

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

Independently reviewed, analyzed and exercised judgment in making the determination, by the Planning Commission on _____, pursuant to Section 21082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

CEQA requires the preparation of an Initial Study when a proposal must obtain discretionary approval from a governmental agency and is not exempt from CEQA. The purpose of the Initial Study is to determine whether or not a proposal, not except from CEQA, qualifies for a Negative Declaration (ND) or whether or not an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared.

1. **Project Title:** Valley and Lilac Warehouse
2. **Lead Agency Name:** City of Rialto
Planning Division
150 South Palm Avenue
Rialto, CA 92376
3. **Contact Person:** Daniel Casey, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (909) 820-2525 ext. 2075
4. **Project Location:** South side of Valley Boulevard between Lilac and Willow Avenues in the City of Rialto.
5. **Geographic Coordinates of Project Site:** 34° 04' 10.91" N, 117° 22' 38.57" W
6. **USGS Topographic Map:** Fontana 7.5-Minute USGS Topographic Quadrangle
7. **Public Land Survey System:** Township 1 South, Range 5 West, Section 23 - SW 1/4
8. **Thomas Guide Location:** Map 605, Grid G6, 2013 San Bernardino & Riverside Counties
9. **Assessor Parcel Number:** 0132-191-15
10. **General Plan and Zoning Designations:** Business Park with Specific Plan Overlay – Industrial Park (I-P)
11. **Description of Project:** CDRE Holdings 12 LLC is proposing the construction of a 74,466 square-foot industrial warehouse/distribution facility on an approximate 4.11-acre site of which development will occur on 3.69 acres. Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, drainage/water quality, and one point of access along Valley Boulevard. The Proposed Project includes dedicating an additional five feet on Valley Boulevard feet for right-of-way purposes. Existing off-site improvements across

the project frontage along Valley Boulevard includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements. The Project also includes rerounding of an existing 10-inch vitrified clay pipe located on the Project Site. The sewer line would be rerouted around the proposed building to allow for future access in the event maintenance or replacement of the sewer line is necessary.

Per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.020.A.4 and 5 of the Rialto Municipal Code, warehousing and distribution facilities are subject to the approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. Additionally, per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.030.A, a maximum building height of 35 feet, or two and one-half stories, is allowed for the Project Site. The Project Proponent is proposing to construct a building that has a maximum height of 44 feet. Approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance is required.

This Initial Study addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Project including all associated discretionary actions and approvals required to implement the Proposed Project, as well as all construction and operational activities.

12. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	ZONING	EXISTING
PROJECT SITE	Industrial Park	Vacant
NORTH	Freeway Commercial	Steel Unlimited, Inc. and Jack's Diesel Repair
EAST	Industrial Park	Teamsters Local #63
SOUTH	N/A	Interstate 10
WEST	Industrial Park	Days Inn Hotel

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

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (RWQCB – Santa Ana Region, General Construction Permit, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
- City of Rialto discretionary actions:
 - Approval of a Precise Plan of Design application
 - Approval of a Variance Application

1.1 EVALUATION FORMAT

This Initial Study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant
Impact

Less than Significant
with Mitigation

Less than Significant

No Impact

Substantiation is then provided to justify each determination. One of the four following conclusions is then provided as a summary of the analysis for each of the major environmental factors.

1. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
2. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
3. Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List mitigation measures)
4. Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are: (List the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or as requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study, the City of Rialto Environmental Review Committee finds:

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

SECTION 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

The purpose of this Initial Study is to identify potential environmental impacts associated with a Proposed Project being the development of an approximate 74,466 square-foot industrial warehouse/distribution facility on the south side of Valley Boulevard between Lilac and Willow Avenues in the City of Rialto. This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines.

Pursuant to Section 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Rialto is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this Initial Study. The City has primary responsibility for approval or denial of this project. The intended use of this Initial Study is to provide adequate environmental analysis related to project construction and operation activities of the Proposed Project.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site is located in the southern portion of the City of Rialto on the south side of Valley Boulevard and north of Interstate 10 (I-10). Figure 1, Regional Location, depicts the location of the Project Site in context to its regional setting and Figure 2 depicts the Project Vicinity. The Project Site consists of one San Bernardino County Assessor Parcel (APN 0132-191-15) which is approximately 4.11 acres and is located on the south side of Valley Boulevard between Lilac and Willow Avenues. The Project Site is currently vacant and does not appear to have been previously developed as shown by property tax information provided by the San Bernardino County Office of the Assessor. The Project Site is located in the SW ¼ of Section 23, Township 1 South, Range 5 West, Fontana USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle Map.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CDRE Holdings 12 LLC is proposing the construction of a 74,466 square-foot industrial warehouse/distribution facility on an approximate 4.11-acre site of which development will occur on 3.69 acres. The Proposed Project includes 68,625 square-feet designated for warehouse/distribution uses and 6,000 square-feet for ancillary office uses, including a 3,000 square-foot mezzanine. Proposed on-site improvements include paving, drainage/water quality, landscaping, and one new 40-foot driveway along Valley Boulevard. The Proposed Project will include approximately 23,820 square-feet of landscaping and approximately 65,202 square-feet of paving for access and parking. A proposed underground infiltration basin to capture storm water flows is proposed to be located at the south property line as shown on Figure 3, Site Plan. The Proposed Project includes dedicating an additional five feet on Valley Boulevard for right-of-way purposes. Existing off-site improvements across the project frontage along Valley Boulevard includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements.

Figure 1: Regional Location

Figure 2: Project Vicinity

Figure 3: Site Plan

General Plan Designation and Zoning

The Project Site is located in the southern portion of the Gateway Specific Plan planning area. The Project Site's designated zoning in the Gateway Specific Plan is Industrial Park (I-P). As stated in Section 18.35.050.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, the primary purpose of the zone is to provide wholesale sales and business or trade services consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the Gateway Specific Plan, and, to provide for a certain range of light industrial activities which will be developed and conducted in a manner that enhance the image of the area. Per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.020.A.4 and 5 of the Rialto Municipal Code, proposed warehousing and distribution facilities within the I-P zone are subject to the approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. Additionally, per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.030.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, a maximum building height of 35 feet, or two and one-half stories, is allowed for the Project Site. The Project Proponent is proposing to construct a building that has a maximum height of 44 feet, and therefore, approval of a Variance application is required. As such, the Proposed Project includes uses which are permitted within the I-P zone with the approval of a Precise Plan of Design application and Variance application.

2.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The Project Site consists of one parcel; APN 0132-191-15. The Project Site is approximately 4.11 acres and is currently vacant and does not appear to have been previously developed as shown by property tax information provided by the San Bernardino County Office of the Assessor. Existing off-site improvements across the project frontage along Valley Boulevard includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements. The City's General Plan identifies Valley Boulevard as a 'Major Arterial', with an ultimate half-width of 60 feet and ultimate curb location at 48 feet from centerline. The Proposed Project includes dedicating an additional five feet on Valley Boulevard for right-of-way purposes. Approximately 0.03 acres of dedication is proposed for the Project Site. Under existing conditions, the property immediately to the east is developed and occupied by Teamsters Local #63; the property immediately to the west is developed and occupied by Days Inn Hotel; the property to the north is developed and occupied by Steel Unlimited, Inc. and Jack's Diesel Repair; and I-10 is located immediately south of the Project Site.

2.5 INTENDED USE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Initial Study addresses the potential impacts of the Proposed Project, as well as those of the associated discretionary actions and approvals required to implement the Proposed Project, and those of subsequent construction and operational activities.

SECTION 3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Less than Significant.** The City of Rialto General Plan identifies the views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains as backdrops for creating scenic vistas throughout the City. The San Bernardino Mountains are located to the northeast of the Project Site and the San Gabriel Mountains are located to the northwest. In accordance with City of Rialto General Plan Goal 2-14: Protect scenic vistas and scenic resources, the City recognizes the following policies:

Policy 2-14.1: Protect views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains by ensuring that building heights are consistent with the scale of surrounding, existing development.

