MITIGATING**

5 **AN ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

7 The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan,
8 policy, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. As set
9 forth in the SEIR, regionally, the Project would comply with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and the
10 goals and policies presented in Southern California Association of Government's ("SCAG") Regional
11 Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy ("RTP/SCS"). Locally, the Project would comply
12 with the City's General Plan and its land use goals and policies, the City's Development Code, and the
13 Renaissance Specific Plan. For these reasons and the reasons set forth in the Draft SEIR, the Project would
14 have a less than significant impact relating to this issue, and no mitigation is required.

15 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

16 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with
17 adopted land use plans, policies or regulations beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than
18 significant impacts are anticipated.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.9.

23 **4.10 MINERAL RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 5.4)**

24 **IMPACT 5.4-12 (LOSS OF A KNOWN MINERAL RESOURCE)**

25 **NO IMPACT**

26 The project site is within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 2, indicating significant mineral deposits or a high
27 likelihood of their presence. However, no mineral extraction activities occur on the site, and such uses are
28 not permitted. The site includes Planning Areas 123, 126, and 133, zoned for School, Public Park, and
Employment with a Park overlay, which do not allow mineral extraction. The Project will rezone Planning
Areas 126 and 133 to Business Center and Planning Area 123 to General Commercial with a Residential
overlay, none of which permit mineral extraction. Future development in Planning Area 123 will be
individually evaluated per CEQA requirements as applicable. Therefore, Project implementation will not
result in the loss of a known mineral resource, and no impact will occur.

29 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

30 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to mineral resources beyond
31 those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
32 required for this impact.

1

2

3 **Mitigation Program**

4

5 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

6

7 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8

9 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

10

11 **IMPACT 5.4-13 (LOSS OF A KNOWN MINERAL RESOURCE RECOVERY SITE)**

12

13 **NO IMPACT**

14

15 The project site consists of vacant, previously disturbed land currently zoned for School, Public Park, and
16 Employment with a Designated Park overlay, none of which allow for mineral extraction. The site is not
17 identified by the City as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Therefore, the Project's
18 implementation will not result in the loss of availability of such a site. Additionally, development of
19 Planning Area 123 is not part of the Project; future projects in this area will be evaluated individually in
20 compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Thus, no impact on the availability of locally important mineral
21 resources will occur.

22 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

23

24 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
25 the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this
26 impact.

27 **Mitigation Program**

28

1 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

2 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

3 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

4 **4.11 NOISE (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.10)**

5 **IMPACT 4.10-3 (WITHIN A PRIVATE AIRSTRIPO OR AN AIRPORT LAND USE
6 PLAN, EXPOSE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE
7 PROJECT AREA TO EXCESSIVE NOISE LEVELS)**

8

9 **NO IMPACT**

10

11 The Project would not be located within two miles of a public airport or within an airport land use plan.
12 There are no private airstrips located within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the Project would not expose
13 people residing or working within the Project area to excessive airport or airstrip-related noise levels.
14 Additionally, development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future
15 development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in
16 compliance with CEQA, as applicable. No impact would occur.

17 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

18

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
4 the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this
5 impact.

6 **Mitigation Program**

7 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

9 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.10.

10 **4.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.11)**

11 **IMPACT 4.11-1 (UNPLANNED POPULATION GROWTH)**

12 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

13 The proposed project site is currently zoned for School, Public Park, and Employment and consists of
14 vacant, undeveloped land. Upon approval of the proposed Specific Plan amendment, Planning Area 123
15 will be rezoned to General Commercial with a Residential overlay, while Planning Areas 126 and 133 will
16 be zoned Business Center. The Project would include the construction of two warehouse buildings
17 consistent with the new zoning designations, anticipated to generate up to 154 jobs, primarily filled by
18 local residents. Necessary off-site improvements for the Project will not induce unplanned population
19 growth on or near the project site. The Project does not include any housing, and therefore would not
20 induce substantial unplanned population growth. Future developments in Planning Area 123 would be
21 evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Therefore, the Project would
22 result in less than significant impacts related to population growth.

23 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

24 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from induced population
25 growth beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
26 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

27 **Mitigation Program**

28 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

1 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

2 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.11.

3 **IMPACT 4.11-2 (DISPLACE PEOPLE OR HOUSING)**

4 **NO IMPACT**

5 The Project includes the rezone of vacant land currently designated for Employment, Public Park, and
6 School uses. Planning Area 123 will be rezoned from School to General Commercial with a Residential
7 overlay, with an option to become Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and potentially accept
8 residential units transferred from other areas within the Specific Plan. Development in Planning Area 123
9 is not part of the current Project and will be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA,

1
2
3 as applicable. The project site is currently vacant and does not have existing people or housing; thus, the
4 construction and operation of the proposed Project will not displace any existing people or housing, nor
will it necessitate the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no impact will occur.

5 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

6 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from the displacement of
7 individuals or housing beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated.
Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

8 **Mitigation Program**

9 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

10 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

11 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.11.

12 **4.13 PUBLIC SERVICES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.12)**

13 **IMPACT 4.12-1I (FIRE PROTECTION)**

14 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

15 The nearest Rialto Fire Department fire station to the project site is Station 203, located approximately
16 0.4 miles to the north on North Ayala Drive. Emergency vehicles from Station 203 will access the Project
17 via Miro Way and Ayala Drive driveways. Currently, the site is vacant and undeveloped; hence, the
18 proposed Project is expected to increase calls for fire services to the project site. As a standard condition
19 of approval, the Project Applicant will pay fire protection services development impact fees to finance
20 public facilities; thus, new development covers the costs of necessary public services. The Project will
21 comply with all fire protection regulatory requirements, including adequate fire flows, emergency access,
22 sprinkler systems, and fire alarms, minimizing the need for additional fire protection services. While the
23 Project will require fire protection services, it is not expected to necessitate new or altered fire facilities
24 or significantly impact service ratios or response times. No new facilities would be required to serve the
25 Project. Therefore, no significant impacts related to fire protection services will occur. Future
26 development in Planning Area 123 will be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA,
27 as applicable.

28 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to fire services beyond those
2 concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
3 measures are required for this impact.

4 **Mitigation Program**

5 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

6 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

7 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.12.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.12-II (POLICE PROTECTION)**

4

5 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

6

7 The proposed Project will construct two warehouse buildings, likely increasing calls for police services
8 from the currently vacant site. Officers from the Rialto Police Department, 2 miles southwest, will handle
9 these calls. During construction, security risks may rise, so BMPs and standard construction site security
10 measures will be in place. Project personnel commuting via State Route 210 may temporarily increase
11 police demand, but this impact will be minimal and temporary. The Project may affect response times but
12 would not require a new police station. Police services will continue to be dispatched from the existing
13 department, with response times managed by the City. The Project Applicant will pay the City's law
14 enforcement services development impact fees per Section 3.33.210 of the City's Municipal Code, funding
15 future police facilities and further reducing impacts. Therefore, the Project's impact on police services will
16 be less than significant. Future development in Planning Area 123 will be evaluated on a project-specific
17 level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

18 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

19 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to police beyond those
20 concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
21 measures are required for this impact.

22 **Mitigation Program**

23 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

24 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

25 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.12.

26 **IMPACT 4.12-III (SCHOOLS)**

27 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

28 The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and does not contain any school facilities. Future
1 employees are expected to commute to the project site from within the City or nearby areas. The Project
2 does not include housing construction and is not anticipated to cause substantial unplanned population
3 growth. Under Senate Bill 50 (1998) and the California Education Code, school districts can collect impact
4 fees from developers to fund school facilities, fully mitigating potential project impacts. Payment of these
5 fees provides full and complete school facilities mitigation under CEQA. As such, impacts on schools will
6 be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Future development in Planning Area 123 will be
7 evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

8 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

9 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to schools beyond those
10 concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
11 measures are required for this impact.

1

2

Mitigation Program

3

4 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

5

6 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

7

8 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.12.

9

10 **IMPACT 4.12-1IV (PARKS)**

11

12 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

13

14 The Project involves rezoning Planning Areas 126 and 133 from Park/Employment with a Park overlay to
15 Business Center, and Planning Area 123 from School to General Commercial with a Residential overlay.
16 The site, consists of vacant land, and does not feature existing parks. The Project includes the construction
17 of two warehouse buildings in Planning Areas 126 and 133 with associated improvements. The City has a
18 standard of three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents but currently has a shortage, with a ratio of 2.78
19 acres per resident. The Project will not cause substantial unplanned population growth and will not
20 increase demand for new or altered parks. Future development in Planning Area 123 will be evaluated on
21 a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Thus, the Project's impact on parkland
22 demand will be less than significant.

23

24 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

25

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to parks beyond those
27 concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
28 measures are required for this impact.

29

30 **Mitigation Program**

31

32 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

33

34 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

35

36 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.12.

37

38 **IMPACT 4.12-1V (OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES)**

39

40 **NO IMPACT**

41

42 Library services in the City are provided by the Rialto Library and the Carter Library, which are part of the
43 San Bernardino County Library System. These libraries offer access to movies, books, computers, and the
44 Internet and can request materials from other libraries within the system. The proposed Project includes
45 rezoning Planning Areas 123, 126, and 133 and constructing a warehouse development on Planning Areas
46 126 and 133, along with associated improvements. Since the Project does not include habitable structures
47 and will not lead to substantial unplanned population growth, it will not increase demand for library
48 facilities. According to Section 3.33.200 of the City's Municipal Code, the Project Applicant will pay library
49 facilities development impact fees to fund library improvements. Future development in Planning Area
50 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Thus, the
51 Project's impact on library services will be less than significant.

52

53 **Finding:** The city adopts CEQA Finding 1.

54

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to other public facilities
4 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
measures are required for this impact.

5 **Mitigation Program**

6 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

7 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.12.

9 **4.14 RECREATION (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.13)**

10 **IMPACT 4.13-1 (INCREASE USE OF PARKS RESULTING IN DETERIORATION)**

11 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

12 The proposed Project will add approximately 399,715 square feet of warehouse space, 21,000 square feet
13 of office space, and 8,000 square feet of mezzanine space. This increase in space will increase employees
14 on the project site and may marginally increase demand for nearby recreational facilities since some
15 employees might exercise before or after work, or during lunch breaks. However, as detailed in Section
16 4.11, Population and Housing, of the Draft SEIR, the Project is not expected to cause substantial unplanned
17 population growth, with most employees commuting from within the City or nearby areas. The Project
18 will rezone Planning Areas 126 and 133 from Public Park and Employment to Business Center, and
19 Planning Area 123 from School to General Commercial with a Residential overlay. These areas currently
20 have no existing recreational facilities, and no recreational facilities are planned for the privately-owned
21 Planning Area 126. Therefore, the Project will not significantly impact or deteriorate existing recreational
22 facilities. Future development in Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in
23 compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Thus, the Project impact on recreational facilities will be less than
24 significant.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate impacts due to the increased demand on
27 established parks beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
28 Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

1 **Mitigation Program**

2 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.13.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.13-2 (INCREASE USE OF PARKS RESULTING IN NEW**

4 **RECREATIONAL FACILITIES)**

5

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

7

8 The Project does not propose, nor require, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The
9 project site consists of vacant, undeveloped land and does not feature existing recreational facilities. The
10 Project is not anticipated to result in substantial population growth, and implementation of the Project
11 would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment as it pertains to construction/expansion of
12 recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

13 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

14 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate impacts from the potential construction or
15 expansion of park facilities beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
16 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

17 **Mitigation Program**

18 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

19 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

20 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.13.

21 **4.15 TRANSPORTATION (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.14)**

22 **IMPACT 4.14-1 (CONFLICT WITH A PROGRAM, PLAN, ORDINANCE OR**

23 **POLICY ADDRESSING THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM)**

24 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

25 The Project is consistent with SCAG's Connect SoCal: 2020-2045 RTP/SCS and the City's General Plan, as
26 detailed in Draft SEIR sections covering Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Land Use and Planning. The Traffic
27 Study confirms that the Project roadways and intersections will operate at acceptable Levels of Service.
28 The Project will not interfere with the Rialto Active Transportation Plan or the circulation plan from the
2016 RSPA. The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the
circulation system. Therefore, the Project is anticipated to have less than significant impacts.

20 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

21 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts that conflict with existing
22 programs and plans beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
23 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

24 **Mitigation Program**

25 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

27 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.14.

1

2

3 **IMPACT 4.14-2 (CONSISTENCY WITH CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15064.3,
4 SUBDIVISION (B))**

5

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

7

8 SB 743 shifted the primary metric for identifying a project's transportation impact from delay-based LOS
9 to VMT. The LCI's Technical Advisory and the City's TIA Guidelines provide the basis for VMT analysis,
10 emphasizing screening thresholds to determine if a detailed study is necessary. Screening includes three
11 steps: Transit Priority Area (TPA) Screening, Low VMT Area Screening, and Land Use Type Screening, with
12 a project needing to meet only one threshold to be considered to have no significant impact. The proposed
13 Project does not qualify under TPA Screening but is located in a low VMT generating area according to the
14 SBCTA VMT Screening Tool. However, due to the project's scale, it does not meet the Land Use Type
15 Screening criteria. Based on the City of Rialto Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines VMT and LOS and the
16 SBCTA VMT Screening Tool, the proposed Project is located within a low VMT generating area. Therefore,
17 the Project would result in a less than significant VMT impact, and no further VMT analysis is required.

18 Further, it should be noted that development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project.
19 Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level
20 in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

21 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

22 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding conflicts with
23 CEQA transportation guidelines beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts
24 are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

25 **Mitigation Program**

26 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

27 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

28 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.14.

18 **IMPACT 4.14-3 (HAZARDS DUE TO A GEOMETRIC DESIGN FEATURE)**

19 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

20 The proposed Project would not introduce incompatible uses to surrounding roadways and would be
21 consistent with Planning Areas 126 and 133 upon approval of the proposed Specific Plan amendment.
22 Driveways and improvements would provide adequate sight distance and limited use areas for each
23 driveway would be clear of visual obstructions. The Project would comply with State building codes and
24 City design standards, and provide adequate site access and driveway width, subject to City review and
25 approval. A peak hour signal warrant analysis indicates that the intersection of Ayala Drive at Miro Way
26 would meet PM peak hour requirements, operating at an optimum level of service under 2024 conditions.
27 Development of Planning Area 123 is not part of the Project, with any future projects would be evaluated
28 on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts related to hazards due to
geometric design features or incompatible uses would be less than significant.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to incompatible uses
4 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no
mitigation measures are required for this impact.

5
Mitigation Program

6
2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

7
Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

8
Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.14.

9
IMPACT 4.14-4 (INADEQUATE EMERGENCY ACCESS)

10
NO IMPACT

11 The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency vehicles could access the
12 project site through any of the four driveways. Project traffic would not result in substantial delays or
congestion that would affect the circulation of emergency vehicles within the Project area. Further, the
13 proposed driveways would meet requirements for fire access roads in the California Fire Code 9 CCR Title
24 Part 9. There are no impacts concerning emergency access and no mitigation is required. Future
development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in
compliance with CEQA, as applicable. The Project would have no impact with respect to adequate
emergency access.