Policy 2-14.2: Protect views of the La Loma Hills, Jurupa Hills, Box Spring Mountains, Moreno Valley, and Riverside by ensuring that building heights are consistent with the scale of surrounding, existing development.

Policy 2-14.3: Ensure use of building materials that do not produce glare, such as polished metals or reflective windows.

The proposed industrial warehouse/distribution facility is located in the I-P zone of the Gateway Specific Plan. Per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.030.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, development in the I-P zone is limited to a maximum building height of 35 feet, or two and one-half stories. The Project Proponent is proposing to construct a building that has a maximum height of 44 feet, and therefore, approval of a Variance application is required. Additionally, discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of

Rialto includes approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. With City approval of the Precise Plan of Design and a Variance, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **No Impact.** No known significant scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings exist on or within the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project Site is not located adjacent to or within the vicinity of a State scenic highway as the nearest Officially Designated State Scenic Highway is a portion of State Route 38 approximately 35 miles to the east of the Project Site, as identified by the California Scenic Highway Mapping System (April 2018). Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- c) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is currently vacant and located within a predominantly developed area. The property immediately to the east is developed and occupied by Teamsters Local #63; the property immediately to the west is developed and occupied by Days Inn Hotel; Steel Unlimited, Inc. and Jack's Diesel Repair is located to the north; and I-10 is located immediately south of the Project Site.

The Proposed Project is located within the I-P zone of the Gateway Specific Plan. As stated in Section 18.35.050.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, the primary purpose of the zone is to provide wholesale sales and business or trade services consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the Gateway Specific Plan, and, to provide for a certain range of light industrial activities which will be developed and conducted in a manner that enhance the image of the area. As such, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design, Conditional Development Permit, and Variance application. Proposed on-site improvements include paving, drainage/water quality, landscaping, and one access point along Valley Boulevard. The Proposed Project includes dedicating an additional five feet on Valley Boulevard for right-of-way purposes. Existing off-site improvements across the project frontage along Valley Boulevard includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements.

Approval of the requested Variance would not result in the proposed warehouse being out of character for the area. In January 2018 a 404,837 square-foot warehouse located approximately ¼-mile west of the Project Site on the southside of Valley Blvd. between Cactus Avenue and Spruce Avenue was approved for an increase in height from 35 feet to 47 feet (VAR 2017-0011; Planning Commission Resolution No. 18-10). No significant impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- d) **Less than Significant.** Operation of the proposed industrial warehouse/distribution facility would result in an increase in outdoor illumination when compared to the current use of the site, which is vacant. The lighting, however, would be designed in accordance with the following lighting requirements listed within Section 5.5.3, Building Lighting, of the Gateway Specific Plan:

- Exterior lighting, when used, shall enhance the building design and the adjoining landscape.
- Lighting standards and building fixtures shall be of a design and size compatible with the building and adjacent areas.
- Lighting shall be restrained in design and excessive brightness avoided.

In addition, discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of Rialto include approval of a Precise Plan of Design which will include a lighting plan. With adherence to the Gateway Specific Plan Development Guidelines and City approval of the Precise Plan of Design, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) No Impact. The Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the Project Site as “Urban and Built-up Land” in its California Important Farmland Finder. No prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance occurs at the Project Site or in its immediate vicinity. Development of the Project Site would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
b) No Impact. The Project Site is recognized as “Urban and Built-Up Land” as identified in the latest San Bernardino County Williamson Act Map (FY 2015/2016) prepared by the California Department of Conservation’s Division of Land Resource Protection. The City of Rialto General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan do not designate any of the land on or within the vicinity of the Project Site for agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
c) No Impact. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan zoning designation of I-P. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production because the Project Site is within a predominantly urbanized area and these designations do not occur in the vicinity. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
d) No Impact. The Project Site does not support forest land and implementation of the Proposed Project would not convert forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
e) No Impact. The Project Site does not support agricultural or forest land uses that would be lost as a result of the Proposed Project implementation. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Less than Significant. The Project Site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the basin establishes a program of rules and regulations administered by SCAQMD to obtain attainment of the state and federal air quality standards. The most recent AQMP (AQMP 2016) was adopted by the SCAQMD on March 3, 2017. The 2016 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including transportation control measures developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) from the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, any updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories.				

The Proposed Project is located within the I-P land use zone of the Gateway Specific Plan area. As stated in Section 18.35.050.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, the primary purpose of the zone is to provide wholesale sales and business or trade services consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the Gateway Specific Plan, and, to provide for a certain range of light industrial activities which will be developed and conducted in a manner that enhance the image of the area. As such, the Proposed Project is an acceptable

use within the I-P zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and Variance application. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Proposed Project have already been accounted for in the AQMP and approval of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project's construction and operational emissions were screened using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2 prepared by the SCAQMD (available at the City offices for review). CalEEMod was used to estimate the on-site and off-site construction emissions. The emissions incorporate Rule 402 and 403 by default as required during construction. The criteria pollutants screened for include: reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). In addition, reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions were analyzed. Two of the analyzed pollutants, ROG and NO_x, are ozone precursors. Both summer and winter season emission levels were estimated.

Construction Emissions

Construction emissions are considered short-term, temporary emissions and were modeled with the following construction parameters: site preparation, site grading (fine and mass grading), building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2019 and be completed in early-2020. The resulting emissions generated by construction of the Proposed Project are shown in Table 1 and Table 2, which represent summer and winter construction emissions, respectively.

Table 1
Summer Construction Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source/Phase	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Site Preparation	4.4	45.6	23.0	0.04	10.7	6.7
Grading	2.7	28.4	17.0	0.03	4.5	2.8
Building Construction	2.9	24.7	21.6	0.04	2.3	1.5
Paving	1.6	12.8	13.3	0.02	0.9	0.7
Architectural Coating	40.4	1.7	2.5	0.00	0.3	0.2
Highest Value (lbs/day)	40.4	45.6	23.0	0.04	10.7	6.7
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Summer Emissions.

Phases do not overlap and represent the highest concentration.

Table 2
Winter Construction Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source/Phase	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Site Preparation	4.4	45.6	22.8	0.04	10.7	6.7
Grading	2.7	28.4	16.9	0.03	4.5	2.8
Building Construction	2.9	24.7	21.0	0.04	2.3	1.5
Paving	1.6	12.8	13.1	0.02	0.9	0.7
Architectural Coating	40.4	1.7	2.4	0.00	0.3	0.2
Highest Value (lbs/day)	40.4	45.6	22.8	0.04	10.7	6.7
SCAQMD Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Winter Emissions.

Phases do not overlap and represent the highest concentration.

As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, construction emissions during either summer or winter seasonal conditions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Compliance with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403

Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction emissions, the Project Proponent would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as the SCAB is in non-attainment status for ozone and suspended particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}).

The Project Proponent would be required to comply with Rules 402 nuisance, and 403 fugitive dust, which require the implementation of Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) for each fugitive dust source, and the AQMP, which identifies Best Available Control Technologies (BACTs) for area sources and point sources. The BACMs and BACTs would include, but not be limited to the following:

1. The Project Proponent shall ensure that any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered prior to the onset of grading activities.
 - (a) The Project Proponent shall ensure that watering of the site or other soil stabilization method shall be employed on an on-going basis after the initiation of any grading activity on the site. Portions of the site that are actively being graded shall be watered regularly (2x daily) to ensure that a crust is formed on the ground surface and shall be watered at the end of each workday.
 - (b) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed upon.

- (c) The Project Proponent shall ensure that landscaped areas are installed as soon as possible to reduce the potential for wind erosion.
- (d) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all grading activities are suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

During construction, exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and fugitive dust generated by equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, would increase NO_x and PM₁₀ levels in the area. Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds during construction, the Applicant/Contractor would be required to implement the following conditions as required by SCAQMD:

- 2. To reduce emissions, all equipment used in grading and construction must be tuned and maintained to the manufacturer's specification to maximize efficient burning of vehicle fuel.
- 3. The Project Proponent shall ensure that existing power sources are utilized where feasible via temporary power poles to avoid on-site power generation during construction.
- 4. The Project Proponent shall ensure that construction personnel are informed of ride sharing and transit opportunities.
- 5. All buildings on the Project Site shall conform to energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code.
- 6. The operator shall maintain and effectively utilize and schedule on-site equipment in order to minimize exhaust emissions from truck idling.
- 7. The operator shall comply with all existing and future California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SCAQMD regulations related to diesel-fueled trucks, which may include among others: (1) meeting more stringent emission standards; (2) retrofitting existing engines with particulate traps; (3) use of low sulfur fuel; and (4) use of alternative fuels or equipment.

Operational Emissions

The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using a Focused Traffic Analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc. in June 2018. The Focused Traffic Analysis determined that the Proposed Project would generate approximately 218 total daily trips in passenger car equivalents. Emissions associated with the Proposed Project's estimated vehicle trips were modeled and are listed in Table 3 and Table 4, which represent summer and winter operational emissions, respectively.

Table 3
Summer Operational Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	1.71	0.0	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.04	0.03	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	0.32	8.13	3.19	0.03	1.29	0.38
Totals (lbs/day)	2.0	8.2	3.2	0.0	1.3	0.4
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significance	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Summer Emissions.

Table 4
Winter Operational Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	1.71	0.0	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.04	0.03	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	0.31	8.12	3.07	0.03	1.29	0.38
Totals (lbs/day)	2.0	8.2	3.1	0.0	1.3	0.4
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significance	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Winter Emissions.

As shown, both summer and winter season operational emissions are below SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures would be required.

The Proposed Project does not exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds either during construction or operational activities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project would not exceed any SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction (see Tables 1 and 2). Operational emissions are less than significant and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant (see Tables 3 and 4). Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **Less than Significant.** SCAQMD has developed a methodology to assess the localized impacts of emissions from a proposed project as outlined within the Final Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Methodology report; completed in June 2003 and revised in July 2008. The use of LSTs is voluntary, to be implemented at the discretion of local public agencies acting as a lead agency pursuant to CEQA. LSTs apply to projects that must undergo CEQA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and are five acres or less. LST methodology is incorporated to represent worst-case scenario

emissions thresholds. CalEEMod version 2016.3.2 was used to estimate the on-site and off-site construction emissions. The LSTs were developed to analyze the significance of potential air quality impacts of proposed projects to sensitive receptors (i.e. schools, single family residences, etc.) and provide screening tables for small projects (one, two, or five acres). Projects are evaluated based on geographic location and distance from the sensitive receptor (25, 50, 100, 200, or 500 meters from the site).

For the purposes of a CEQA analysis, the SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a receptor such as a residence, hospital, convalescent facility or anywhere that it is possible for an individual to remain for 24 hours. Additionally, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities can also be considered as sensitive receptors. Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition of sensitive receptor because employees do not typically remain on-site for a full 24 hours, but are usually present for shorter periods of time, such as eight hours.

The Project Site is approximately 4.11 acres, however, the “2 acres scenario” was used to represent a worst-case scenario as larger sites are typically granted a larger emission allowance. The nearest sensitive receptor land use is Joe Baca Middle School which is located approximately 700 feet northwest of the Project Site and therefore LSTs are based on a 656-foot (200-meter) distance. The Proposed Project’s construction and operational emissions with the appropriate LS are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Localized Significance Thresholds
(Pounds per Day)

Source	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀		PM _{2.5}	
Construction Emissions (Max. from Table 1 and Table 2)	45.6	23.0	10.7		6.7	
Operational Emissions (Max. Total from Table 3 and Table 4) ¹	0.85	0.37	0.13		0.04	
Highest Value (lbs/day)	45.6	23.0	10.7	0.13	6.7	0.04
LST Thresholds	378	6,346	83*	20†	26*	7†
Greater Than Threshold	No	No	No	No	No	No

Note: PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions are separated into construction and operational thresholds in accordance with the SCAQMD Mass Rate LST Look-up Tables.

* Construction emissions LST

† Operational emissions LST

¹ Per LST Methodology, mobile source emissions do not need to be included except for land use emissions and on-site vehicle emissions. It is estimated that approximately 10 percent of mobile emissions will occur on the Project Site.

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Summer & Winter Emissions; SCAQMD Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology; SCAQMD Mass Rate Look-up Tables for 2-acre site in SRA No. 34, distance of 200 meters.

As shown in Table 5, the Proposed Project’s emissions are not anticipated to exceed the thresholds for LSTs. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project does not contain land uses typically associated with the emission of objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the Proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities; and the temporary storage of domestic solid waste (refuse) associated with the Proposed Project's (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It should be noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City of Rialto's solid waste regulations. The Project would be also required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc...) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Less than Significant With Mitigation. In June 2018, Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI) prepared a general Biological Assessment for the Proposed Project (available at the City offices for review). As part of the Biological Assessment, NRAI conducted a data search for information on plant and wildlife species with known occurrences within the vicinity of the Project Site. The data reviewed included biological texts on general and specific biological resources, and those resources considered to be sensitive by various wildlife agencies, local governmental agencies and interest groups. Additionally, NRAI conducted a biological assessment of the development area on April 18th and May 12th of 2018. The field survey included habitat assessment surveys for resources covered under local, state, and federal laws and regulations.</p> <p>The Project Site is dominated by ruderal (weedy) species such as red brome (<i>Bromus madritensis</i> var. <i>rubens</i>) and slender wild oats (<i>Avena barbata</i>). Weedy native and non-natives forbs are also present, including fiddleneck (<i>Amsinckia menziesii</i>), red-stemmed filaree (<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>), short-pod mustard (<i>Hirschfeldia incana</i>) and cheeseweed (<i>Malva parviflora</i>). Birds were the most common group of species observed on the Project Site. Bird species observed included house finch (<i>Haemorrhous mexicanus</i>), mourning dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>), and northern mockingbird (<i>Mimus polyglottos</i>). Bottae's pocket gopher (<i>Thomomys bottae</i>) burrows were observed. No California ground squirrel or kangaroo rat burrows were observed. No reptile species were observed, probably due to the uniform soil cover and lack of shrub or rock cover. No amphibian species were observed, likely due to the lack of on-site or nearby surface water and similar moist habitats.</p> <p>Sensitive species potentially present include but are not limited to those listed, or candidates for listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and California Native Plant Society (CNPS). The USFWS identified 21 federal resources of concern near the Project Site, and the CNDDB and CNPS website collectively identified 55 resources for the Fontana 7.5 United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map, with several of the same resources occurring on all three lists.</p>				

In addition to the three listed species that were determined to have some potential to be on-site: San Bernardino kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami parvus*), Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis*), and Santa Ana River woolly star (*Eriastrum densifolium* var. *sanctorum*) the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) was included within the general Biological Assessment because it is of sufficient local concern, as shown in the County's Biotic Resources Overlay. The Biological Assessment also includes discussions on three small mammals (Northwestern San Diego Pocket Mouse, Los Angeles Pocket Mouse, and San Diego Desert Woodrat) that are not listed but are of concern to the wildlife agencies.

Following the field surveys, NRAI concluded that none of the seven species listed above were found on-site and/or are expected to be present on site due to a lack of suitable habitat. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not 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.

The Project Site provides marginal nesting for ground-nesting species. A row of eucalyptus trees located at the southern boundary of the Project Site may provide nesting sites for tree-nesting and some migratory species. As such, construction on-site may impact nesting birds. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended to avoid impacts to raptors and nesting birds if any disturbance on the property occurs during the breeding season of February 1 through August 31.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

If avoidance is not possible then a qualified biologist shall conduct a breeding bird survey no more than three days prior to the start of construction to determine if nesting is occurring. If occupied nests are found, they shall not be disturbed unless the qualified biologist determines through non-invasive methods that either (a) the adult birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (b) the juveniles from the occupied nests are capable of independent survival. If the biologist is not able to verify one of the above conditions, then no disturbance shall occur within a distance specified by the qualified biologist for each nest or nesting site. The qualified biologist will determine the appropriate distance in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, less than significant adverse impacts would be anticipated.