14
Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

15 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts from impaired emergency
16 access beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. No impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation
measures are required for this impact.

17
Mitigation Program

18
2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

19
Project Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

20
Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.14.

21
4.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.16)

22
**IMPACT 4.16-1 (RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW
23 UTILITIES)**

24
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

25 The proposed Project requires the construction of new water service connection laterals, wastewater
26 connections, and minor dry utility extensions to connect to existing infrastructure. The water facilities will
27 be constructed mostly underground within current road rights-of-way, resulting in only temporary
28 construction impacts. The wastewater generated by the Project will be treated at the existing Rialto
Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) utilizing the current sewer main in Ayala Drive. Project facilities
would be constructed and operated in compliance with applicable guidelines and regulations, including

1
2
3 payment of applicable connection fees, and follow applicable SEIR mitigation measures in each topical
4 area addressed in the SEIR. As such, impacts associated with the relocation or construction of water and
wastewater facilities will be less than significant.

5 For dry utilities, including electric, natural gas, and telecommunications, the Project will connect to
6 existing lines and infrastructure without requiring significant off-site construction or expansion. Southern
7 California Edison (SCE) will provide additional electricity through existing distribution lines, while SoCalGas
and AT&T will supply natural gas and telecommunications services, respectively, through current facilities.
As these utilities will be extended within already disturbed areas, the impacts are considered less than
significant.

8 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

9 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts that related to the
relocation or construction of new or expanded infrastructure beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR.
Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this
impact.

10 **Mitigation Program**

11 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

12 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

13 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.16.

14 **IMPACT 4.16-2 (WATER SUPPLY)**

15 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

16 The Project construction will necessitate a temporary water demand of approximately 3,020 gallons per
acre per day for purposes such as dust control, based on energy assessment calculations. However, the
17 operational phase of the Project is projected to decrease previously analyzed overall water demand for
Planning Areas 123, 126, and 133 from 140 AFY (Acre-Feet per Year) to 131 AFY, as demonstrated in the
2016 RSPA analysis and the comparison detailed in Table 4.16-3. This decrease results from the proposed
rezone and updated water usage projections, which align with the methodologies used in the 2016 RSPA.

18 Based on existing zoning designations of the 2016 RSPA and assuming full buildout of the project site, the
19 City's General Plan EIR confirms that adequate water supplies are available to serve the project, even
20 under conditions of normal, dry, and multiple dry years, without requiring a project-specific water supply
assessment. Future developments, specifically within Planning Area 123, would be evaluated on a project-
21 specific level in accordance with CEQA, as applicable. Consequently, considering the adequate provision
22 of water supplies and the decrease in long-term water demand, the impacts associated with water supply
are less than significant.

23 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

24 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to water supplies beyond
those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no
mitigation measures are required for this impact.

1

2

3 **Mitigation Program**

4 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

5 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

6 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.16.

7 **IMPACT 4.16-3 (WASTEWATER TREATMENT CAPACITY)**

8 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

9 The Project's wastewater treatment provider is anticipated to have adequate capacity to treat the
10 projected demand. Projected wastewater treatment demand associated with the Project accounts for a
11 minimal increase in relation to the City's 7 to 8 mgd of sewage and remaining treatment capacity. As such,
12 existing wastewater facilities have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and the Project is anticipated
13 to cause a less than significant impact on services provided by the wastewater service provider.
14 Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects
15 related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as
16 applicable.

17 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

18 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding wastewater
19 treatment demand beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
20 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

21 **Mitigation Program**

22 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

23 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

24 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.16.

25 **IMPACT 4.16-4: (SOLID WASTE CAPACITY)**

26 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

27 It was determined that the Project's solid waste disposal needs could be accommodated at the Mid-Valley
28 Sanitary Landfill. A minimum of 50 percent of the Project's construction waste would be diverted from
the landfill in accordance with applicable requirements, and the non-salvaged construction and demolition
waste associated with Project construction would be accommodated within existing landfill capacity.
Operational activities would also be subject to compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local
statutes and regulations for solid waste, including those identified under CALGreen and AB 939. The
Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient remaining permitted capacity to accommodate the
Project's solid waste disposal needs. The Project would result in less than significant impacts concerning
solid waste, and no mitigation is required. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a part of
the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a project-
specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

29 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts regarding solid waste
4 generation beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

5 **Mitigation Program**

6 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

7 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.16.

9 **IMPACT 4.16-5 (SOLID WASTE REGULATIONS)**

10 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

11 The Project would comply with applicable local, State, and federal regulations regarding solid waste, such
12 as AB 939, the Solid Waste Disposal Management Act, and the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling
13 Access Act. Solid waste services would be provided to the Project without significantly impacting existing
14 and planned development within the City and County. Additionally, development of Planning Area 123 is
15 not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would
16 be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts associated with
17 compliance with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to
18 solid waste would be less than significant.

19 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

20 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with
21 established solid waste policies beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts
22 are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

23 **Mitigation Program**

24 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

25 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.16.

27 **4.17 WILDFIRE (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 5.4)**

28 **IMPACT 5.4-14 (IMPAIR AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN)**

29 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

30 The City's Emergency Operations Plan provides comprehensive policy and guidance for emergency and
31 response operations. Ayala Drive, Linden Avenue, and Miro Way are not designated evacuation routes for
32 the City. Project construction would not require the full closure of existing roadways. Emergency access
33 to the project site would be provided via the four proposed driveways to provide site access to emergency
34 personnel and vehicles during Project operation. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed as a
35 part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on a
36 project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

1
2
3 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

4 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate impacts to established emergency response or
5 evacuation plans beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

6 **Mitigation Program**

7 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

9 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

10 **IMPACT 5.4-15 (EXACERBATE WILDFIRE RISKS)**

11 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

12 The project site is not located in or near an SRA and does not contain lands classified as VHFHSZs. Because
13 the site is located within an urbanized area, it would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose Project
14 occupants to pollutant concentrations of the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Therefore, impacts would
15 be less than significant.

16 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

17 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate wildfire impacts beyond those concluded in the
18 Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are
19 required for this impact.

20 **Mitigation Program**

21 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

22 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

23 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

24 **IMPACT 5.4-16 (INSTALLATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE THAT MAY
EXACERBATE FIRE RISK)**

25 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

26 Project implementation would comply with the applicable requirements of the California Fire Code. The
27 Project does not include components that would exacerbate wildfire risk. Development of Planning Area
28 123 is not proposed as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123
would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be
less than significant.

29 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

30 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial wildfire impacts due to the
31 installation of infrastructure beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
32 anticipated. Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

1

2

3 **Mitigation Program**

4 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

5 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

6 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

7 **IMPACT 5.4-17 (POST-FIRE CONDITIONS RESULTING IN FLOODING OR
LANDSLIDES)**

8 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

9 The project site consists of vacant, previously disturbed land. Because the project site is located within an
10 urbanized portion of the City, it would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of
runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Development of Planning Area 123 is not proposed
as a part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123 would be evaluated on
a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable. Impacts would be less than significant.

11 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

12 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial post-fire flooding or landslide
impacts beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.
Consequently, no mitigation measures are required for this impact.

13 **Mitigation Program**

14 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

15 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

16 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.4.

1

2

3 **5.0 FINDINGS REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT**

4 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CAN BE MITIGATED TO A**

5 **LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

6 The City finds, based upon the threshold criteria for significance presented in the Draft SEIR, that all
7 potentially significant environmental effects of the Project can be avoided or reduced to insignificance
8 with feasible mitigation measures identified in the Draft SEIR. No substantial evidence has been submitted
9 to or identified by the City that indicates that the following impacts would, in fact, occur at levels that
10 would necessitate a determination of significance.

11 **5.1 AIR QUALITY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.2)**

12 **IMPACT 4.2-1 (AIR QUALITY PLAN)**

13 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

14 The Project is within the SCAB under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD, which is required by the FCAA to
15 reduce nonattainment pollutant emissions through AQMPs. The first criterion for determining consistency
16 with the AQMPs is that the Project will not worsen air quality violations or hinder timely air quality
17 standard attainment. The Project's construction and operational emissions, with mitigations, will not
18 exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Hence, the Project would not contribute to an existing air quality violation
19 and meets the first criterion. The second criterion is that the Project will not exceed the assumptions in
20 the AQMP or increments based on the years of the Project build-out phase. Concerning the second
21 criterion, the Project aligns with SCAG's growth forecasts and local general plans, as it proposes an
22 industrial warehouse use in accordance with the Specific Plan. The Project will generate approximately
23 154 jobs, representing a small fraction of the City's anticipated employment growth by 2050, thus aligning
24 with employment projections and not requiring new housing development. The Project's compliance with
25 regional air quality plans and local growth forecasts minimizes conflict with or obstruct the
26 implementation of AQMPs. Therefore, impacts are deemed less than significant with mitigation measures
27 incorporated.

28 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with
2 established air quality plans beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
3 anticipated with implementation of **MM AIR-1** through **MM AIR-7** of Project Mitigation Measures and
4 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures **AQ-4** through **AQ-13**.

5 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in *Section 4.2, Air Quality* of the Draft SEIR,
6 which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made
7 binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant
8 impacts to less than significant.

9 **Mitigation Program**

10 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:**

1

2

3 **AQ-4** Off-Road Diesel Equipment. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant
4 shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence
5 that off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower will meet
6 the Tier 4 emission standards, where feasible. In addition, where feasible all construction
7 equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified
8 by the Air Resources Board (ARB). Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall
9 achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel
10 emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by ARB regulations.

11 **AQ-5** Construction Equipment Tier Specification. Prior to the mobilization of each applicable off-
12 road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower, the Project applicant
13 shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, a copy of the certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technology (BACT)
14 documentation, and Air Resources Board or South Coast Air Quality Management District's
15 operating permit for each shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit
16 of equipment.

17 **AQ-6** Truck Building Access. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant shall
18 submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that
19 the following truck access routes have been incorporated into the Project design, to the
20 maximum extent practicable, to reduce air quality and potential future health risk impacts
21 from the operation phases of the proposed Project:

22

- 23 ▪ Design warehouse/distribution centers such that entrances and exits discourage that
24 trucks from traversing past neighbors or other sensitive receptors.
- 25 ▪ Design warehouse/distribution centers such that any check-in point for trucks is well
26 inside the facility property to ensure that there are no trucks queuing outside of the
27 facility.
- 28 ▪ Establish area(s) within the facility for repair needs.
- 29 ▪ Provide electrical service capacity for equipment at facilities.

30 **AQ-7** Truck Routes. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit,
31 to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that the
32 following truck access routes have been incorporated into the Project design, to the maximum
33 extent practicable, to reduce air quality and potential future health risk impacts from the
34 operation phase of the proposed Project, if feasible:

35

- 36 ▪ Develop, adopt and enforce truck routes both for entering and leaving the city and in and
37 out of facilities; keeping in mind common pedestrian routes, especially for schools.
- 38 ▪ Have truck routes clearly marked with trailblazer signs, so trucks will not enter residential
39 areas.

1

2

3 ▪ Identify or develop secure locations outside of residential neighborhoods where truckers
4 that live in the community can park their truck, such as a Park & Ride.

5 ▪ Where there are traffic impacts, improve traffic flow by signal synchronization.

6 **AQ-8** Super-Compliant VOC Paints. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project
7 applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division,
8 evidence that the construction contractor shall be required to utilize Super-Compliant VOC
9 paints, which are defined by SCAQMD as meeting the "super-compliant" VOC standard of 10
10 grams per liter (g/L). Use of HVLP or electrostatic spray equipment shall be encouraged.

11 **AQ-9** Exterior and Interior Finishes. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project
12 applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division,
13 evidence that exterior and interior finishes that do not require painting shall be used where
14 feasible.

15 **AQ-10** Building Orientation. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall
16 submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that
17 buildings have been oriented and incorporate landscaping to maximize passive solar; heating
18 during cool seasons, and minimize solar heat gain during hot seasons where feasible
19 depending upon site condition and topography.

20 **AQ-12** Energy Efficiency Education. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project
21 applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division,
22 evidence that building tenants shall be encouraged to educate employees on energy
23 efficiency measures.

24 **AQ-13** Preferential Parking Spaces. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project
25 applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division,
26 evidence that preferential parking spaces shall be offered to car pools and van pools.

27 **AQ-14** Electrical Hookup Capacity. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant
28 shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence
29 that building designs provide electrical capacity for installation of electrical hookups at onsite
30 loading docks and for electric vehicle charging stations.

31 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

32 **AIR-1** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan
33 specifies all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower
34 shall meet California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or
35 incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS). Requirements for
36 Tier 4 Final equipment and the option for Level 3 VDECS shall be included in applicable bid
37 documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such
38 equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation
39 (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating
40 permit (if applicable) shall be maintained on site and available upon request.

1
2
3 AIR-2 Prior to issuance of tenant occupancy permits, the tenant/facility operator shall prepare and
4 submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that
5 would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of
6 trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited
7 to the following:

- 8 ▪ Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate
9 residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options.
- 10 ▪ Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees,
11 self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site.
- 12 ▪ Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the
13 automobile parking spaces provided.
- 14 ▪ Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities as part of
15 the tenant improvements.
- 16 ▪ Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a
17 vehicle.
- 18 ▪ Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and
19 administrative support, such as ride-matching service.
- 20 ▪ Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential
21 load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users.
- 22 ▪ Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal
23 destinations.
- 24 ▪ Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient
25 vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces.

26 This mitigation measure applies only to tenant occupancy and not the building shell approvals.

27 AIR-3 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Planning Department shall confirm that the
28 Project is designed to include the following:

- 29 ▪ The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may
30 be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric vehicle (EV) truck
31 charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to
32 tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the Project
33 Applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating
34 the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes
35 commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered
36 engines.

1
2
3 AIR-4 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall confirm
4 that truck exit driveway signs provide directional information to the truck route and that all
5 truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that
6 identifies that:

- 7 ▪ Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use.
- 8 ▪ Truck drivers shall shut down the engine after two minutes of continuous idling operation.
Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking
brake is engaged.
- 9 ▪ Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.
- 10 ▪ Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the
California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a
good neighbor by not parking in residential areas.

11 This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell
12 approvals.

13 AIR-5 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall confirm
14 that the tenant has been provided with information about Carl Moyer Program and that
15 compliance with the voluntary program including energy efficiency improvement features for
16 vendor trucks for the industrial buildings through the Carl Moyer Program—including truck
17 modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires—to reduce
18 fuel consumption but strongly encouraged. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant
19 improvements and not the building shell approvals.

20 AIR-6 Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Tenant Improvements, not building shell,
21 the Project tenants shall train staff on vehicle records in diesel technologies requirements and
22 compliance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations, by attending CARB-
23 approved courses. Facility operators shall maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance
24 and make records available for inspection by the City of Rialto, South Coast Air Quality
Management District, and State upon request.

25 AIR-7 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, and not building shell, the Planning
26 Department shall confirm that the Project plans and specifications show the following:

- 27 ▪ All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet
jacks, and forklifts) are zero emission/powered by electricity. Each building shall include
28 the necessary charging stations for cargo handling equipment. Note that SCAQMD Rule
2305 (Warehouse Indirect Source Rule) Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce
Emissions (WAIRE) points may be earned for electric/zero emission yard truck/hostler
usage. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building
shell approvals.

- All standard emergency generators shall meet California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final emissions standards. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification) and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.2.

IMPACT 4.2-2 (CRITERIA POLLUTANTS)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

Construction associated with the Project would generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. 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. The Project's unmitigated construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD's standards for ROG. However, mitigated construction emissions for all criteria air pollutants would remain below the thresholds. The Project would implement mitigation measures which require the use of Tier 4 construction equipment and "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints. With implementation of mitigation, criteria pollutant construction emissions would be below their respective thresholds and construction impacts would be less than significant.

The Project's operational emissions would be associated with area sources (e.g. landscape maintenance equipment, architectural coatings, etc.), energy sources, mobile sources (i.e., motor vehicle use), and off-road equipment. Primary sources of operational criteria pollutants are from motor vehicle use and area sources. Unmitigated operational (i.e., area, energy, mobile, off-road, and emergency generators) emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for all criteria pollutants, with the exception of nitrogen oxide (NO_x). Emissions from motor vehicles are controlled by State and federal standards and the Project has no control over these standards. However, mitigation measures have been included to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible and to below the SCAQMD thresholds. Operational impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to a net increase in criteria pollutants beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of Mitigation Measures **AQ-4** through **AQ-10**, and **AQ-12** through **AQ-14** are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, and Laws, Ordinances, and Regulations **AQ-1** through **AQ-7**, which are set forth in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft SEIR.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.2, Air Quality** of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measures **AQ-4** through **AQ-10**, and **AQ-12** through **AQ-14** are discussed under Impact 4.2-1.

1
2
3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** Further details regarding **MM AIR-2** through **MM AIR-7** are discussed
under Impact 4.2-1, above.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.2.

5 **IMPACT 4.2-3 (SENSITIVE RECEPTORS)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

7 The construction activities for the proposed Project are expected to generate short-term emissions of
8 criteria air pollutants, including NO_x, carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and
9 reactive organic gases (ROG). The nearest sensitive receptors are single-family residences located
10 approximately 520 feet to the south. The Project's construction and operational emissions were estimated
11 using the CalEEMod program and compared against SCAQMD's Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs).
12 The analysis determined that the maximum daily emissions during construction and operations would not
13 exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, indicating a less than significant impact on nearby sensitive receptors
14 after applying standard rules and controls for dust minimization and with the incorporation of mitigation
measures.

15 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

16 The City hereby finds that the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant
17 concentrations beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated
18 with implementation of **MM AIR-1** through **MM AIR-7** of the Project's Mitigation Measures and **AQ-4** of
the 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** Further details regarding
Mitigation Measure **AQ-4** are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, above.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** Further details regarding **MM AIR-1** and **MM AIR-7** are discussed under
Impact 4.2-1, above. Further details regarding 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measure **MM AQ-4** and **MM AIR-7**
22 are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, above.

23 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.2.

24 **5.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.3)**

25 **IMPACT 4.3-1 (SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES)**

26 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

27 No federally or State threatened or endangered plant species or other special-status plant species were
28 observed during the field survey of the project site, and none have a moderate or high potential to occur
within the project site due to the relatively disturbed nature of the site.

29 Crotch's bumble bee, a State candidate for listing under the CESA, has a low-to-moderate potential to
30 occur within the project site and may be impacted by Project implementation. Project impacts would be
31 reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of **MM BIO-2A** through **MM BIO-2D**, which
32 require nesting surveys prior to ground disturbing activities, implementation of non-disturbance buffer

1
2
3 areas surrounding any identified nesting sites, a focused survey within one year prior to ground disturbing
activities, and on-site revegetation with suitable nectar sources.

4 Burrowing owl is currently a candidate species under the CESA as of October 10, 2024. The project site
5 has high potential to support burrowing owl. To reduce potentially significant impacts to burrowing owl,
6 as described in Mitigation Measure (MM) **BIO-3A**, prior to Project construction, construction workers shall
7 complete training with instructions on how to be aware of and identify burrowing owls and the Project
would require pre-construction surveys to determine the presence of burrowing owls within and adjacent
8 to the project site (**MM BIO-3B**). A qualified biologist shall perform monitoring during all construction
activities to ensure avoidance of impacts to burrowing owl (**MM BIO-3B**).

9 Impacts to both the California horned lark and Loggerhead shrike could occur through loss of suitable
10 foraging habitat in proximity to the project site and Project construction activities that could result in
11 direct impacts on nesting California horned lark and loggerhead shrike, if nests are present. To reduce
12 potential direct impacts to these species, an updated potential to occur assessment would be conducted
13 to assess the potential for special-status avian species to occur on the project site prior to construction
14 activities (**MM BIO-1A**) and a 100%-coverage pre-construction wildlife survey would be conducted at least
15 one week prior to ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal (**MM BIO-1B**). If deemed necessary
16 based on the results of the pre-construction survey, additional avoidance and minimization measures
17 would be developed to protect sensitive wildlife species, including California horned lark and loggerhead
18 shrike (**MM BIO-1C**). Further, vegetation trimming and removal, grading, and other construction activities
19 within suitable nesting habitat would occur outside of breeding season (February 15 through August 31)
20 and pre-construction surveys would be conducted three days prior to any disturbance of the project site
21 (**MM BIO-4A**). In the event either species are documented on-site, no-work exclusion buffers would be
22 established and maintained around each active nest (**MM BIO-4B**).

23 The coastal whiptail and coast horned lizard have a moderate potential to occur within the project site.
24 Potential direct impacts to these species could occur during vegetation clearing, grading, and other
25 construction activities. The Project would implement mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant
26 impacts to these species including conducting an updated potential to occur assessment on the project
27 site prior to construction activities (**MM BIO-1A**) and a 100%-coverage pre-construction wildlife survey to
28 be conducted at least one week prior to ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal (**MM BIO-1B**).
If deemed necessary based on the results of the pre-construction survey, additional avoidance and
minimization measures would be developed to protect coastal whiptail and coast horned lizard, including
relocation to nearby suitable habitat by a qualified biologist under the appropriate permits and
authorizations from relevant wildlife agencies (**MM BIO-1C**). Prior to ground disturbing activities, a
biologist would walk through habitat to be imminently removed to flush any coastal whiptail or coast
horned lizard that may be present, from the project site (**MM BIO-1D**) and all limits of works would be
clearly demarcated (**MM BIO-1K**). Speed limits would be set and enforced to minimize risk of vehicle
collisions with the species (**MM BIO-1E**). Any holes and trenches excavated during Project construction
would be covered or equipped with escape ramps to prevent entrapment of the species (**MM BIO-1E**).
Pets, which could harass, injure, or kill the species, would be prohibited from the project site (**MM BIO-1I**)
and all trash would be properly stored and disposed of to avoid attracting predators of the species to
the project site (**MM BIO-1J**).

With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM BIO-1A to MM BIO-1K, MM BIO-2A to MM BIO-2D, MM BIO-3A to MM BIO-3B, and MM BIO-4A to MM BIO-4B**, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a), the City hereby finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant effect on the environment to below a level of significance with mitigation measures **MM BIO-1A to MM BIO-1K, MM BIO-2A to MM BIO-2D, MM BIO-3A to MM BIO-3B, and MM BIO-4A to MM BIO-4B**.

Mitigation Measures: Based upon the analysis presented in *Section 4.3, Biological Resources* of the Draft SEIR, and updated in the Final SEIR, both of which are incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures:

BIO-1A Prior to project construction activities, an updated potential to occur assessment shall be completed. Species to be addressed shall include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380) for which suitable habitat is present within or adjacent to the project site. If deemed necessary, pre-construction species-specific surveys, completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, shall be conducted. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures shall follow CDFW and USFWS guidance, where applicable.

BIO-1B Prior to the start of project construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a comprehensive pre-construction wildlife survey. This survey must be completed within one week before any ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal begins. The survey shall include 100% coverage of the project site, as well as a 100-foot buffer zone surrounding the site to identify and document any wildlife species present in adjacent areas. All species observed during the survey shall be recorded and mapped accordingly.

BIO-1C If necessary, appropriate avoidance and minimization measures shall be developed to protect sensitive wildlife species identified during the pre-construction survey. These measures may include establishing species-specific no-disturbance buffer zones. If wildlife is observed within the project footprint and cannot be avoided, individuals may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the impact area by a qualified biologist. All relocations shall be conducted under the appropriate permits and authorizations from relevant wildlife agencies.

BIO-1D A biologist shall flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species), with the exception of burrowing owl, from suitable habitat areas within the Project development footprint to the maximum extent practicable immediately (e.g., within 24 hours) prior to

1
2
3 initial vegetation removal activities. The biologist shall flush wildlife by walking through
4 habitat to be immediately removed and towards adjacent remaining suitable habitat.
5
6

7 **BIO-1E** Construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads adjacent to the
8 project site or the right-of-way accessing the project site.
9
10

11 **BIO-1F** The Project applicant, or its contractors, shall screen, cover, or elevate at least one (1) foot
12 above ground, all construction pipe, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of three
13 (3) inches or greater that are stored on-site overnight. The pipes, culverts, and similar
14 structures shall be inspected by the Project biologist for wildlife before such material is
15 moved, buried, or capped.
16

17 **BIO-1G** Construction activities shall occur during daytime hours to the greatest extent feasible. If
18 construction must occur at nighttime, lights shall be oriented in such a way that they direct
19 light downward and toward the active construction, ensuring that no direct light is emitted
20 towards adjacent lands, and shields or deflectors shall be installed on lights to reduce light
21 spill. Nighttime concrete pouring shall be performed in accordance with the City of Rialto
22 Municipal Code.
23

24 **BIO-1H** At the end of each workday during construction, the Project applicant, or its contractors, will
25 cover all excavated, steep-sided holes or trenches more than eight inches deep and that have
26 sidewalls steeper than 1:1 (45 degree) slope with plywood or similar materials, or provide a
27 minimum of one escape ramp per 100 feet of trenching (with slopes no greater than 3:1)
28 constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. The Project biologist shall thoroughly inspect holes
and trenched for trapped animals during biological monitoring.
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **BIO-1I** Contractors shall not permit pets on the construction site.
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **BIO-1J** If trash and debris need to be stored overnight during maintenance activities, fully covered
2 trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof shall be used by the maintenance
3 contractor to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other
4 miscellaneous trash. Alternatively, standard trash receptacles may be used during the day,
5 but shall be removed or emptied each night.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **BIO-1K** To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of work, the construction limits
2 shall be clearly demarcated (e.g., installation of flagging or temporary visibility construction
3 fence) prior to ground-disturbance activities, and all construction activities, including
4 equipment staging and maintenance, shall be conducted within the marked disturbance
5 limits. The work limit delineation shall be maintained throughout Project construction.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **BIO-2A** If Crotch's bumble bee is no longer a candidate or listed species under CESA at the time of
2 project construction, then these mitigation measures shall not be required. Within one year
3 prior to ground disturbing activities, an approved qualified designated biologist shall conduct
4 active Crotch's bumble bee nest surveys during the typical colony active period (April –
5 August) following survey guidelines provided in the CDFW's Survey Considerations for CESA
6 Candidate Bumble Bee Species within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site
7 where suitable habitat exists. The qualified biologist shall be familiar with Crotch's bumble
8 bee identification and life history. Survey results including negative findings shall be
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3 submitted to CDFW at least 30 days prior to vegetation removal and/or ground disturbing
4 activities.

5
6
7
8
BIO-2B If suspected or active Crotch's bumble bee nests are present, a qualified biologist shall
9 establish an appropriate non-disturbance buffer around each nest immediately prior to
10 initiation of construction activities using stakes and/or brightly colored flagging to avoid
11 disturbance or incidental take of the species. If avoidance buffers are not feasible, or if
12 complete avoidance of Crotch's bumble bee cannot be achieved, Project activities with the
13 potential to impact Crotch's bumble bee shall be postponed until appropriate authorization
14 (i.e., a finalized CESA ITP under Fish and Game Code section 2081) is obtained during
15 construction activities, then CDFW shall be consulted.

16
17
18
BIO-2C Within one year prior to ground disturbing activities, the approved designated biologist shall
19 survey suitable nectar plants for foraging Crotch's bumble bee during the typical flight season
20 (February – October), within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site where
21 suitable habitat exists, following survey guidelines provided in the CDFW's Survey
22 Considerations for CESA Candidate Bumble Bee Species. The qualified biologist shall be
23 familiar with Crotch's bumble bee identification and life history. Survey results including
24 negative findings shall be submitted to CDFW at least 30 days prior to vegetation removal
25 and/or ground disturbing activities.

26
27
28
BIO-2D If occupied foraging habitat for Crotch's bumble bee is present within project impact areas, a
1 Revetation Plan shall be prepared which includes native shrubs and native seed mixes that
2 contain known nectar sources for Crotch's bumble bee. The Revetation Plan shall be
3 developed in consultation with a qualified Crotch's bumble bee biologist and implemented
4 following Project construction.

5
6
7
8
BIO-3A Prior to initial ground disturbing activities, a Worker Environmental Awareness Program
9 (WEAP) shall be prepared, which will include a training presentation and key fact sheet. The
10 training will instruct construction crews to be aware of and recognize burrowing owls and
11 other sensitive biological resources that may be encountered within, or adjacent to, the
12 project. The training will provide workers with instructions to follow in the event a burrowing
13 owl is observed or suspected to be on site.

14
15
16
17
18
19 Biologists shall provide WEAP training materials, including but not limited to the key fact
20 sheet, to construction personnel before their commencement of work on the project.
21 Additionally, all construction staff shall attend the WEAP training presentation prior to
22 beginning work on site. A refresher WEAP training will be completed on an annual basis
23 thereafter. Note that the fact sheet shall be provided in other languages, as necessary, to
24 accommodate non-English speaking workers.

25
26
27
28
Upon completion of the WEAP training, each member of the construction crew shall sign a
1 form stating that they attended the training, understood the information presented, and
2 agreed to comply with the requirements set out in the WEAP training. On an annual basis, the
3 project proponent shall certify that WEAP training has been provided to all construction
4 personnel. Biologists shall provide updates relevant to the training to construction personnel
5 during the safety ("tailgate") meetings, as needed.