- b) **No Impact.** The Biological Assessment concludes that there are no drainages or riparian habitat on the Project Site and there are no indications of direct flow or flooding areas. Additionally, the Project Site is within a highly disturbed and impacted area in which native habitat does not exist and there are no biological resources within the Project Site that would come under the jurisdiction of CDFW. Therefore, the Proposed Project would

not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** As stated in the Biological Assessment, the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. These watersheds include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria. The Biological Assessment concludes that there are no jurisdictional waters on-site and the Project Site does not contain any drainages, indication of flow, or evidence of flooding. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or by other means. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **Less than Significant.** Wildlife movement and the fragmentation of wildlife habitat are recognized as critical issues that must be considered in assessing impacts to wildlife. In summary, habitat fragmentation is the division or breaking up of larger habitat areas into smaller areas that may or may not be capable of independently sustaining wildlife and plant populations. Wildlife movement (more properly recognized as species movement) is the temporal movement of individuals (plants and animals) along diverse types of corridors. Wildlife corridors are especially important for connecting fragmented habitat areas.

The Project Site is in an area fragmented by existing development including paved roads, commercial and industrial development. The Biological Assessment concludes that the Proposed Project is mostly within a developed area and will not add significantly to additional fragmentation of habitat or affects to wildlife movement. The Proposed Project would not 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. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) **No Impact.** As identified in the City of Rialto General Plan, the City is mostly developed, and the majority of local biological resources are associated with Lytle Creek Wash, located approximately four miles northeast of the Project Site. In accordance with City of Rialto General Plan Goal 2-39: Conserve and enhance Rialto's biological resources, the City recognizes the following policies:

Policy 2-14.1: Protect endangered, threatened, rare, and other special status habitat and wildlife species within and along Lytle Creek by working with the United States Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game to establish Natural Community Conservation Plans, Habitat Conservations Plans (HCP), or other established biological resource protection mechanisms within this sensitive area.

Policy 2-14.2: Pursue open space, wildlife corridors, or conservation easements to protect sensitive species and their habitats.

Policy 2-14.3: Continue to work with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to adopt a habitat conservation plan to protect viability of the Delhi Sands Flowing-loving Fly. Until a habitat conservation plan is established, continue to support the implementation of the existing Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly Recovery Plan.

As stated in the Biological Assessment, the Proposed Project would result in the loss of ruderal habitat; an impact that is not considered to be significant. Additionally, the Project Site is located outside of the Delhi Sand Soils Colton Recovery Unit Area as shown by the USFWS's Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly. Furthermore, the City of Rialto Code of Ordinances does not currently contain ordinances which specifically protect biological resources. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located within the planning area of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as identified in the CDFW California Regional Conservation Plans Map (October 2017), in the City of Rialto General Plan or in the Gateway Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RECOURES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a, b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** In May 2018, McKenna et al. prepared a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Project (available at the City offices for review). An archaeological records check was completed at the California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center. Research identified a minimum of fifty-six cultural resources investigations within a one-mile radius around the Project Site. These studies also included large and small blocks of surveying, linear surveys (transmission lines, roadways, and railroad alignments), and small property investigations. Of these, only one directly involved the Project Site (1061772).

Further review of the recorded cultural resources resulted in the identification of 50 resources within a one-mile radius of the Project Site, however, none of the identified cultural resources are within or adjacent to the Project Site.

McKenna et al. completed an intensive survey and found the property to be covered in foot-high grasses with some areas bare of surface vegetation and other areas densely overgrown. McKenna et al. found no evidence of prehistoric or historical archaeological resources. Based on the recent historical research and documentation, McKenna et al. has concluded the Project Site yielded no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources and no evidence of historic archaeological resources. The Project Site is not culturally significant or sensitive and the proposed development would not result in any adverse environmental impacts; however, the possibility of discovering a significant unanticipated find remains. Therefore, potentially significant impacts could occur and the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CR-1:

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall cease and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service [NPS] 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find(s). If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted and will be reported to the City.

Mitigation Measure CR-2:

Should human remains and/or cremations be encountered during any earthmoving activities, all work shall stop immediately in the area in which the find(s) are present (suggested 100-ft radius area around the remains and project personnel will be excluded from the area and no photographs will be permitted), and the County of San Bernardino Coroner will be notified. The City of Rialto and the Project Proponent shall also be called and informed of the discovery. The

Coroner will determine if the bones are historic/archaeological or a modern legal case. The Coroner will immediately contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in the event that remains are determined to be human and of Native American origin, in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

All discovered human remains shall be treated with respect and dignity. California state law (California Health & Safety Code 7050.5) and federal law and regulations ([Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) 16 USC 470 & 43 CFR 7], [Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) 25 USC 3001 & 43 CFR 10] and [Public Lands, Interior 43 CFR 8365.1-7]) require a defined protocol if human remains are discovered in the State of California regardless if the remains are modern or archaeological.

- c) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation.** McLeod (2018) completed a paleontological overview of the Project Site in conjunction with the Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation and concluded that the area consists of surficial deposits of older Quaternary alluvial deposits – possibly Holocene – and, in the southwestern corner, exposed younger Quaternary alluvial deposits. Neither the older or younger alluvial deposits are conducive to yielding paleontological specimens, but deeper deposits (pre-Holocene) may contain fossil remains. No such fossils have been reported in the immediate area.

Based on the historical research, field investigations, and documentation, McKenna et al. concluded that the Project Site yielded no evidence of paleontological resources and the area is not considered to be paleontologically sensitive. Recent geological testing confirmed the Holocene alluvium exceeds 50 feet in depth and the potential to impact fossil bearing deposits is very low. No such resources are expected to be present or identifiable, however, the possibility of discovering a significant unanticipated paleontological find remains. Therefore, potentially significant impacts could occur and the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CR-3:

In the event fossil specimens are unearthed, the Project Proponent shall have a paleontological consultant assess the specimens and report to the City of Rialto. If the consultant and City concur, a paleontological monitoring program shall be implemented for the remainder of earth moving activities.

- d) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Construction activities, particularly grading, could potentially disturb human remains interred outside of a formal cemetery. Thus, the potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with project construction. In the event that human remains are

discovered during grading or other ground disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Project, all work in that area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds as detailed under Mitigation Measure CR-2, listed in Section V(a, b), above. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-2. No additional mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------

disposal systems where sewers are not available
for the disposal of wastewater?

a)

- i) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is located in seismically active southern California with numerous fault systems in the region. The San Jacinto fault zone is located approximately 10 miles north of the Project Site, while the San Andreas fault zone is located approximately 10 miles northeast of the Project Site. The Project Site, however, is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as identified in Exhibit 5.1, Seismic and Geologic Hazards, of the City of Rialto General Plan. Potential for damage due to direct fault rupture is considered remote. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- ii) **Less than Significant.** As is the case for most areas of southern California, strong seismic ground shaking resulting from earthquakes associated with nearby faults may occur at the Project Site. Strong seismic ground shaking can be expected to induce lower horizontal accelerations due to smaller anticipated earthquakes during the lifetime of the proposed structure. Development of the Project Site would take place in accordance with the applicable requirements listed in the International Building Code (IBC), the California Building Standards Code, and the Buildings and Construction requirements of the City of Rialto Municipal Code. In addition, discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of Rialto includes approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- iii) **No Impact.** Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which cohesion-less, saturated, fine-grained sand and silt soils loose shear strength due to ground shaking. As a result, the soil behaves like a liquid, has an inability to support weight, and can flow down gentle slopes. This condition is usually temporary and is most often caused by an earthquake vibrating water-saturated fill or unconsolidated soil. The Project Site is not located in an area identified to have liquefaction susceptibility as identified in Exhibit 5.1 of the City of Rialto General Plan. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- iv) **No Impact.** The Project Site is relatively level with a southerly gradient from approximately 1,073 feet in elevation at the northern boundary to approximately 1,067 feet at the southern boundary. The Project Site is not located in an area with identified seismic and geologic hazards as shown on Exhibit 5.1 of the City of Rialto General Plan. Additionally, as identified in the County of San Bernardino General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlay Map FH29C Fontana, the Project Site is not located in an area likely to become unstable as a result of on- or off-site

landslide. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** During the development of the Project Site, which would include disturbance of approximately 4.11 acres, project-related dust may be generated due to the operation of machinery on-site or due to high winds. Additionally, erosion of soils could occur due to a storm event. Development of the Proposed Project would disturb more than one acre of soil; therefore, the Proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (SWRCB Construction General Permit Order 2009-2009-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize soil erosion. Adherence to BMPs approved by the SWRCB would ensure that the Proposed Project does not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- c) **Less than Significant.** A site visit performed by Lilburn Corporation in April 2018 found the Project Site to be relatively level with no prominent geologic features occurring on or within the vicinity of the Project Site. Additionally, review of County of San Bernardino General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlay Map FH29C Fontana showed that the Project Site is not located in an area likely to become unstable as a result of on- or off-site landslide. Accordingly, the Project Site is located within an area with no potential for landslides, and development on the subject property would not be exposed to risk of landslide.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which cohesion-less, saturated, fine-grained sand and silt soils lose shear strength due to ground shaking. As identified in Exhibit 5.1, Seismic and Geologic Hazards, of the City of Rialto General Plan, the Project Site is not located in an area identified to have liquefaction susceptibility. Therefore, the Proposed Project is anticipated to result in less than significant risks related to liquefaction.

Ground subsidence is a process characterized by downward displacement of surface material caused by natural phenomena such as a removal of underground fluids, natural consolidation, or dissolution of underground minerals, or by man-made phenomena such as underground mining. Currently, there is no determination on the Project Site's possible location on a geologic unit or soil that is potentially unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site subsidence.

Seismically induced lateral spreading involves primary lateral movement of earth materials over underlying materials which are liquefied due to ground shaking. It differs from slope failure in that complete ground failure involving large movement does not occur due to the relatively smaller gradient of the initial ground surface. Lateral spreading is demonstrated by near-vertical cracks with predominantly horizontal movement of the

soil mass involved. Review of available database and geologic map resources did not reveal a determination regarding the Project Site's possible location on a geologic unit or soil that is potentially unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site lateral spreading.

Although the Project Site is located in an area in which impacts related to ground subsidence and lateral spreading have not been determined, as a mandatory condition of project approval, the Proposed Project will be developed in conformance with the IBC, the California Building Standards Code, the Buildings and Construction requirements of the City of Rialto Municipal Code. Additionally, discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of Rialto includes approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- d) **Less than Significant.** Expansive soils, sometimes referred to as shrink-swell soils, are fine-grained silts and clays which are subject to swelling and contracting. The amount of swelling and contracting is subject to the amount of fine-grained clay materials present in the soils and the amount of moisture either introduced or extracted from the soils. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Web Soil Survey identified the presence of Tujunga gravelly loamy sand (TvC) and Hanford coarse sandy loam (HaC) on the Project Site. The USDA Soil Conservation Service's Soil Survey of San Bernardino County: Southwestern Part, California, describes TvC and HaC as having low shrink-swell potentials. Therefore, the Project Site is not anticipated to be located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- e) **No Impact.** Sewer service is available to the Project Site and the facilities would be connected to the existing system. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed at the Project Site. Therefore, no impact would occur relative to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems and no mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Less than
Significant with
Mitigation | Less than
Significant | No
Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- a) **Less than Significant.** Emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod version 2016.3.2., which are available at the City offices for review). Construction is anticipated to begin in early 2019 and be completed in early 2020. Other parameters which are used to estimate construction emissions, such as the worker and vendor trips and trip lengths, utilized the CalEEMod defaults. The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using the Focused Traffic Analysis prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., June 2018. The Focused Traffic Analysis determined that the Proposed Project would generate approximately 218 total daily trips in passenger car equivalents.

Many gases make up the group of pollutants that are believed to contribute to global climate change. However, three gases are currently evaluated and represent the highest concentration of GHG: Carbon dioxide (CO₂), Methane (CH₄), and Nitrous oxide (N₂O). SCAQMD provides guidance methods and/or Emission Factors that are used for evaluating a project's emissions in relation to the thresholds. A threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂E per year has been adopted by SCAQMD for industrial uses. The modeled emissions anticipated from the Proposed Project compared to the SCAQMD threshold are shown below in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6
Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions
(Metric Tons per Year)

Source/Phase	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Site Preparation	9.0	0.0	0.0
Grading	11.2	0.0	0.0
Building Construction	439.8	0.1	0.0
Paving	16.8	0.0	0.0
Architectural Coating	3.6	0.0	0.0
Total MTCO₂e	482.5		
SCAQMD Threshold	10,000		
Significant?	NO		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

Table 7
Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions
(Metric Tons per Year)

Source/Phase	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Area	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	71.5	0.0	0.0
Mobile	494.9	0.0	0.0
Waste	14.2	0.8	0.0
Water	77.1	0.6	0.0
MTCO₂e	698.0		
SCAQMD Threshold	10,000		
Significant?	NO		

Source: CalEEMod.2016.3.2 Annual Emissions.

As shown in Table 6 and Table 7, the Proposed Project's emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's 10,000 MTCO₂e threshold of significance. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** There are no existing GHG plans, policies, or regulations that have been adopted by CARB or SCAQMD that would apply to this type of emissions source. However, the operator shall comply with CARB and SCAQMD regulations related to diesel-fueled trucks, which may include among others: (1) meeting more stringent emission standards; (2) retrofitting existing engines with particulate traps; (3) use of low sulfur fuel; and (4) use of alternative fuels or equipment.

It is possible that CARB may develop performance standards for project-related activities prior to construction of the Proposed Project. In this event, these performance standards would be implemented and adhered to, and there would be no conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulations. The Proposed Project is consistent with CARB scoping measures and therefore does not conflict with local or regional greenhouse gas plans. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a, b) **Less than Significant.** The specific business or tenant that will occupy the proposed industrial warehouse/distribution facility is not known at this time. Potential hazardous materials used by the future tenant of the Project Site could include chemical reagents, solvents, fuels, paints, and cleansers. Businesses that handle one or more regulated substances in a process in excess of the threshold quantities as listed in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, Section 2770.5, must register activities in accordance with CCR Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, Sections 2735.1 through 2785.1. Potential on-site uses also could generate hazardous byproducts that eventually must be handled and disposed of as hazardous materials. If businesses that use or store hazardous materials occupy the Project Site, the business owner and operator would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations including cooperation with the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) with Hazardous Materials Division of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. As part of the CUPA process, in accordance with CCR, Title 19, Public Safety, Division 2 California Governor's Office of Emergency Services, Chapter 4.5 California Accidental Release Prevention Program Detailed Analysis, Article 4, Hazard Assessment, Section 2750.5 Defining Offsite Impacts to the Population, the owner or operator would be required to identify the presence of institutions (schools, hospitals, long-term health care facilities, child day care facilities, prisons) parks and recreation areas, and major commercial, office and industrial buildings in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Risk Management Plan (RMP). In addition, the future tenant of the warehouse would be required to submit a California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CALARP) Stationary Source Registration Form. Also, the San Bernardino County Fire Department – Hazardous Materials Division requires businesses involved in hazardous materials activity to submit business information electronically into the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS).

Hazardous or toxic materials transported in association with construction of the Proposed Project may include items such as oils, paints, and fuels. All materials required during construction will be kept in compliance with State and local regulations. With implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) and compliance with all applicable regulations, potential impacts from the use of hazardous materials during construction is considered to be less than significant. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **Less than Significant.** The school located nearest to the Project Site is Joe Baca Middle School, located approximately 0.1-mile northwest of the Project Site. As described in Section VIII (a, b) above, the specific business or tenant that will occupy the building is not known at this time. However, with implementation of BMPs and compliance with applicable regulations less than significant impacts are anticipated. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not a known hazardous material site as identified in Exhibit 5.4, Hazardous Materials, of the City of Rialto General Plan. As reviewed on April 3, 2018, the Project Site was not found on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 by the California Department of

Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor data management system. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) **No Impact.** The Project Site is located approximately 4.5 miles southeast of the former Rialto Municipal Airport runway. The airport was officially closed in September 2014. At the time of this writing some of the airport infrastructure, including portions of the runway remain on the ground; however, airport operations are no longer supported. The nearest airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately nine miles southwest of the Project Site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard related to airport land uses for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- f) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a known private airstrip; therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The nearest airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately nine miles southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- g) **No Impact.** The Project Site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the City. The Proposed Project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan; therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- h) **No Impact.** As shown in Exhibit 5.3, Fire Hazards, of the City of Rialto General Plan, the Project Site is not identified in an area associated with risk of wildland fire. The Project Site is located in predominantly developed area and no wildlands are located on or adjacent to the Project Site. The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to significant risk or loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Less than
Significant with
Mitigation | Less than
Significant | No
Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project would be subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Construction activities covered under the State of California's General Construction permit include removal of vegetation, grading, excavating, or any other activities that causes the disturbance of one acre or more. The General Construction permit requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The purpose of the SWPPP is to: 1) identify pollutant sources that may affect the quality of discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities; and 2) identify, construct, and implement stormwater pollution control measures to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges from the construction site during and after construction.