1
2
3 **BIO-3B** Suitable burrowing owl habitat and burrowing owl presence has been confirmed on the site;
4 therefore, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, familiar
5 and experienced in burrowing owls, in accordance with the CDFW BUOW Guidelines (2012 or
most recent version) prior to vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities for all phases
of project construction and surrounding 500 foot radius.

6 Take avoidance surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to initiation of project-
7 related activities. Burrowing owls may re-colonize a site after only a few days. Time lapses
8 between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not
limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance, in accordance
with the CDFW BUOW Guidelines (2012 or most recent version). Upon beginning ground-
disturbing activities or vegetation removal, a biologist shall be on hand to perform monitoring
during all construction activities every day to ensure no impacts occur to burrowing owls as a
result of the project.

9
10 Should burrowing owls, active burrows, or signs thereof be confirmed during any survey or
11 biological monitoring, Project activities with the potential to impact burrowing owl shall be
12 immediately halted. The qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and prepare a
13 Burrowing Owl Plan that shall be submitted to CDFW for review and approval prior to
14 commencing Project activities. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall describe proposed avoidance,
15 and monitoring actions. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall include the number and location of
16 occupied burrow sites, acres of burrowing owl habitat that will be impacted, details of site
17 monitoring, and details on proposed buffers and other avoidance measure if avoidance is
18 proposed. Project activities with the potential to impact burrowing owl shall not occur within
19 1,000 feet of an active burrow until CDFW approves the Burrowing Owl Plan.

20 If Project activities, including burrow exclusion and closure, could result in take of burrowing
21 owl, the project proponent shall begin early coordination with CDFW for appropriate CESA
22 authorization (i.e., ITP under CFGC section 2081) prior to commencement of Project activities.
23 The ITP shall describe, at a minimum, Project activities and equipment, proposed
24 avoidance/buffers, temporary and permanent impacts, monitoring, relocation and/or
25 translocation, and minimization and compensatory mitigation actions. ITP compensatory
mitigation will be fulfilled by one or more of following options: 1) Conservation or Mitigation
Bank credits (if available) 2) Mitigation Credit Agreements 3) Permittee-responsible
mitigation land acquisition.

26 **BIO-4A** To ensure compliance with CFGC sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 and to avoid potential
27 impacts to nesting birds, vegetation clearing and ground-disturbing activities shall be
28 conducted outside of the bird nesting season (generally February 15 through August 31).
Regardless of the time of year, a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey within
three (3) days prior to any disturbance of the site, including but not limited to vegetation
clearing, disking, demolition activities, and grading.

BIO-4B If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests
depending on the level of activity within the buffer and species observed, and the buffer areas
shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied, and the juvenile birds can survive
independently from the nests. During construction activities, the qualified biologist shall

1
2
3 continue biological monitoring activities at a frequency recommended by the qualified
4 biologist using their best professional judgment. If nesting birds are documented, avoidance
5 and minimization measures may be adjusted, and construction activities stopped or
6 redirected by the qualified biologist using their best professional judgement to avoid take of
7 nesting birds. If nesting birds are not documented during the preconstruction survey,
8 adherence to additional measures may not be necessary to avoid impacts to nesting birds.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3 and Final SEIR Section 3.2.

IMPACT 4.3-4 (MOVEMENT OF MIGRATORY FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The proposed Project has the potential to impact active bird nests if vegetation is removed or ground disturbing activities are initiated during the nesting season. The disturbed habitat and disturbed Riversidean sage scrub within the project site have the potential to support avian nests and impacts on nesting birds are prohibited by the MBTA and CFGC Section 3503. To avoid potential direct impacts on nesting birds, removal of suitable habitat would occur outside of the breeding season (**MM BIO-4A**), when feasible. Additionally, within three days prior to ground disturbance or construction activities, a qualified biologist would conduct a nesting bird survey (**MM BIO-4A**). If active nests are found, construction activities would be avoided in a buffer area around the nest until nestlings have fledged and the nest is determined to be inactive, a biologist would be retained to monitor nesting activity (**MM BIO-4B**). Additionally, the project site and surrounding area do not serve as a wildlife corridor.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established wildlife corridors beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM BIO-4A** and **BIO-4B**.

Mitigation Program

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required.

Project Mitigation Measures: **BIO-4A** and **BIO-4B**.

Supportive Evidence: Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3.

IMPACT 4.3-5 (ORDINANCES PROTECTING BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES)

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

The project site is located within the Burrowing Owl Overlay Zone. As such, focused surveys and preconstruction surveys for burrowing owl would be conducted to determine the presence or absence of burrowing owl within the project site prior to construction. The Project would result in less than significant impacts to burrowing owl with the implementation of **MM BIO-3A** to **MM BIO-3D**. With compliance with applicable mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Finding: The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

1
2
3 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts due to conflicts with local
4 policies or ordinances protecting biological resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than
5 significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM BIO-3A** through **BIO-3D**.

6 **Mitigation Program**

7 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

8 **Project Mitigation Measures:** **BIO-3A** through **BIO-3D**.

9 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.3.

10 **5.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.4)**

11 **IMPACT 4.4-1 (HISTORICAL RESOURCE)**

12 **IMPACT 4.4-2 (ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE)**

13 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

14 A records search revealed 26 previous studies within a one-mile radius of the project site, but none
15 included the project site itself. Twelve historic cultural resources were identified within this radius,
16 including refuse, buildings, structures, infrastructure, water conveyance features, and the Art Scholl
17 Municipal Airport, but none are on the project site. Historical imagery shows the site was used for
18 agriculture from 1938 to 2002, with structures appearing between 1980 and 1994, now demolished. No
19 prehistoric or historic archaeological resources were found during a pedestrian survey, indicating low
20 archaeological sensitivity. However, unknown resources might be unearthed during project
21 implementation. **MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-3** will be implemented, requiring suspension of work within
22 a 60-foot buffer of discoveries, evaluation by a qualified archaeologist, consultation with the YSMN, a
23 Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan, and compliance with State Health and Safety Code
24 Section 7050.5. These measures reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Development of Planning
25 Area 123 is not part of the Project, and future projects there will be evaluated on a project-specific level
26 in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

27 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

28 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts on historical resources or
29 archaeological resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are
30 anticipated with implementation of **MM CUL 1** through **MM CUL 3** of Project Mitigation Measures.

31 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.4, Cultural Resources** of the Draft
32 SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are
33 made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially
34 significant impacts to less than significant.

35 **Mitigation Program**

36 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

37 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

1

2

3 **CUL-1** In the event that archaeological or 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 other portions of the Project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in **MM TCR-1**, regarding any pre-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

4

5

6

7 **CUL-2** 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 (Plan), the drafts of which shall be provided to YSMN for review and comment, as detailed within **MM TCR-1**. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the Project and Implement the Plan accordingly.

8

9

10 **CUL-3** If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during 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 Section 7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the Project.

11

12

13 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.4.

14 **IMPACT 4.4-3 (HUMAN REMAINS)**

15 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

16 The project site is not located within a known or suspected cemetery and there are no known human remains within the project site. Despite the applicable regulatory framework and the relatively low likelihood of discovery, it remains possible that the Project could discover human remains during subsurface activities, which could then result in the remains being inadvertently damaged. To reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level, the Project would implement **MM CUL-3**. Compliance with existing laws and the protocols described in **MM CUL-3** would reduce potential impacts related to the discovery of human remains to a less than significant level.

17

18

19 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

20 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to human remains beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM CUL 3** of Project Mitigation Measures.

21

22 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of this mitigation measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

23

24 **Mitigation Program**

25 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

26

27

28

1
2
3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** Further details regarding **MM CUL-3** are included under Impact 4.4-2, above.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.4.

5 **5.4 ENERGY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.5)**

6 **IMPACT 4.5-1 (ENERGY CONSUMPTION)**

7 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

8 Construction of the Project would use approximately 0.0111 GWh of electricity, 23,531 gallons of gasoline, and 103,745 gallons of diesel. In 2022, San Bernardino County consumed 16,630 GWh of electricity, making the project's electricity use less than 0.0001 percent of the current county usage. For 2025, the county is projected to use approximately 828,612,797 gallons of gasoline and 281,399,849 gallons of diesel, with the project's construction fuel consumption constituting just 0.0028 percent of gasoline and 0.0369 percent of diesel usage. The project's energy use is in accordance with existing capacity and projected capacity of Southern California Edison (SCE), which is anticipated to sell 103,561 GWh of electricity in 2025. Compliance measures, such as state regulations for turning off equipment when not in use, adhering to the latest EPA and CARB standards, and air quality monitoring under SCAQMD guidelines maximize energy-efficient operations. Mitigation measures **MM GHG-1**, **MM GHG-2** and **MM AIR-2** will also reduce fuel, electricity, and natural gas consumption. The project's consumption in relation to existing county fuel usage is less than one percent, thus considered insignificant. The use of sustainable construction practices, including recycled materials, will further conserve energy. Operational energy consumption will be minimal due to ongoing conservation measures. The project will not affect local or regional energy supplies significantly and any future development in Planning Area 123 will undergo separate CEQA evaluation as applicable. Therefore, the project's potential energy impacts are less than significant

16 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

17 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to energy resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM GHG-1**, **MM GHG-2** and **MM AIR-2** of the Project Mitigation Measures.

18 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in Section 4.5, Energy of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are applicable.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** See Section 4.2, Air Quality, for further discussion on **MM AIR-2** and Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for further discussion on **MM GHG-1** and **MM GHG-2**.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.5.

1
2
3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** Further details regarding **MM CUL-3** are included under Impact 4.4-2, above.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.4.

5 **5.4 ENERGY (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.5)**

6 **IMPACT 4.5-1 (ENERGY CONSUMPTION)**

7 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

8 Construction of the Project would use approximately 0.0111 GWh of electricity, 23,531 gallons of gasoline, and 103,745 gallons of diesel. In 2022, San Bernardino County consumed 16,630 GWh of electricity, making the project's electricity use less than 0.0001 percent of the current county usage. For 2025, the county is projected to use approximately 828,612,797 gallons of gasoline and 281,399,849 gallons of diesel, with the project's construction fuel consumption constituting just 0.0028 percent of gasoline and 0.0369 percent of diesel usage. The project's energy use is in accordance with existing capacity and projected capacity of Southern California Edison (SCE), which is anticipated to sell 103,561 GWh of electricity in 2025. Compliance measures, such as state regulations for turning off equipment when not in use, adhering to the latest EPA and CARB standards, and air quality monitoring under SCAQMD guidelines maximize energy-efficient operations. Mitigation measures **MM GHG-1**, **MM GHG-2** and **MM AIR-2** will also reduce fuel, electricity, and natural gas consumption. The project's consumption in relation to existing county fuel usage is less than one percent, thus considered insignificant. The use of sustainable construction practices, including recycled materials, will further conserve energy. Operational energy consumption will be minimal due to ongoing conservation measures. The project will not affect local or regional energy supplies significantly and any future development in Planning Area 123 will undergo separate CEQA evaluation as applicable. Therefore, the project's potential energy impacts are less than significant

16 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

17 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to energy resources beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of **MM GHG-1**, **MM GHG-2** and **MM AIR-2** of the Project Mitigation Measures.

18 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in Section 4.5, Energy of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

19 **Mitigation Program**

20 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are applicable.

21 **Project Mitigation Measures:** See Section 4.2, Air Quality, for further discussion on **MM AIR-2** and Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for further discussion on **MM GHG-1** and **MM GHG-2**.

22 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.5.

1

2

3 **5.5 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.6)**

4 **IMPACT 4.6-2 (GHG EMISSION REDUCTION PLANS)**

5 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

6 The proposed Project would be consistent with the Rialto Climate Adaptation Plan, the CARB Scoping Plan,
7 and SCAG's RTP/SCS, and will adhere to existing regulations, including measures from the City's General
8 Plan. The Project would be directly affected by statewide compliance with future low carbon fuel standard
9 amendments and increasingly stringent Renewable Portfolio Standards, which would reduce the carbon
10 intensity of vehicle trips and energy consumption. As such, the Project would not conflict with any other
11 State-level regulations pertaining to GHGs. Approximately 90 percent of the Project's mitigated GHG
12 emissions come from energy and mobile sources, and these emissions will be further reduced by the 2022
13 Scoping Plan goals (e.g., 100 percent clean electricity by 2045, zero-emission vehicle sales by 2035, and
14 Advanced Clean Fleets regulation). Due to statewide measures and the implementation of cleaner
15 technology, vehicle emissions, which constitute around 80 percent of the Project's total emissions, are
16 expected to decline. SCAG's RTP/SCS aims to reduce per capita transportation emissions by 19 percent by
17 2035, supporting California's GHG reduction goals. While it is currently impossible to quantify emissions
18 savings from future regulatory measures, Project operations will benefit from these measures once
19 enacted. The Project will not hinder California's progress towards carbon neutrality by 2045 and will
20 comply with all relevant regulatory requirements under the 2022 Scoping Plan.

21 Mitigation measures include **MM AIR-2**, reducing mobile source emissions via a Transportation Demand
22 Management (TDM) program. Additional measures **MM GHG-3** and **MM GHG-4** require a 75 percent
23 diversion of waste from landfills and 100 percent electric landscape equipment, respectively. The Project
24 will not conflict with plans aimed at reducing GHG emissions, with impacts being less than significant.
25 Future development in Planning Area 123 will be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with
26 CEQA, as applicable.

27 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

28 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts beyond those concluded in
the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

29 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions** of
30 the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible
31 and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially
32 significant impacts to less than significant.

33 **Mitigation Program**

34 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are
35 applicable.

36 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

37 **MM AIR-2 through MM AIR-7** are set forth in Section 5.2, above, and further discussed in Section 4.2, *Air
38 Quality of the Draft SEIR*.

1
2
3 **GHG-1** Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Tenant Improvements, not building shell,
4 the Project shall install photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy
5 generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated
6 by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the
7 Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, anticipated to be approximately 4.62 kilowatt
8 hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot¹), as feasible, based on the maximum net roof area
9 available for solar (i.e., solar-ready zone). The solar-ready zone shall comply with Section
10 11.0.10 of the 2022 California Energy Code and shall comply with access, pathway, ventilation,
11 and spacing requirements, and exclude skylight area.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
With expected energy consumption at 4.62 kWh/sf, a PV panel array covering approximately
one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy
generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size requires approval by
Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements
for any facility connected to SCE's distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export,
the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site
export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to off-set consumption. If the Project
cannot generate enough renewable energy to cover 100 percent of the building load,
renewable energy may be acquired from the local utility.

This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell
approvals.

14 **GHG-2** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project applicant or successor in interest shall
15 provide documentation to the City demonstrating the following:

16

- 17 The Project shall be designed to meet or exceed CALGREEN Tier 2 standards in effect at
the time of building permit application in order to exceed 2022 Title 24 energy efficiency
standards by at least 15 percent.
- 18 The Project shall provide conduits to support electric charging stations per the Tier 2
standards in Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the 2022
CALGreen Code.