The NPDES also requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). In April 2018 a Preliminary WQMP for the Proposed Project was prepared by Thatcher Engineering & Associates, Inc. (available at the City offices for review) to comply with the requirements of the City of Rialto and the NPDES Area Wide Stormwater Program. Mandatory compliance with the Proposed Project's WQMP, in addition to compliance with NPDES Permit requirements, would ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are minimized or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** As stated in the City of Rialto 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the City Water Services obtains its water supply from several sources. The primary source of water supply for the City is from groundwater supplies. The groundwater is pumped from the Rialto Basin, Chino Basin, North Riverside Basin, and the Lytle Creek Basin. The City also receives water from the West Valley Water District (WVWD) and the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD). The UWMP provides a supply reliability analysis which includes future supply and demand comparisons for the service area. As shown in Table 5.10 of the UWMP, the projected 2030 multiple dry year water supply is approximately 14,650 acre-feet (AF), while the projected 2030 multiple dry year water demand is approximately 12,020 AF. Therefore, the City can expect to meet future demands through 2030 for all climatologic classifications. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance; therefore, the Proposed Project's water supply demand has been anticipated as a planned land use in the UWMP. There are no groundwater recharge facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in

aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **Less than Significant.** In April 2018, a Preliminary Drainage Study for the Proposed Project was completed by Thatcher Engineering & Associates, Inc. in conjunction with the Preliminary WQMP (available at the City offices for review). As described in the Preliminary Drainage Study, post-development flows will continue as they have historically from north to south along proposed curb and ribbon gutters to proposed drop inlets located along the north portion of the Project Site and a proposed catch basin located along the south property line. From these drop inlets and catch basin, flows will enter an on-site storm drain system and will drain into a proposed Stormtech underground chamber system. This Stormtech system has been sized for water quality purposes and will have a total volume of 16,111 cubic-feet, which is more than the 100-year storm event on-site. Flows from the back to back 100-year storms will be allowed to leave the Project Site by backing up in the proposed catch basin and will flow out a proposed opening in the back of the catch basin to the existing concrete spillway to the existing trapezoidal channel along the north side of I-10. There will be no increase in flows or intensity from historic storm events. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **Less than Significant.** See response to c) above.
- e) **Less than Significant.** As stated in the Preliminary Drainage Study, flows on the Project site drain as sheet flow from the north to the south at an approximate grade of 1.8 percent. Flows along Valley Boulevard frontage are directed east along the existing curb and gutter. Flows on-site that make their way south are directed to the middle of the Project Site along an existing concrete curb and gutter to a concrete spillway. This curb and gutter is located within an existing 15-foot drainage easement that collects the flows from the parcel located immediately west of the Project Site. From the aforementioned spillway, flows continue to an existing trapezoidal channel located along the north side of I-10. From this channel, flows continue east to the Rialto Channel where they are directed south to the Santa Ana River. After development of the Project Site, flows contributed by the parcel located immediately to the west will continue to be accepted by the Project Site. The parcel located immediately east of the Project Site drains to the south and does not contribute tributary flows to the Project Site.

Furthermore, any potential increase in post-development volume from pre-development conditions on-site has been mitigated through the use of an underground Stormtech infiltration system which will have a total capacity of 16,111 cubic feet. This system has been sized for water quality purposes. Flows from back to back 100-year storms will be allowed to leave the Project Site by backing up in the proposed catch basin along the south property line and flow to the existing concrete spillway to the CalTrans right-of-way. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance and would not create or

contribute an amount of water runoff that was not already anticipated by the General Plan or the Gateway Specific Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project does not present any other conditions that could result in the substantial degradation of water quality. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- g) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project does not include housing. The Project Site is not identified to be inside a 100-year floodplain as shown in Exhibit 5.2, Flooding Hazards, of the City of Rialto General Plan. Additionally, as identified in the County of San Bernardino General Plan Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana, the Project Site is not located in a Flood Plain Safety (FP) Overlay District. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- h) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not inside a 100-year floodplain as shown in Exhibit 5.2 of the City of Rialto General Plan. Additionally, as identified in the County of San Bernardino General Plan Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana, the Project Site is not located in a FP Overlay District. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- i) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in a Dam Inundation area as identified by San Bernardino County's General Plan – Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- j) **No Impact.** Seiches are standing waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. The Project Site is not located in the immediate vicinity of a known large body of water or water storage facility and therefore impacts from potential seiches are not anticipated. Tsunamis are large waves generated in open bodies of water by fault displacement of major ground movement. Due to the inland location of the Project Site, tsunamis are not considered to be a risk. Dams or other water-retaining structures may fail as a result of large earthquakes, resulting in flooding and mudflow production. The Project Site is not located within a designated Dam Inundation area as identified by San Bernardino County's General Plan – Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a, b) Less than Significant. The Project Site is located in the City of Rialto on the south side of Valley Boulevard between Lilac and Willow Avenues. The Proposed Project is located within an area of the Gateway Specific Plan zoned for I-P land uses. As stated in Section 18.35.050.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, the primary purpose of the zone is to provide wholesale sales and business or trade services consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the Gateway Specific Plan, and, to provide for a certain range of light industrial activities which will be developed and conducted in a manner that enhance the image of the area.</p>				

Per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.020.A.4 and 5 of the Rialto Municipal Code, warehousing and distribution facilities are subject to the approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. Additionally, per Chapter 18.35, Section 18.35.030.A of the Rialto Municipal Code, a maximum building height of 35 feet, or two and one-half stories, is allowed for the Project Site. The Project Proponent is proposing to construct a building that has a maximum height of 44 feet, and therefore, approval of a Variance application is required. Approval of the requested Variance would not result in the proposed warehouse being out of character for the area. In January 2018 a 404,837 square-foot warehouse located approximately ¼-mile west of the Project Site on the southside of Valley Blvd. between Cactus Avenue and Spruce Avenue was approved for an increase in height from 35 feet to 47 feet (VAR 2017-0011; Planning Commission Resolution No. 18-10). As such, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance.

The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone and therefore the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of

avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located within the planning area of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as identified in the CDFW California Regional Conservation Plans Map (October 2017), in the City of Rialto General Plan, or in the Gateway Specific Plan. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a, b) **Less than Significant.** As identified in Exhibit 2.7, Mineral Resource Zones, of the City of Rialto General Plan, the Project Site is located in an area designated as MRZ-3 by the State Geologist. MRZ-3 designations apply to areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. Exhibit 2.6, Aggregate Resources, of the General Plan identifies aggregate resource areas designated by the City. The Project Site is not located within an area recognized by the State Mining and Geology Board as containing regional significant PCC-grade aggregated resources. Furthermore, heavy industrial/extraction uses such as mining are not permitted land uses within the Gateway Specific Plan area. As shown Exhibit 2.7 of the General Plan, the majority of designated aggregate resources occur in the northern part of the City. These areas have a land use designation of Open Space to protect aggregate resources as long as mining activity is feasible. The Project Site is not located within an area protected by the City for mining development and therefore the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource recovery site.