19 **GHG-3** The development shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of
20 certificate of tenant occupancy permits, a recyclables collection and load area shall be
constructed in compliance with City standards for recyclable collection and loading areas. This
mitigation measure applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals. The
diversion plan shall also comply with the established solid waste and recycling laws including
AB 939 and AB 341.

21 **GHG-4** Prior to the issuance of tenant occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that
22 tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all handheld landscaping
23 equipment used on-site shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This mitigation measure
24 applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals.

25
26
27
28
¹ The expected electricity demand is based on CalEEMod; refer to Appendix G.

1
2
3 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.6.

4 **5.6 NOISE (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.10)**

5 **IMPACT 4.10-1 (AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

7 Project construction would result in a temporary increase in noise levels in the Project vicinity. The nearest
8 sensitive receptors to the project site include the single-family residences located approximately 520 feet
9 to the south. As construction would occur up to the Project boundary line, construction activities would
10 occur as close as 520 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors. However, it is acknowledged that
11 construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the
12 point closest to the sensitive receptors. Construction noise levels would not exceed the FTA construction
13 thresholds used for purposes of analysis and remain well below the thresholds. Project construction noise
14 would be less than significant.

15 On-site operations would generate noise levels associated with sources such as mechanical equipment,
16 trucks, loading activities, parking areas, and off-site traffic. These noise levels would be below the City's
17 standards, and the noise impacts associated with on-site operations and off-site traffic would be less than
18 significant.

19 As discussed above, construction and operational noise impacts would be less than significant. However,
20 the Project would be subject to 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measures N-01 and N-02 to reduce construction
21 noise impacts. With the implementation of 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measures N-01 and N-02, impacts
22 would remain less than significant. Additionally, it should be noted that development of Planning Area
23 123 is not proposed as part of the Project. Future development projects related to Planning Area 123
24 would be evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

25 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

26 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to ambient noise levels
27 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with
28 implementation of **N-1** and **N-2** of the 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation
Measures.

29 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.10, Noise** of the Draft SEIR, which
30 is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are feasible and made binding
31 through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to
32 less than significant.

33 **Mitigation Program**

34 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:**

35 **N-1** Construction activities shall be limited to the City's allowable hours of construction activities
36 in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance.

37 **N-2** All Construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine
38 shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

1
2
3 **Project Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation is required.

4 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.10.

5 **IMPACT 4.10-2 (GROUND BORNE VIBRATION)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

7 Once operational, the proposed Project will not generate groundborne vibration. Any increases in
8 groundborne vibration will primarily occur during short-term construction activities, which could cause
9 human annoyance or building damage, particularly if vibration levels exceed 0.20 in/sec PPV, as per FTA
10 and Caltrans standards. Typical construction equipment, such as vibratory rollers and large bulldozers, can
11 generate vibration levels ranging from 0.034 to 2.348 in/sec PPV at distances of 5 feet. Since construction
12 activities are expected to occur up to the project boundary, nearby structures approximately 5 feet away
13 could experience vibrations exceeding structural damage (0.5 in/sec PPV) and human annoyance (0.4
14 in/sec PPV) criteria. Mitigation Measure **NOI-1**, which mandates a buffer distance for heavy equipment
15 operation near existing commercial buildings, will be implemented to maintain vibration impacts at less
16 than significant levels. Future development in Planning Area 123 will undergo project-specific CEQA
17 evaluation, as applicable. With implementation of MM **NOI-1**, the vibration impacts will be less than
18 significant.

19 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

20 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts groundborne vibration
21 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with
22 implementation of **MM NOI-1**.

23 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.10, Noise** of the Draft SEIR, which
24 is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measure is feasible and is made binding
25 through the MMRP. Imposition of this mitigation measure will reduce potentially significant impacts to
26 less than significant.

27 **Mitigation Program**

28 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are
29 applicable.

30 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

31 **NOI-1** The following measures shall be incorporated on all grading and building plans and
32 specifications subject to approval of the City's building and safety division prior to issuance of
33 a grading permit:

34 The developer shall ensure construction equipment will not approach the construction buffer
35 zone adjacent to the commercial building (i.e., 1348 West Baseline Road) along portions of
36 the Project southern and southwestern Project Boundary. The buffer zone shall be tiered
37 based on distances established in **Table 4.10-8**. As shown in **Table 4.10-8**, vibratory rollers
38 shall not operate within 17 feet of the commercial building; large bulldozers and loaded trucks
39 shall not operate within 10 feet of the commercial building; and jack hammers and small
40 bulldozers/ tractors shall not operate within 5 feet of the commercial building.

1
2
3 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.10.

4 **5.7 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.15)**

5 **IMPACT 4.15-1 (TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE)**

6 **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED**

7 The City of Rialto sent letters to those interested tribes that requested notification from projects occurring
8 within the City pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52. The following tribes were contacted: Agua Caliente Band
9 of Cahuilla Indians, Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Cahuilla
10 Band of Indians, Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, Gabrieleño Tongva Indians of California
11 Tribal Council, Gabrieleño Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council, Gabrieleño-Tongva Nation,
12 Gabrieleño-Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleño-Tongva Tribe, Los Coyotes Band of
13 Cahuilla and Cupeno Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Pala Band of Mission Indians, Pechanga
14 Band of Indians, Queechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Ramona Band of Cahuilla, Rincon Band of
15 Luiseno Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, Serrano Nation
16 of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, and Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla.

17 On November 14, 2022, a Query Letter was sent to tribal representatives who may have an interest in the
18 Project. The City received correspondence from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation in
19 response to the query letter requesting information on the lead agency. The consultation period ended
20 on December 2, 2024. The City attempted to engage with tribes that requested consultation and
21 additional Project details; however, response was only received by San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

22 No known or potential tribal cultural resources were identified by the NAHC SLF search or in response to
23 the query letters. Further, due to previous uses of the project site, it is unlikely tribal cultural resources
24 would occur on-site. The Project would implement **MM TCR-1** and **MM TCR-2** to reduce potential impacts
25 to tribal cultural resources.

26 **Finding:** The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

27 The City hereby finds that the Project would not generate substantial impacts to tribal cultural resources
28 beyond those concluded in the Draft SEIR. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with
29 implementation of the Mitigation Measures below.

30 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in *Section 4.15, Tribal and Cultural Resources*,
31 of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, the following Mitigation Measures are
32 feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will reduce
33 potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

34 **Mitigation Program**

35 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are
36 applicable.

37 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

38 **TCR-1** The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN) Cultural Management Department shall be
39 contacted, as detailed in **MM CUL-2**, of any pre-contact cultural resources discovered during
40 Project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as

1
2
3 to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be
4 deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a Cultural Resources
5 Monitoring and Treatment Plan (Plan) shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination
6 with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a
7 monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the Project, should YSMN
8 elect to place a monitor on-site.

9
10
11 **TCR-2** Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the Project (isolate
12 records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant
13 and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency, and/or applicant shall, in
14 good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the Project.

15 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.15.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1

2

3 **6.0 FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE**

4 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED**

5 **TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

6 **6.1 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (DRAFT SEIR SECTION 4.6)**

7 **IMPACT 4.6-1 (GHG EMISSIONS)**

8 **SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT**

9 The project's unmitigated GHG emissions are approximately 10,817 MTCO₂e annually, exceeding the
10 3,000 MTCO₂e per year threshold. The majority (55%) of these emissions are from non-construction
11 related mobile sources, which are controlled by State and Federal standards outside the project's control.
12 The project includes several mitigation measures listed below to reduce GHG emissions. Despite these
13 mitigation efforts, which reduce emissions to 7,039 MTCO₂e, the project's GHG emissions still exceed the
14 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold, rendering them significant and unavoidable. Most remaining emissions are due
15 to mobile sources, which are regulated by CARB through programs like the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and
16 various clean transportation regulations. Emissions of motor vehicles are controlled by State and Federal
17 standards, and neither the City nor the Project has control over these standards.

18 The Project will comply with all relevant laws and regulations, and implement mitigation measures;
19 however, additional reductions in mobile emissions are not feasible due to the limitations of municipal
20 control over these sources. California's broader legislative efforts (SB 375, SB 743, SB 32, SB 100, SB 1020,
21 SB 905, AB 1757) aim to further reduce emissions through control technology, VMT reductions, and
22 encouraging clean energy.

23 Development in Planning Area 123 is not part of the current project and future development will be
24 evaluated on a project-specific level in compliance with CEQA, as applicable.

25 **Mitigation Measures:** Based upon the analysis presented in **Section 4.2, Air Quality**, and **Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions** of the Draft SEIR, which is incorporated herein by reference, Mitigation Measures **MIM AIR-2** through **MM AIR-7**, listed above, and **MM GHG-1** through **MM GHG-4**, listed below, from the Project Mitigation Measures, are feasible and are made binding through the MMRP. Imposition of these mitigation measures will not reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. As such, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

26 **Mitigation Program**

27 **2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment SEIR Mitigation Measures**

28 No mitigation measures are applicable.

29 **Project Mitigation Measures:**

30 **GHG-1** Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Tenant Improvements, not building shell,
31 the Project shall install photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy
32 generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated
33 by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the

1
2
3 Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, anticipated to be approximately 4.62 kilowatt
4 hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot²), as feasible, based on the maximum net roof area
5 available for solar (i.e., solar-ready zone). The solar-ready zone shall comply with Section
6 110.10 of the 2022 California Energy Code and shall comply with access, pathway, ventilation,
7 and spacing requirements, and exclude skylight area.

8 With expected energy consumption at 4.62 kWh/sf, a PV panel array covering approximately
9 one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy
10 generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size requires approval by
11 Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements
12 for any facility connected to SCE's distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export,
13 the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site
14 export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to off-set consumption. If the Project
15 cannot generate enough renewable energy to cover 100 percent of the building load,
16 renewable energy may be acquired from the local utility.

17 This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell
18 approvals.

19 **GHG-2** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project applicant or successor in interest shall
20 provide documentation to the City demonstrating the following:

- 21 ▪ The Project shall be designed to meet or exceed CALGREEN Tier 2 standards in effect at
22 the time of building permit application in order to exceed 2022 Title 24 energy efficiency
23 standards by at least 15 percent.
- 24 ▪ The Project shall provide conduits to support electric charging stations per the Tier 2
25 standards in Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the 2022
26 CALGreen Code.

27 **GHG-3** The development shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of
28 certificate of tenant occupancy permits, a recyclables collection and load area shall be
constructed in compliance with City standards for recyclable collection and loading areas. This
mitigation measure applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals. The
diversion plan shall also comply with the established solid waste and recycling laws including
AB 939 and AB 341.

29 **GHG-4** Prior to the issuance of tenant occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that
30 tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all handheld landscaping
31 equipment used on-site shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This mitigation measure
32 applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals.

33 **Supportive Evidence:** Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 4.6.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
5550
5551
5552
5553
5554
5555
5556
5557
5558
5559
55510
55511
55512
55513
55514
55515
55516
55517
55518
55519
55520
55521
55522
55523
55524
55525
55526
55527
55528
55529
55530
55531
55532
55533
55534
55535
55536
55537
55538
55539
55540
55541
55542
55543
55544
55545
55546
55547
55548
55549
55550
55551
55552
55553
55554
55555
55556
55557
55558
55559
555510
555511
555512
555513
555514
555515
555516
555517
555518
555519
555520
555521
555522
555523
555524
555525
555526
555527
555528
555529
555530
555531
555532
555533
555534
555535
555536
555537
555538
555539
555540
555541
555542
555543
555544
555545
555546
555547
555548
555549
555550
555551
555552
555553
555554
555555
555556
555557
555558
555559
5555510
5555511
5555512
5555513
5555514
5555515
5555516
5555517
5555518
5555519
5555520
5555521
5555522
5555523
5555524
5555525
5555526
5555527
5555528
5555529
5555530
5555531
5555532
5555533
5555534
5555535
5555536
5555537
5555538
5555539
5555540
5555541
5555542
5555543
5555544
5555545
5555546
5555547
5555548
5555549
5555550
5555551
5555552
5555553
5555554
5555555
5555556
5555557
5555558
5555559
55555510
55555511
55555512
55555513
55555514
55555515
55555516
55555517
55555518
55555519
55555520
55555521
55555522
55555523
55555524
55555525
55555526
55555527
55555528
55555529
55555530
55555531
55555532
55555533
55555534
55555535
55555536
55555537
55555538
55555539
55555540
55555541
55555542
55555543
55555544
55555545
55555546
55555547
55555548
55555549
55555550
55555551
55555552
55555553
55555554
55555555
55555556
55555557
55555558
55555559
555555510
555555511
555555512
555555513
555555514
555555515
555555516
555555517
555555518
555555519
555555520
555555521
555555522
555555523
555555524
555555525
555555526
555555527
555555528
555555529
555555530
555555531
555555532
555555533
555555534
555555535
555555536
555555537
555555538
555555539
555555540
555555541
555555542
555555543
555555544
555555545
555555546
555555547
555555548
555555549
555555550
555555551
555555552
555555553
555555554
555555555
555555556
555555557
555555558
555555559
5555555510
5555555511
5555555512
5555555513
5555555514
5555555515
5555555516
5555555517
5555555518
5555555519
5555555520
5555555521
5555555522
5555555523
5555555524
5555555525
5555555526
5555555527
5555555528
5555555529
5555555530
5555555531
5555555532
5555555533
5555555534
5555555535
5555555536
5555555537
5555555538
5555555539
5555555540
5555555541
5555555542
5555555543
5555555544
5555555545
5555555546
5555555547
5555555548
5555555549
5555555550
5555555551
5555555552
5555555553
5555555554
5555555555
5555555556
5555555557
5555555558
5555555559
55555555510
55555555511
55555555512
55555555513
55555555514
55555555515
55555555516
55555555517
55555555518
55555555519
55555555520
55555555521
55555555522
55555555523
55555555524
55555555525
55555555526
55555555527
55555555528
55555555529
55555555530
55555555531
55555555532
55555555533
55555555534
55555555535
55555555536
55555555537
55555555538
55555555539
55555555540
55555555541
55555555542
55555555543
55555555544
55555555545
55555555546
55555555547
55555555548
55555555549
55555555550
55555555551
55555555552
55555555553
55555555554
55555555555
55555555556
55555555557
55555555558
55555555559
555555555510
555555555511
555555555512
555555555513
555555555514
555555555515
555555555516
555555555517
555555555518
555555555519
555555555520
555555555521
555555555522
555555555523
555555555524
555555555525
555555555526
555555555527
555555555528
555555555529
555555555530
555555555531
555555555532
555555555533
555555555534
555555555535
555555555536
555555555537
555555555538
555555555539
555555555540
555555555541
555555555542
555555555543
555555555544
555555555545
555555555546
555555555547
555555555548
555555555549
555555555550
555555555551
555555555552
555555555553
555555555554
555555555555
555555555556
555555555557
555555555558
555555555559
5555555555510
5555555555511
5555555555512
5555555555513
5555555555514
5555555555515
5555555555516
5555555555517
5555555555518
5555555555519
5555555555520
5555555555521
5555555555522
5555555555523
5555555555524
5555555555525
5555555555526
5555555555527
5555555555528
5555555555529
5555555555530
5555555555531
5555555555532
5555555555533
5555555555534
5555555555535
5555555555536
5555555555537
5555555555538
5555555555539
5555555555540
5555555555541
5555555555542
5555555555543
5555555555544
5555555555545
5555555555546
5555555555547
5555555555548
5555555555549
5555555555550
5555555555551
5555555555552
5555555555553
5555555555554
5555555555555
5555555555556
5555555555557
5555555555558
5555555555559
55555555555510
55555555555511
55555555555512
55555555555513
55555555555514
55555555555515
55555555555516
55555555555517
55555555555518
55555555555519
55555555555520
55555555555521
55555555555522
55555555555523
55555555555524
55555555555525
55555555555526
55555555555527
55555555555528
55555555555529
55555555555530
55555555555531
55555555555532
55555555555533
55555555555534
55555555555535
55555555555536
55555555555537
55555555555538
55555555555539
55555555555540
55555555555541
55555555555542
55555555555543
55555555555544
55555555555545
55555555555546
55555555555547
55555555555548
55555555555549
55555555555550
55555555555551
55555555555552
55555555555553
55555555555554
55555555555555
55555555555556
55555555555557
55555555555558
55555555555559
555555555555510
555555555555511
555555555555512
555555555555513
555555555555514
555555555555515
555555555555516
555555555555517
555555555555518
555555555555519
555555555555520
555555555555521
555555555555522
555555555555523
555555555555524
555555555555525
555555555555526
555555555555527
555555555555528
555555555555529
555555555555530
555555555555531
555555555555532
555555555555533
555555555555534
555555555555535
555555555555536
555555555555537
555555555555538
555555555555539
555555555555540
555555555555541
555555555555542
555555555555543
555555555555544
555555555555545
555555555555546
555555555555547
555555555555548
555555555555549
555555555555550
555555555555551
555555555555552
555555555555553
555555555555554
555555555555555
555555555555556
555555555555557
555555555555558
555555555555559
5555555555555510
5555555555555511
5555555555555512
5555555555555513
5555555555555514
5555555555555515
5555555555555516
5555555555555517
5555555555555518
5555555555555519
5555555555555520
5555555555555521
5555555555555522
5555555555555523
5555555555555524
5555555555555525
5555555555555526
5555555555555527
5555555555555528
5555555555555529
5555555555555530
5555555555555531
5555555555555532
5555555555555533
5555555555555534
5555555555555535
5555555555555536
5555555555555537
5555555555555538
5555555555555539
5555555555555540
5555555555555541
5555555555555542
5555555555555543
5555555555555544
5555555555555545
5555555555555546
5555555555555547
5555555555555548
5555555555555549
5555555555555550
5555555555555551
5555555555555552
5555555555555553
5555555555555554
5555555555555555
5555555555555556
5555555555555557
5555555555555558
5555555555555559
55555555555555510
5555555

3 7.0 FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

4 CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e) requires that an EIR:

5 "Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population
6 growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the
7 surrounding environment."

8 Under State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(e), a project would be considered to have a growth-
9 inducing effect if it would result in any of the following effects:

- 10 ▪ Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional
11 housing in the surrounding environment;
- 12 ▪ Remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., construction of an infrastructure expansion to
allow for more construction in service areas);
- 13 ▪ Tax existing community service facilities, requiring the construction of new facilities that could
cause significant environmental effects; or
- 14 ▪ Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either
individually or cumulatively.

15 Here, the Project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

16 As discussed in Draft SEIR Section 5.3 and Section 4.11, the proposed warehouse development would
17 generate approximately 154 jobs, which is less than the 2,900 unemployed persons within the City.
18 Accordingly, the proposed Project would not necessarily spur a boost in population because the
19 employees could be found within the City's existing residents. The proposed Project, at the time of its
20 implementation, would likely only have an indirect effect on the City's population through the expansion
21 of economic activity within the City.

22 The project site is undeveloped and the Project does not include the development of residential units.
23 Further, upon approval of the proposed rezone, the Project would be consistent with the 2016 RSPA
24 zoning for the project site. Therefore, the Project would not directly affect housing availability within the
25 City.

26 The Project would not remove obstacles to growth through the construction or extension of major
27 infrastructure facilities. Although the project site is undeveloped, it is bordered by existing uses and is
28 planned for development in the City's General Plan and the 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment.

29 Existing utilities and service systems (i.e., water, wastewater, solid waste, and electricity) are available to
30 provide services to the Project. While upgrades to the existing utilities may be necessary, major
31 infrastructure is already present in the area. The Project does not propose improvements that would
32 extend services to areas that currently are not served or provide additional capacity in these infrastructure
33 improvements, thereby facilitating new off-site development. Therefore, the Project is not considered
34 growth inducing with respect to removal of obstacles to growth or through the provision of infrastructure.

35 As discussed in Draft SEIR Sections 4.1 through 4.16, the Project would result in significant and
36 unavoidable GHG impacts. The Project would implement mitigation measures to reduce the significance

1
2
3 of these impacts to the greatest extent feasible. While these impacts would remain significant and
4 unavoidable, they would not encourage other activities that could significantly affect the environment.
5 Implementation of the Project is anticipated to have a beneficial economic effect. During construction,
6 design, engineering, and construction-related jobs would be created. These jobs would span from
planning to construction of the Project, lasting until the Project is completed and in use. This would be a
direct but temporary growth-inducing impact of the Project. The Project would create employment
positions.

7 **Finding** – The City adopts CEQA Finding 1.

8 The City hereby finds that the Project does not directly result in any significant growth-inducing impacts.
The Project involves the creation of opportunities for industrial development.

9 **Supportive Evidence** – Please refer to Draft SEIR Section 5.3.

3 8.0 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

4 The following alternatives were addressed in the Draft SEIR:

- 5 ▪ Alternative 1: No Development Alternative
- 6 ▪ Alternative 2: Reduced Development Intensity Alternative
- 6 ▪ Alternative 3: Industrial Park

7 NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 1)

8 **Description:** State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6, requires an evaluation of the “No Project” alternative for
9 decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving a project with the impacts of not approving it.
10 Alternative 1: No Development Alternative (Alternative 1) assumes that the project site would not be
11 developed, which means there would be no warehousing facilities, landscape improvements, or surface
12 lot improvements developed on the project site or off-site.

13 Alternative 1 would have no significant impacts when compared to the proposed Project because no
14 development would occur. Significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impacts associated with
15 the proposed Project would not occur. No mitigation would be required to reduce potential significant
16 impacts to a less than significant level. All impact areas which were anticipated to cause a less than
17 significant impact, less than significant with mitigation measures, or a significant and unavoidable impact
18 due to implementation of the proposed Project would be eliminated under the No Project Alternative.

19 **Finding** – The City adopts Finding 3.

20 The City finds that Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project objectives, as identified above as the
21 project site would remain in its existing vacant condition. The project site would fail to provide expanded
22 economic activity to the City and would not provide employment opportunities. This would conflict with
23 the City’s goals of expanding its economic base and providing greater economic opportunity to the City’s
24 residents.

25 **Supporting Evidence** – Please see Draft SEIR Section 6.

26 REDUCED DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY (200,000 SF) (ALTERNATIVE 2)

27 **Description:** The Reduced Development Intensity Plan Alternative would involve the development of one
28 warehouse building. The building would include approximately 200,000 sf of warehouse space.
29 Alternative 2 would be required to provide approximately 96 parking stalls. Landscaping would be
30 provided along the boundaries of the project site. The Project would include the rezone of Planning Areas
31 126 and 133 and would comply with the development standards of the 2016 RSPA. Development of
32 Alternative 2 would require a Conditional Development Permit (CDP) to allow for the proposed warehouse
33 use.

34 **Finding** – The City adopts Finding 3.

35 The City finds that although Alternative 2 would result in reduced air quality, GHG emissions, and noise,
36 as well as an incremental reduction in the use of energy as compared to the Project, it may not provide
37 the production potential and revenue for the City that the Project would provide, and GHG emissions
38 would not be reduced to a level below the threshold. As such, Alternative 2 would not eliminate the
39 Project’s significant and unavoidable impact with regard to GHG emissions. In addition, Alternative 2

would likely result in reduced economic activity for the City as compared to the Project, and therefore Alternative 2 would not contribute as much to the City's goal of expanding its economic base and providing revenue-generating uses. Thus, while Alternative 2 would meet Project objectives, it would meet them to a lesser extent than the Project.

Supporting Evidence – Please see Draft SEIR Section 6.

INDUSTRIAL PARK (ALTERNATIVE 3)

Description: Alternative 3 would develop the site with approximately 411,853 square feet across three warehouse and office buildings, compared to two buildings under the proposed Project. This layout would reduce building mass and allow for more open space. Like the proposed Project, the site would be fully graded and rezoned to Business Center, requiring a Conditional Development Permit and complying with the 2016 RSPA standards.

Finding – The City adopts Finding 3.

Due to the similar development size between the Project and Alternative 3, both the Project and Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts, and Alternative 3 would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impact with regard to GHG emissions. Alternative 3 would likely result in reduced economic activity for the City as compared to the Project and therefore Alternative 3 would not contribute as much to the City's goal of expanding its economic base and providing revenue-generating uses. As such, while Alternative 3 would achieve the Project objectives, it would meet them to a lesser degree than the Project.

Supporting Evidence – Please see Draft SEIR Section 6.

1

2

3 **9.0 FINDINGS REGARDING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND**

4 **REPORTING PROGRAM**

5

6

7 Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when making findings required by
8 Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the Lead Agency approving a project shall adopt a
9 reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition
10 of project approval, in order to ensure compliance with project implementation and to mitigate or avoid
11 significant effects on the environment. The City hereby finds that:

12

- 13 1) A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared for the Project,
14 and the mitigation measures therein. The MMRP is incorporated herein by reference and is
15 considered part of the record of proceedings for the Project.
- 16 2) The MMRP designates responsibility for implementation and monitoring of proposed
17 mitigation measures. The City's Community Development Director will serve as the overall
18 MMRP coordinator and will be primarily responsible for ensuring that all mitigation measures
19 are complied with.
- 20 3) The MMRP prepared for the Project has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. The
21 MMRP meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code. The City will
22 use the MMRP to track compliance with mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available
23 for public review during the compliance period.

24

25

26

10.0 OTHER FINDINGS

The City hereby finds as follows:

- 1) The foregoing statements are true and correct;
- 2) The City is the "Lead Agency" for the Project evaluated in the SEIR and independently reviewed and analyzed in the Draft SEIR and Final SEIR for the Project;
- 3) The Notice of Preparation of the Draft SEIR was circulated for public review. It requested that responsible agencies respond as to the scope and content of the environmental information germane to that agency's specific responsibilities;
- 4) The public review period for the Draft SEIR was for 45 days between March 21, 2025 and May 5, 2025. The Draft SEIR and appendices were available for public review during that time. A Notice of Completion and copies of the Draft SEIR were sent to the State Clearinghouse, and notices of availability of the Draft SEIR were published by the City. The Draft SEIR was available for review on the City's website. Physical copies of the environmental documents are available at the City of Rialto Community Development Department;
- 5) The SEIR was completed in compliance with CEQA;
- 6) The SEIR reflects the City's independent judgment;
- 7) The City evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft SEIR. In accordance with CEQA, the City prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final SEIR provided adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The City reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information to the Draft SEIR regarding adverse environmental impacts. The City has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these Findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the Final SEIR;
- 8) The City finds that the SEIR, as amended, provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit all comments made during the public review period;
- 9) The SEIR evaluated the following impacts: (1) aesthetics; (2) agriculture and forestry; (3) air quality; (4) biological resources; (5) cultural resources; (6) energy; (7) geology and soils; (8) greenhouse gas emissions; (9) hazards and hazardous materials; (10) hydrology and water quality; (11) land use and planning; (12) mineral resources; (13) noise; (14) population and housing; (15) public services; (16) recreation; (17) transportation and circulation; (18) tribal cultural resources; (19) utilities and service systems; (20) wildfire. Additionally, the SEIR considered, in separate sections, significant irreversible environmental changes and growth-inducing impacts of the Project, as well as a reasonable range of project alternatives. All of the significant environmental impacts of the Project were identified in the SEIR;

1

2

3 10) The MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the SEIR and has been designed
4 to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. The MMRP provides the steps
5 necessary to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable;

6 11) The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of
7 mitigation; the City's Community Development Director will serve as the MMRP
8 Coordinator;

9 12) In determining whether the Project may have a significant impact on the environment, and
10 in adopting these Findings pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA, the City has complied with
11 CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2;

12 13) The impacts of the Project have been analyzed to the extent feasible at the time of certification
13 of the SEIR;

14 14) The City made no decisions related to approval of the Project prior to the initial
15 recommendation of certification of the SEIR. The City also did not commit to a definite course
16 of action with respect to the Project prior to the initial consideration of the SEIR;

17 15) Copies of all the documents incorporated by reference in the SEIR are and have been available
18 upon request at all times at the offices of the City of Rialto Community Development
19 Department, the custodian of record for such documents or other materials;

20 16) The responses to the comments on the Draft SEIR, which are contained in the Final SEIR, clarify
21 and amplify the analysis in the Draft SEIR;

22 17) Having reviewed the information contained in the SEIR and in the administrative record, the
23 City finds that there is no new significant information regarding adverse environmental impacts
24 of the Project in the SEIR; and

25 18) Having received, reviewed and considered all information in the SEIR, as well as all other
26 information in the record of proceedings on this matter, these Findings are hereby adopted by
27 the City in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency.

28

1

2

3 **11.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

4

5

6

7

8

Pursuant to PRC § 21081(b), and CEQA Guidelines § 15043 and § 15093(a) and (b), the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (CEQA Guidelines § 15093 (a)). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines § 15093(b)).

The City finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the SEIR that are within the purview of the City would be implemented with the Project, and that the mitigation measures that may be within another agency's discretion have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. As identified below, the City further finds that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, based upon the facts set forth above, the SEIR, and the record.

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the City finds that the mitigation measures identified in the SEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), when implemented, would avoid, or substantially lessen all of the significant effects identified in the SEIR for the Miro Way and Ayala Drive Project. However, GHG emissions impacts of the Project are significant and unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. T

The City finds that any one of the benefits set forth below is sufficient by itself to warrant approval of the Project. This determination is based on the findings herein and the evidence in the record. Having balanced the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts against each of the benefits, the City hereby adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations for the following reasons:

1. **Minimized Environmental Impacts.** All feasible mitigation measures have been imposed to lessen Project impacts to less than significant levels; and furthermore, alternatives to the Project are infeasible because while they have similar or less environmental impacts, they do not provide the economic benefits of the Project, or are otherwise socially or economically infeasible when compared to the Project, as described in the Statement of Facts and Findings.
2. **Specific Plan Consistency.** The Project aligns with the goals of the Renaissance Specific Plan, as amended. The proposed Project would bring new business to vacant land with the construction of the proposed warehouse buildings, which would be consistent with the proposed Business Center zone change. The rezone of Planning Area 123 from School to General Commercial with a Residential overlay would allow for future uses on Planning Area 123 to meet the needs of the residents, employees, and visitors to the Renaissance Specific Plan area.
3. **General Plan Objectives.** The Project fulfills key objectives of the City's General Plan by creating employment opportunities and promoting economic growth.