The Proposed Project would require concrete for construction. Resources are commercially available in the southern California region without any constraint and no potential for adverse impacts to the natural resources base supporting these materials is forecast to occur over the foreseeable future. The Proposed Project's demand for mineral resources is not significant due to the abundance of available local aggregate resources.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Less than Significant. Urban Crossroads prepared a Noise Impact Analysis (NIA) for the Proposed Project in July 2018 (available at the City offices for review). Peak hour or average noise levels, while useful, do not completely describe a given noise environment. Noise levels lower than peak hour may be disturbing if they occur during times when quiet is most desirable, namely evening and nighttime (sleeping) hours. To account for this, the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), representing a composite 24-hour noise level is utilized. The CNEL is the weighted average of the intensity of a sound, with corrections for time of day, and averaged over 24 hours. The City of Rialto's General</p>				

Plan Safety & Noise Element establishes policies to guard against the creation of any new noise and land use conflicts, and to minimize the impact of existing noise sources on the community. The Noise Element does not contain specific transportation-related noise standards; however, it does provide land use compatibility guidelines for future development and the future noise contour boundaries for major roadways in the City of Rialto.

The compatibility criteria, presented by the Rialto Noise Guidelines for Land Use Planning, provides the City with a planning tool to gauge the compatibility of land uses relative to existing and future exterior noise levels. The Rialto Noise Guidelines for Land Use Planning matrix indicates that industrial land uses, such as the Proposed Project, are considered normally acceptable with exterior noise levels below 70 dBA CNEL, and conditionally acceptable with noise levels below 75 dBA CNEL. Noise-sensitive residential land uses are considered normally acceptable with exterior noise levels below 60 dBA CNEL, and conditionally acceptable with noise levels below 65 dBA CNEL.

Furthermore, the City of Rialto Municipal Code, Section 9.50.070, states that construction activities are permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday from October 1st to April 30th, 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday from May 1st to September 30th, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays any time of year; with no activity allowed on Sundays or state holidays. While the City establishes limits to the hours during which construction activity may take place, neither the City, or the County of San Bernardino, General Plans or Municipal Codes establish numeric maximum acceptable construction source noise levels at potentially affected receivers, which would allow for a quantified determination of what CEQA constitutes a substantial temporary or periodic noise increase.

Existing Noise Levels

To describe the existing noise environment, the hourly noise levels were measured by Urban Crossroads during typical weekday conditions over a 24-hour period. By collecting individual hourly noise level measurements, it is possible to describe the daytime and nighttime hourly noise levels and calculate the 24-hour CNEL. The long-term noise readings were recorded using a sound meter positioned as close to the nearest sensitive receiver locations as possible to assess the existing ambient hourly noise levels surrounding the Project Site. The 24-hour existing noise level measurements shown in Table 8, below, present the existing ambient noise conditions.

Table 8: 24-hour Ambient Noise Level Measurements

Location	Distance to Project Boundary (Feet)	Description	Energy Average Noise Level (dBA Leq)		CNEL
			Daytime	Nighttime	
L1	815	Located northwest of the Project Site on Lilac Avenue near existing residential homes and Joe Baca Middle School.	60.0	55.5	63.4
L2	360	Located northwest of the Project Site on Lilac Avenue near existing commercial uses and Joe Baca Middle School.	67.7	61.7	70.4
L3	0	Located adjacent to the western Project Site boundary near an existing Days Inn on Valley Boulevard.	64.3	59.9	67.6
L4	230	Located east of the Project Site in an existing parking lot for office and commercial uses south of Valley Boulevard.	67.1	63.0	70.7
L5	30	Located west of the Project Site in an existing truck parking lot south of the Days Inn hotel.	59.6	56.3	73.7

Source: Urban Crossroad's Noise Impact Analysis (2018)

Note: "Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Off-site Transportation Noise Impacts

The 2018 Traffic Impact Analysis shows that the Proposed Project would generate an average daily traffic volume of 130 vehicle trips, and 13 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Based on the existing PM peak hour traffic volume of 3,446 at Riverside Avenue and Valley Boulevard, the anticipated increase in traffic represents a 0.4 percent increase to the existing roadway volumes. This increase in roadway volume does not approach a "barely perceptible" noise level increase of three-dBA CNEL at nearby sensitive land uses adjacent to study area roadways, since a doubling of the existing traffic volumes would be required to generate a three-dBA CNEL increase. Therefore, due to the anticipated low traffic volumes generated by the Proposed Project, the off-site traffic noise levels generated by the Proposed Project are considered to be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

Receiver Locations

To assess the potential for long-term operational and short-term construction noise impacts, six receiver locations were identified as representative locations for focused analysis. Six noise-sensitive receivers near the Project Site include existing residential homes, Joe Baca Middle School, a Days Inn hotel, and an outdoor area with playground, as shown on Figure 4. Non-noise-sensitive receiver locations include the office building east of the Project Site. Other sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the Project Site that are

Figure 4: Noise Impact Analysis Receiver Locations

located at greater distances than those identified in this noise study will experience lower noise levels than those presented in this report due to the additional attenuation from distance and the shielding of intervening structures.

Construction Impacts

Noise generated by the Proposed Project's construction equipment will include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that when combined can reach high levels. The number and mix of construction equipment is expected to occur in the following stages:

- Site Preparation
- Grading
- Building Construction
- Paving
- Architectural Coating

The construction noise analysis shows that the highest construction noise levels will occur when construction activities take place at the closest point from the edge of primary construction activity to each of the nearby receiver locations. For the purposes of this analysis, the lowest, more conservative construction noise level threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq} is used as an acceptable threshold for construction noise at the nearby sensitive receiver locations. Since this construction-related noise level threshold represents the energy average of the noise source over a given time, they are expressed as L_{eq} noise levels.

Therefore, the noise level threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq} over a period of eight hours or more is used to evaluate the potential project-related construction noise level impacts at the nearby sensitive receiver locations.

The unmitigated construction noise levels are expected to range from 43.8 to 70.9 dBA L_{eq} at the nearby receiver locations. The highest construction noise levels at the potentially impacted receiver locations are expected to approach 70.9 dBA L_{eq} and, therefore, will satisfy the construction noise level threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq} at all receiver locations. As such, the noise impact due to unmitigated project-related construction noise levels is, therefore, considered a less than significant impact at all receiver locations.

Operational Impacts

To describe the Proposed Project's operational noise level contributions at nearby noise-sensitive receiver locations, the Proposed Project's operational noise levels were combined with the existing ambient noise levels measurements for the off-site noise-sensitive receiver locations potentially impacted by Project operational noise sources. Note that the projected noise levels assume the worst-case noise environment with the idling trucks, delivery truck activities, backup alarms, as well as loading and unloading of dry goods, roof-top air conditioning units, and parking lot vehicle movements all

operating continuously; in actuality, these noise level impacts will likely vary throughout the day.

As indicated by the NIA, the Proposed Project will contribute an operational noise level increase during the daytime hours of up to 1.1 dBA L_{eq} and during the nighttime hours of up to 2.1 dBA L_{eq} . Therefore, the increases at the sensitive receiver locations will be less than significant as the Proposed Project operational stationary-source noise would not result in a substantial temporary/periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project. In addition, the background ambient noise levels associated with the I-10 and Union Pacific Railroad yard located to the south will likely overshadow the potential noise level impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

The NIA concludes that the Proposed Project will not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** There are several different methods that are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings but is not always suitable for evaluating human response (annoyance) because it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. Instead, the human body responds to average vibration amplitude often described as the root mean square (RMS). The RMS amplitude is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal and is most frequently used to describe the effect of vibration on the human body. Decibel notation (VdB) is commonly used to measure RMS. Decibel notation (VdB) serves to reduce the range of numbers used to describe human response to vibration. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Sensitive receivers for vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly, and sick), and vibration-sensitive equipment.

The background vibration-velocity level in residential areas is generally 50 VdB. Ground-borne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB. For most people, a vibration-velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration-velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

To analyze vibration impacts originating from the operation and construction of the Proposed Project, vibration-generating activities are typically evaluated against standards established under a jurisdiction's Municipal Code. Since the City of Rialto Municipal Code does not identify specific vibration level standards, the County Development Code

vibration level standards are used in this analysis to assess potential impacts at nearby sensitive receiver locations. The County Development Code, Section 83.01.090(a) states that vibration shall be no greater than or equal to two-tenths inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line. Therefore, to determine if the vibration levels due to the operation and construction of the Project, the peak particle velocity (PPV) vibration level standard of 0.2 inches per second is used.