1

2

3 4. **Employment Opportunities.** Approval of the Project will generate employment opportunities for citizens of Rialto and surrounding communities. The development and construction of the site will create temporary on-site jobs and indirectly support local and regional employment. Additionally, construction spending will provide a one-time economic stimulus to the local and regional economies. Furthermore, the Project's approval will help maximize employment opportunities, improve the jobs-housing balance, and reduce unemployment within the City.

5 5. **Economic Development.** Approval of the Project will facilitate the construction of two industrial warehouse buildings. These structures are designed to adhere to contemporary industry standards and will be economically competitive with similar facilities in the local and regional areas, attracting businesses that can expedite the delivery of essential goods to consumers and businesses in Rialto and the surrounding area.

6 6. **Planned Development.** Approval of the Project will contribute to the continued development of a master planned community with a unique character and quality with a commitment to economic development, sustainability, flexible planning, high quality architecture, site design, and landscape design.

7 7. **Improved Infrastructure.** Approval of the Project will facilitate infill development on a vacant site and the completion of Miro Way and other planned infrastructure improvements in the Renaissance Specific Plan area.

8 8. **Increased Tax Revenues.** The Project will bolster the City's fiscal health by generating additional property taxes, sales taxes, and other local revenue streams. These funds will support essential public services such as public safety, parks, and infrastructure maintenance.

9 9. **Public Services and Amenities.** Approval of the Project will result in the payment of development impact fees, used to increase public services and amenities throughout the City.

10 10. **Quality of Life.** The Project will create permanent employment opportunities near residential, commercial areas, and near transit options. This will enhance the quality of life for residents who can live, work, shop, and enjoy recreational activities in the Renaissance Plan area and close to the City's downtown center.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
12.0 CERTIFICATION OF THE SEIR
4

5 The City Council certifies that the SEIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines
6 and that the City Council has complied with CEQA's procedural and substantive requirements.

7 The City Council further certifies that it has reviewed and considered the SEIR in evaluation of the Project
8 and that the SEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council. The City Council
9 further finds that no new significant information as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, has been
10 received by the City Council after the circulation of the Draft SEIR that would require further recirculation.

11 Accordingly, the City Council certifies the SEIR for the Miro Way and Ayala Drive Project.

12 As the decision-making body for approval, the City Council has reviewed and considered the information
13 contained in the Findings and supporting documentation. The City Council determines that the Findings
14 contain complete and accurate reporting of the unavoidable impacts and benefits of the Project as
15 detailed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Section 4.1: Aesthetics			
Impact 4.1-1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.1-2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
In non-urbanized areas, would the project 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 points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? ²			
Impact 4.1-3: Would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	LS AES-1	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures Pursuant to Section 15.32 of the City's Municipal Code. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director, evidence that all electrical distribution lines of 16,000 volts or less, telephone lines, cable antenna television and similar service wires or cable, which provide direct service to the property being developed, shall be installed underground.	LS
Impact 4.1-24: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	LS	Project Mitigation Measures No mitigation is required.	LS No mitigation measures are required.

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Section 4.2: Air Quality			
Impact 4.2-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures	LS
	AQ-4	Off-Road Diesel Equipment. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower will meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where feasible. In addition, where feasible all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by the Air Resources Board (ARB). Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by ARB regulations.	
	AQ-5	Construction Equipment Tier Specification. Prior to the mobilization of each applicable off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, a copy of the certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation, and Air Resources Board or South Coast Air Quality Management District's operating permit for each shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.	
	AQ-6	Truck Building Access. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that the following truck access routes have been incorporated into the Project design, to the maximum extent practicable, to reduce air quality and potential future health	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>risk impacts from the operation phases of the proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design warehouse/distribution centers such that entrances and exits discourage that trucks from traversing past neighbors or other sensitive receptors. Design warehouse/distribution centers such that any check-in point for trucks is well inside the facility property to ensure that there are no trucks queuing outside of the facility. Establish area(s) within the facility for repair needs. Provide electrical service capacity for equipment at facilities. 	
AQ-7		<p>Truck Routes. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that the following truck access routes have been incorporated into the Project design, to the maximum extent practicable, to reduce air quality and potential future health risk impacts from the operation phase of the proposed Project, if feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop, adopt and enforce truck routes both for entering and leaving the city and in and out of facilities; keeping in mind common pedestrian routes, especially for schools. Have truck routes clearly marked with trailblazer signs, so trucks will not enter residential areas. Identify or develop secure locations outside of residential neighborhoods where truckers that live in the community can park their truck, such as a Park & Ride. Where there are traffic impacts, improve traffic flow by signal synchronization. 	
AQ-8			<p>Super-Compliant VOC Paints. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that the construction contractor shall be required to utilize Super-Compliant VOC paints, which are defined by SCAQMD as meeting the "super-compliant" VOC standard of 10 grams per liter (g/L). Use of HVLP or electrostatic spray equipment shall be encouraged.	
AQ-9		Exterior and Interior Finishes. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that exterior and interior finishes that do not require painting shall be used where feasible.	
AQ-10		Building Orientation. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that buildings have been oriented and incorporate landscaping to maximize passive solar; heating during cool seasons, and minimize solar heat gain during hot seasons where feasible depending upon site condition and topography.	
AQ-12		Energy Efficiency Education. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that building tenants shall be encouraged to educate employees on energy efficiency measures.	
AQ-13		Preferential Parking Spaces. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning Division, evidence that preferential parking spaces shall be offered to car pools and van pools.	
AQ-14		Electrical Hookup Capacity. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Project applicant shall submit, to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director and Planning	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Project Mitigation Measures			
		MM AIR-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan specifies all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet California Air Resources Control Board Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards or incorporate CARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategy (VDECS). Requirements for Tier 4 Final equipment and the option for Level 3 VDECS shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be maintained on site and available upon request.	
		MM AIR-2 Prior to issuance of tenant occupancy permits, the tenant/facility operator shall prepare and submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program detailing strategies that would reduce the use of single occupant vehicles by employees by increasing the number of trips by walking, bicycle, carpool, vanpool and transit. The TDM shall include, but is not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a transportation information center and on-site TDM coordinator to educate residents, employers, employees, and visitors of surrounding transportation options. 	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote bicycling and walking through design features such as showers for employees, self-service bicycle repair area, etc. around the project site. ▪ Each building shall provide secure bicycle storage space equivalent to two percent of the automobile parking spaces provided. ▪ Each building shall provide a minimum of two shower and changing facilities as part of the tenant improvements. ▪ Provide on-site car share amenities for employees who make only occasional use of a vehicle. ▪ Promote and support carpool/vanpool/rideshare use through parking incentives and administrative support, such as ride-matching service. ▪ Incorporate incentives for using alternative travel modes, such as preferential load/unload areas or convenient designated parking spaces for carpool/vanpool users. ▪ Provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations. ▪ Each building shall provide preferred parking for electric, low-emitting and fuel-efficient vehicles equivalent to at least eight percent of the required number of parking spaces. <p>This mitigation measure applies only to tenant occupancy and not the building shell approvals.</p>	<p>MM AIR-3 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project is designed to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The buildings' electrical room shall be sufficiently sized to hold additional panels that may be needed to supply power for the future installation of electric

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>Vehicle (EV) truck charging stations on the site. Conduit should be installed from the electrical room to tractor trailer parking spaces in a logical location(s) on the site determined by the project applicant during construction document plan check, for the purpose of accommodating the future installation of EV truck charging stations at such time this technology becomes commercially available and the buildings are being served by trucks with electric-powered engines.</p> <p>MM AIR-4 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall confirm that truck exit driveway signs provide directional information to the truck route and that all truck access gates and loading docks within the project site shall have a sign posted that identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use. ▪ Truck drivers shall shut down the engine after two minutes of continuous idling operation. Once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged. ▪ Telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations. ▪ Signs shall also inform truck drivers about the health effects of diesel particulates, the California Air Resources Board diesel idling regulations, and the importance of being a good neighbor by not parking in residential areas. <p>This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell approvals.</p>	
		<p>MM AIR-5 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, the Planning Department shall confirm that the tenant has been provided with information about Carl Moyer Program and that compliance with the voluntary program including energy</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>efficiency improvement features for vendor trucks for the industrial buildings through the Carl Moyer Program— including truck modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires— to reduce fuel consumption but strongly encouraged. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell approvals.</p> <p>MM AIR-6 Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Tenant Improvements, not building shell, the Project tenants shall train staff on vehicle records in diesel technologies requirements and compliance with California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations, by attending CARB-approved courses. Facility operators shall maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance and make records available for inspection by the City of Rialto, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and State upon request.</p> <p>MM AIR-7 Prior to the issuance of a tenant occupancy permit, and not building shell, the Planning Department shall confirm that the Project plans and specifications show the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) are zero emission/powered by electricity. Each building shall include the necessary charging stations for cargo handling equipment. Note that SCAQMD Rule 2305 (Warehouse Indirect Source Rule) Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRe) points may be earned for electric/zero emission yard truck/hostler usage. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell approvals. ▪ All standard emergency generators shall meet California Air Resources Board Tier 4 Final emissions 	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.2-2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable State or federal ambient air quality standard?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures Further details regarding Mitigation Measures AQ-4 through AQ-10, and AQ-12 through AQ-14 are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, above. Project Mitigation Measures Further details regarding MM AIR-2 through MM AIR-7 are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, above.	LS
Impact 4.2-3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	S	Further details regarding 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-4 and MM AIR-7 are discussed under Impact 4.2-1, above.	LS
Impact 4.2-4: Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.3: Biological Resources			
Impact 4.3-1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1A Prior to project construction activities, an updated potential to occur assessment shall be completed. Species to be addressed shall include all those which meet the CEQA definition (CEQA Guidelines § 15380) for which suitable habitat is present within or adjacent to the project site. If deemed necessary, pre-construction species-specific surveys, completed by a qualified biologist and conducted at the appropriate time of day	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, shall be conducted. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures shall follow CDFW and USFWS guidance, where applicable.</p> <p>MM BIO-1B</p> <p>Prior to the start of project construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a comprehensive pre-construction wildlife survey. This survey must be completed within one week before any ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal begins. The survey shall include 100% coverage of the project site, as well as a 100-foot buffer zone surrounding the site to identify and document any wildlife species present in adjacent areas. All species observed during the survey shall be recorded and mapped accordingly.</p> <p>MM BIO-1C</p> <p>If necessary, appropriate avoidance and minimization measures shall be developed to protect sensitive wildlife species identified during the pre-construction survey. These measures may include establishing species-specific no-disturbance buffer zones. If wildlife is observed within the project footprint and cannot be avoided, individuals may be relocated to suitable habitat outside the impact area by a qualified biologist. All relocations shall be conducted under the appropriate permits and authorizations from relevant wildlife agencies.</p> <p>MM BIO-1D</p> <p>A biologist shall flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species), with the exception of burrowing owl, from suitable habitat areas within the project development footprint to the maximum extent practicable immediately (e.g., within 24 hours) prior to initial vegetation removal activities. The biologist shall flush wildlife by walking through habitat to be</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		MM BIO-1E4 Construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads adjacent to the project site or the right-of-way accessing the project site.	immediately removed and towards adjacent remaining suitable habitat.
		MM BIO-1FB The Project applicant, or its contractors, shall screen, cover, or elevate at least one (1) foot above ground, all construction pipe, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of three (3) inches or greater that are stored on-site overnight. The pipes, culverts, and similar structures shall be inspected by the Project biologist for wildlife before such material is moved, buried, or capped.	
		MM BIO-1GC Construction activities shall occur during daytime hours to the greatest extent feasible. If construction must occur at nighttime, lights shall be oriented in such a way that they direct light downward and toward the active construction, ensuring that no direct light is emitted towards adjacent lands, and shields or deflectors shall be installed on lights to reduce light spill. Nighttime concrete pouring shall be performed in accordance with the City of Rialto Municipal Code.	
		MM BIO-1HF At the end of each workday during construction, the applicant, or its contractors, will cover all excavated, steep-sided holes or trenches more than eight inches deep and that have sidewalls steeper than 1:1 (45 degree) slope with plywood or similar materials, or provide a minimum of one escape ramp per 100 feet of trenching (with slopes no greater than 3:1) constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. The Project biologist shall thoroughly inspect holes and trenched for trapped animals during biological monitoring.	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
	MM BIO-1E	Contractors shall not permit pets on the construction site.	
	MM BIO-1E*	<p>If trash and debris need to be stored overnight during maintenance activities, fully covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof shall be used by the maintenance contractor to contain all food, food scraps, food wrappers, beverage containers, and other miscellaneous trash. Alternatively, standard trash receptacles may be used during the day, but shall be removed or emptied each night.</p> <p>To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of work, the construction limits shall be clearly demarcated (e.g., installation of flagging or temporary visibility construction fence) prior to ground-disturbance activities, and all construction activities, including equipment staging and maintenance, shall be conducted within the marked disturbance limits. The work limit delineation shall be maintained throughout Project construction.</p>	<p>If Crotch's bumble bee is no longer a candidate or listed species under CESA at the time of project construction, then these mitigation measures shall not be required.</p> <p>Within one year prior to ground disturbing activities, an <u>approved</u> <u>qualified</u> <u>designated</u> biologist shall conduct active Crotch's bumble bee nest surveys during the typical colony active period (April – August) following survey guidelines provided in the CDFW's Survey Considerations for CESA Candidate Bumble Bee Species within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site where suitable habitat exists. The qualified biologist shall be familiar with Crotch's bumble bee identification and life history. Survey results, including negative</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>MM BIO-2B</p> <p>If suspected or active Crotch's bumble bee nests are present, a qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate non-disturbance buffer around each nest immediately prior to initiation of construction activities using stakes and/or brightly colored flagging to avoid disturbance or incidental take of the species. If avoidance buffers are not feasible, or if complete avoidance of Crotch's bumble bee cannot be achieved, project activities with the potential to impact Crotch's bumble bee shall be postponed until appropriate authorization (i.e., a finalized CES/ITP under Fish and Game Code section 2081) is obtained during construction activities, then CDFW shall be consulted.</p>	<p>If suspected or active Crotch's bumble bee nests are present, a qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate non-disturbance buffer around each nest immediately prior to initiation of construction activities using stakes and/or brightly colored flagging to avoid disturbance or incidental take of the species. If avoidance buffers are not feasible, or if complete avoidance of Crotch's bumble bee cannot be achieved, project activities with the potential to impact Crotch's bumble bee shall be postponed until appropriate authorization (i.e., a finalized CES/ITP under Fish and Game Code section 2081) is obtained during construction activities, then CDFW shall be consulted.</p>
		<p>MM BIO-2C</p> <p>Within one year prior to ground disturbing activities, the approved designated a qualified biologist shall survey suitable nectar plants for foraging Crotch's bumble bee during the typical flight season (February – October), within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site where suitable habitat exists, following survey guidelines provided in the CDFW's Survey Considerations for CES/ Candidate Bumble Bee Species. The qualified biologist shall be familiar with Crotch's bumble bee identification and life history. Survey results, including negative findings shall be submitted to CDFW at least 30 days prior to vegetation removal and/or ground disturbing activities.</p>	<p>Within one year prior to ground disturbing activities, the approved designated a qualified biologist shall survey suitable nectar plants for foraging Crotch's bumble bee during the typical flight season (February – October), within the project site and areas adjacent to the project site where suitable habitat exists, following survey guidelines provided in the CDFW's Survey Considerations for CES/ Candidate Bumble Bee Species. The qualified biologist shall be familiar with Crotch's bumble bee identification and life history. Survey results, including negative findings shall be submitted to CDFW at least 30 days prior to vegetation removal and/or ground disturbing activities.</p>
		<p>MM BIO-2D</p> <p>If occupied foraging habitat for Crotch's bumble bee is present within project impact areas, a Revegetation Plan shall be prepared which includes native shrubs and</p>	<p>If occupied foraging habitat for Crotch's bumble bee is present within project impact areas, a Revegetation Plan shall be prepared which includes native shrubs and</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>native seed mixes that contain known nectar sources for Crotch's bumble bee. The Revegetation Plan shall be developed in consultation with a qualified Crotch's bumble bee biologist and implemented following Project construction.</p> <p>MM BIO-3A</p> <p>Prior to initial ground disturbing activities, a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) shall be prepared, which will include a training presentation and key fact sheet. The training will instruct construction crews to be aware of and recognize burrowing owls and other sensitive biological resources that may be encountered within, or adjacent to, the project. The training will provide workers with instructions to follow in the event a burrowing owl is observed or suspected to be on site.</p> <p>Biologists shall provide WEAP training materials, including but not limited to the key fact sheet, to construction personnel before their commencement of work on the project. Additionally, all construction staff shall attend the WEAP training presentation prior to beginning work on-site. A refresher WEAP training will be completed on an annual basis thereafter. Note that the fact sheet shall be provided in other languages, as necessary, to accommodate non-English speaking workers.</p> <p>Upon completion of the WEAP training, each member of the construction crew shall sign a form stating that they attended the training, understood the information presented, and agreed to comply with the requirements set out in the WEAP training. On an annual basis, the project proponent shall certify that WEAP training has been provided to all construction personnel. Biologists</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>MM BIO-3B</p> <p>Suitable burrowing owl habitat and burrowing owl presence has been confirmed on the site; therefore, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, familiar and experienced in burrowing owls, in accordance with the CDFW BUOW Guidelines (2012 or most recent version) prior to vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities for all phases of project construction and surrounding 500 foot radius.</p> <p>Take avoidance surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to initiation of project-related activities. Burrowing owls may re-colonize a site after only a few days. Time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance, in accordance with the CDFW BUOW Guidelines (2012 or most recent version). Upon beginning ground-disturbing activities or vegetation removal, a biologist shall be on hand to perform monitoring during all construction activities every day to ensure no impacts occur to burrowing owls as a result of the project.</p> <p>Should burrowing owls, active burrows, or signs thereof be confirmed during any survey or biological monitoring, Project activities with the potential to impact burrowing owl shall be immediately halted. The qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and prepare a Burrowing Owl Plan that shall be submitted to CDFW for review and approval prior to commencing Project activities. The</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p><u>Burrowing Owl Plan</u> shall describe proposed avoidance, and monitoring actions. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall include the number and location of occupied burrow sites, acres of burrowing owl habitat that will be impacted, details of site monitoring, and details on proposed buffers and other avoidance measure. If avoidance is proposed, Project activities with the potential to impact burrowing owl shall not occur within 1,000 feet of an active burrow until CDFW approves the Burrowing Owl Plan.</p> <p>If Project activities, including burrow exclusion and closure, could result in take of burrowing owl, the project proponent shall begin early coordination with CDFW for appropriate CESA authorization (i.e., ITP under CFGC section 2081) prior to commencement of Project activities. The ITP shall describe, at a minimum, Project activities and equipment, proposed avoidance/buffers, temporary and permanent impacts, monitoring, relocation and/or translocation, and minimization and compensatory mitigation actions. ITP compensatory mitigation will be fulfilled by one or more of following options: 1) Conservation or Mitigation Bank credits (if available) 2) Mitigation Credit Agreements 3) Permittee responsible mitigation land acquisition.</p> <p>During active construction, biological monitoring will be performed to ensure unauthorized impacts on burrowing owl do not occur as a result of the project. A biologist shall be contracted to perform monitoring during all construction activities approximately every other day. The definitive frequency and duration of monitoring shall be dependent on project and site conditions, such as the type of construction activity occurring, whether it is the breeding versus non-</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>breeding season, if a burrowing owl has been recently documented on site, and the efficacy of the exclusion buffers, as determined by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>No less than 14 days prior to the onset of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall survey the construction limits of the project site and a 500-foot buffer for the presence of burrowing owls and/or occupied nest burrows. A second survey shall be conducted within 24 hours prior to the onset of construction activities. The surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the most current CDFW survey methods.</p> <p>The project applicant shall submit at least one burrowing owl preconstruction survey report to the satisfaction of the City and CDFW to document compliance with this mitigation measure. For the purposes of this measure, 'qualified biologist' is a biologist who meets the requirements set forth in the CDFW BIOW Guidelines.</p> <p>If burrowing owl is documented on site or within 500-feet of the project site during either preconstruction surveys or biological monitoring, occupied burrowing owl burrows shall not be disturbed. CDFW shall be contacted within 48 hours of the burrowing owl observation and disturbance avoidance buffers shall be set up by a qualified biologist in accordance with the recommendations from CDFW.</p> <p>No work will occur within avoidance buffers until consultation with CDFW and issuance of permits, if required. If burrowing owl is no longer a candidate or listed species under CESA at the time of project construction, then permits shall not be required. If</p>	

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>MM BIO-4A</p> <p>To ensure compliance with CFGC sections 3503.3, 3503.5, and 3513 and to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds, vegetation clearing and ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted outside of the bird nesting season (generally February 15 through August 31). Regardless of the time of year, a qualified biologist will conduct a nesting bird survey within three (3) days prior to any disturbance of the site, including but not limited to vegetation clearing, disking, demolition activities, and grading.</p> <p>MM BIO-4B</p> <p>If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests depending on the level of activity within the buffer and species observed, and the buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied, and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests. During construction activities, the qualified biologist shall continue biological monitoring activities at a frequency recommended by the qualified biologist using their best professional judgment. If nesting birds are documented, avoidance and minimization measures may be adjusted, and construction activities stopped or redirected by the</p>	<p>avoidance of burrowing owls is not possible, either directly or indirectly, consultation with CDFW will determine the appropriate course of action. CDFW may require an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a Burrowing Owl—Relocation and Mitigation Plan (Plan). The conditions of the permit or measures outlined in the plan would be adhered to by the Project proponent and any required compensatory mitigation of habitat would be provided.</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.3-2: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.3-3: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on State or federal protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Impact 4.3-4: Would the project 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?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures Further details regarding MM BIO-4A and through MM BIO-4B <u>C</u> are included under Impact 4.3-1, above.	LS
Impact 4.3-5: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures Further details regarding MM BIO-3A through MM BIO-3B <u>D</u> are included under Impact 4.3-1, above.	LS
Impact 4.3-6: Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Plan, Natural Community conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?			
Section 4.4: Cultural Resources			
Impact 4.4-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	S	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures Project Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 In the event that archaeological or 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 other portions of the Project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in MM TCR-1 , regarding any pre-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. MM CUL-2 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 (Plan), the drafts of which shall be provided to YSMN for review and comment, as detailed within MM TCR-1 . The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the Project and implement the Plan accordingly.	LS No mitigation measures are applicable.

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		MM CUL-3	If human remains or funeral objects are encountered during 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 Section 7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the Project.
Impact 4.4-2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	S	Mitigation Measures 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures Further details regarding MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-3 are included under Impact 4.4-1, above.	LS
Impact 4.4-3: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	S	Mitigation Measures 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures Further details regarding MM CUL-3 are included under Impact 4.4-1, above.	LS
Section 4.5: Energy			
Impact 4.5-1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	S	Mitigation Measures 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are applicable. Project Mitigation Measures See Section 4.2, Air Quality , for further discussion on MM AIR-2 and Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions , for further discussion on GHG-1 and GHG-2 .	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.5-2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact 4.6-1: Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that could have a significant impact on the environment?	SU	<p>2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures are applicable.</p> <p>Project Mitigation Measures</p> <p>MM AIR-2 through MM AIR-7 are further discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> of this SEIR.</p>	<p>MM GHG-1</p> <p>Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for Tenant Improvements, not building shell, the project shall install solar photovoltaic (PV) panels or other source of renewable energy generation on-site, or otherwise acquire energy from the local utility that has been generated by renewable sources, that would provide 100 percent of the expected building load (i.e., the Title 24 electricity demand and the plug-load, anticipated to be approximately 4.62 kilowatt hours per year [kWh/year] per square foot), as feasible, based on the maximum net roof area available for solar (i.e., solar-ready zone). The solar-ready zone shall comply with Section 110.10 of the 2022 California Energy Code and shall comply with access, pathway, ventilation, and spacing requirements, and exclude skylight area.</p> <p>With expected energy consumption at 4.62 kWh/ft², a PV panel array covering approximately one quarter of the proposed roof space would provide sufficient on-site renewable energy generation to offset consumption. The final PV generation facility size</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>requires approval by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE's Rule 21 governs operating and metering requirements for any facility connected to SCE's distribution system. Should SCE limit the off-site export, the proposed Project may utilize a battery energy storage system (BESS) to lower off-site export while maintaining on-site renewable generation to off-set consumption. If the Project cannot generate enough renewable energy to cover 100 percent of the building load, renewable energy may be acquired from the local utility.</p> <p>This mitigation measure applies only to tenant improvements and not the building shell approvals.</p> <p>MM GHG-2 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the City demonstrating the following to meet or exceed CALGreen Tier 2 standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project shall be designed to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification at the time of building permit application in order to exceed 2022 Title 24 energy efficiency standards. ▪ The Project shall provide conduits to support electric charging stations per the Tier 2 standards in Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) of the 2022 CALGreen Code. 	<p>MM GHG-3 The development shall divert a minimum of 75 percent of landfill waste. Prior to issuance of certificate of tenant occupancy permits, a recyclables collection and load area shall be constructed in compliance with City</p>

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
		standards for recyclable collection and loading areas. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals. The diversion plan shall also comply with the established solid waste and recycling laws including AB 939 and AB 341.	
MM GHG-4		Prior to the issuance of tenant occupancy permits, the Planning Department shall confirm that tenant lease agreements include contractual language that all handheld landscaping equipment used onsite shall be 100 percent electrically powered. This mitigation measure applies only to tenant permits and not the building shell approvals.	
Impact 4.6-2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions?	S	<p>2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures The 2016 RSPA EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-14 is further discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>.</p> <p>Project Mitigation Measures</p> <p>MM GHG-1 through MM GHG-4 are further discussed under Impact 4.6-1.</p>	S

Section 4.7: Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impact 4.7-1: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	S	No mitigation measures are required.	S
Impact 4.7-2: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	S	No mitigation measures are required.	S

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.7-3: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.7-4: Would the project 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?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.7-5: For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Impact 4.7-6: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.7-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.8: Hydrology and Water Quality			
Impact 4.8-1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			
Impact 4.8-2: Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Impact 4.8-3i: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.8-3ii: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.8-3iii: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.8-3iv: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?	LS		
Impact 4.8-4: Would the project in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Impact 4.8-5: Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.9: Land Use and Planning			
Impact 4.9-1: Would the project physically divide an established community?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.9-2: Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.10: Noise			
Impact 4.10-1: Would the project generate 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	S N-1	2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures Construction activities shall be limited to the City's allowable hours of construction activities in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	N-2	All Construction equipment shall use noise-reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.	
Impact 4.10-2: Would the project expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	S	<p>Project Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Renaissance Specific Plan EIR Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures are applicable.</p> <p>Project Mitigation Measures</p> <p>MM NOI-1</p> <p>The following measures shall be incorporated on all grading and building plans and specifications subject to approval of the City's building and safety division prior to issuance of a grading permit:</p> <p>The developer shall ensure construction equipment will not approach the construction buffer zone adjacent to the commercial building (i.e., Able Storage) along portions of the Project southern and southwestern Project Boundary. The buffer zone shall be tiered based on distances established in Table 4.10-8. As shown in Table 4.10-8, vibratory rollers shall not operate within 17 feet of the commercial building; large bulldozers and loaded trucks shall not operate within 10 feet of the commercial building; and jack hammers and small bulldozers/tractors shall not operate within 5 feet of the commercial building. The buffer zone shall be enforced around the existing commercial building between 7:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays from October 1 through April 30 and between hours of 6:00 a.m. and</p>	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.10-3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Section 4.11: Population and Housing			
Impact 4.11-1: Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?)	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.11-2: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Section 4.12: Public Services			
Impact 4.12-1: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?	LS		LS
Impact 4.12-1ii: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.12-1iii: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.12-1iv: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Section 4.13: Recreation			
Impact 4.13-1: Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.13-2: Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Section 4.14: Transportation			
Impact 4.14-1: Would the project, conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.14-2: Would the proposed project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.14-3: Would the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Impact 4.14-4: Would the proposed project result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact	No mitigation measures are required.	No Impact
Section 4.15: Tribal Cultural Resources			
<p>Impact 4.15-1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in PRC §1074, 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:</p> <p>(a) Listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC §5020.1(k) or:</p> <p>(b) A resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.</p>			

2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment EIR Mitigation Measures	
Project Mitigation Measures	LS
MM TCR-1	The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (YSMN) Cultural Management Department shall be contacted, as detailed in MM 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 (Plan) shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the Project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.

MM 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 YSMN. The Lead Agency, and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the Project.
-----------------	---

Table 1-1: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Program

Environmental Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Significance With Mitigation
Section 4.16: Utilities			
Impact 4.16-1: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.16-2: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.16-3: 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?	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.16-4: 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.	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS
Impact 4.16-5: Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LS	No mitigation measures are required.	LS

LS= Less Than Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable; S = Significant