Ground-borne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring within the Project Site were estimated by data published by the Federal Transit Administration. Construction activities that would have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration within the Project Site include grading. At distances ranging from 67 to 857 feet from project-related construction activity, construction vibration velocity levels are expected to approach 0.02 in/sec PPV. Based on the County of San Bernardino vibration standards, the unmitigated project-related construction vibration levels will satisfy the 0.2 in/sec PPV threshold at all of the nearby sensitive receiver locations. Therefore, the vibration impacts due to construction of the Proposed Project are considered less than significant. Further, vibration levels at the location of the closest sensitive receiver are unlikely to be sustained during the entire construction period but will occur rather only during the times that heavy construction equipment is operating simultaneously adjacent to the Project Site perimeter.

As concluded in the NIA, less than significant impacts are anticipated and the Proposed Project would not expose persons to, or result in the generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c, d) **Less than Significant.** As discussed in Section XII(a), above, permanent off-site project-related transportation noise level increase is considered less than significant. Additionally, the Proposed Project will contribute an operational noise level increase during the daytime hours of up to 1.1 dBA L_{eq} and during the nighttime hours of up to 2.1 dBA L_{eq} . Furthermore, the highest construction noise levels at the potentially impacted receiver locations are expected to approach 70.9 dBA L_{eq} and, therefore, will satisfy the construction noise level threshold of 85 dBA L_{eq} at all receiver locations. Therefore, the increases at the sensitive receiver locations will be less than significant as the Proposed Project operational stationary-source noise would not result in a substantial temporary/periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without the Proposed Project. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- e) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public land use airport, as identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan – Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana. The Project Site is located approximately 4.5 miles southeast of the former Rialto Municipal Airport runway, however, the airport was officially closed in September 2014. At the time of this writing some of the airport infrastructure, including portions of the runway remain on the ground; however, airport operations are no longer supported.

The nearest airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately nine miles southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- f) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located in the vicinity of a known private airstrip; the nearest airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately nine miles southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Less than Significant. Although the specific business or tenant that will occupy the proposed facility is not known at this time, future use of the building would be consistent with the allowed uses of the I-P zoning designation of the Gateway Specific Plan. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate in the Riverside/San Bernardino/Ontario region as of February 2018 was 4.4%. Based on the availability of a local work force, it is anticipated that the employment generated by the future tenant of the facility would be filled from the local area and would not result in population growth not already anticipated by the Gateway Specific Plan or the City's General Plan. The Project Site is served by existing public roadways and utility infrastructure exists to serve the property. As such, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant direct or indirect growth in the area. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
b) No Impact. Project Site consists of a parcel of land that is currently vacant. The Proposed Project would therefore not reduce the number of existing housing units,				

displace people, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** See response to Section XIII(b), above.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a)

Fire Protection

Less than Significant. Fire emergency response at the Project Site would be provided by the City of Rialto Fire Department. The Rialto Fire Department is an all-risk fire agency; services include: fire suppression, emergency medical, technical rescue, hazardous material, and other related emergency services. Firefighting resources in Rialto include four fire stations; emergency response personnel, firefighters/paramedics, and a Hazardous Materials Response Team. The closest City of Rialto Fire Station to the Project Site is Fire Station 201 located at 131 South Willow Avenue, approximately two miles north of the Project Site. The Proposed Project is required to provide a minimum of fire safety and support fire suppression activities, including type and building construction, fire sprinklers, and paved fire access. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance and therefore would result in the requirement of fire protection services that is already anticipated by the City of Rialto General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan.

In addition the applicant would be required to pay appropriate development impact fees, property taxes, and utility user tax. As such, the Proposed Project would receive adequate fire protection services and would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Police Protection

Less than Significant. The Project Site is located in the service area of the Rialto Police Department. The Rialto Police Department Station is located at 128 Willow Avenue, approximately two miles north of the Project Site. The Rialto Police Department provides a full range of law enforcement and community programs. The Proposed Project is anticipated to require minimal police protection services and would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance and therefore would not result in the need for additional police protection services that is not already anticipated by the City of Rialto General Plan. In addition the applicant would be required to pay appropriate development impact fees, property taxes, and utility user tax. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Schools

Less than Significant. The Proposed Project would not create a direct demand for public school services, as the subject property would be developed with an industrial warehouse/distribution facility. It is expected that the employment opportunity generated by the future tenant of the facility would be met by local labor. As such, the development would not generate any new school-aged children requiring public education. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance and therefore would not result in the requirement of public schools not already anticipated by the City of Rialto General Plan. In addition the applicant would be required to pay school impact fees. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Parks

Less than Significant. The Proposed Project does not propose any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in an increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Other Public Facilities

Less than Significant. The Proposed Project is not expected to result in a demand for other public facilities/services, such as libraries, community recreation centers, and/or animal shelter. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not adversely affect other

public facilities or require the construction of new or modified facilities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) No Impact. No residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity is proposed. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				
b) No Impact. The Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.				

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a/b) No Impact. A Focused Traffic Analysis was prepared for the Proposed Project by Kunzman Associates, Inc. in June 2018 (available at the City offices for review). The Focused Traffic Analysis determined that the Proposed Project would generate approximately 218 daily trips in passenger car equivalents (PCEs), 22 PCEs of which would occur during both the morning and evening peak hours. Based on the threshold of 50 peak hour trips identified in the City of Rialto's Traffic Impact Analysis Report and Guidelines Requirements (2014), the Proposed Project is exempt from the requirement for a Traffic Impact Analysis. The Proposed Project does not conflict with the San				

Bernardino Associated Governments' (SANBAG) Congestion Management Plan which also requires a Traffic Impact Analysis for projects determined to generate 50 or more peak hour trips. Therefore, the Proposed Project does not conflict with any applicable congestion management plan, or other plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness or the performance of the circulation system. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not within an Airport Safety Review area as identified in the San Bernardino County General Plan – Hazard Overlay Map FH29B Fontana. The nearest airport is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately nine miles southwest of the Project Site. Development of the Proposed Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not create substantial hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Access to the Project Site will be from a 40-foot-wide driveway to be constructed at Valley Boulevard. Discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of Rialto includes approval of a Precise Plan of Design application. With City approval of the Precise Plan of Design, the Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- e) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Access to the Project Site will be available via Valley Boulevard. Discretionary actions for the Proposed Project by the City of Rialto includes approval of a Precise Plan of Design. With City approval of the Precise Plan of Design, the Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- f) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is located within the Gateway Specific Plan area within the IP zoning designation. As shown on Exhibit 4.4, Bicycle Routes, of the City of Rialto General Plan, Valley Boulevard does not support a bike path at Project Site frontage; the nearest bike lane is located 1/4-mile east of the Project Site. Furthermore, existing off-site improvements across the project frontage along Valley Boulevard includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements. Development of the Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Less than
Significant with
Mitigation | Less than
Significant | No
Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) Less than Significant with Mitigation. California Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) was approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014. AB52 specifies that CEQA projects with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the bill requires lead agency consultation with California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed of proposed projects in that geographic area. The legislation further requires that the tribe-requested consultation be completed prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. | | | | |

McKenna et al. prepared a Cultural Resources Investigation in May 2018 and concluded that the Project Site is not culturally significant, and the proposed development would not result in any adverse environmental impacts, however, the possibility of discovering a significant unanticipated tribal cultural resource remains. As such, possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated, and therefore Mitigation Measure CR-1 and Mitigation Measure CR-2, listed in Section V(a, b), above, shall be implemented to ensure that less than significant impacts occur. No additional mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** McKenna et al. initiated Native American Consultation through communication with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The Commission has yet to respond to multiple requests. The City of Rialto, serving as the Lead Agency, is responsible for conducting government-to-government consultation with local tribes as requested per AB52. Tribes requests for additional project information, coordination, or consultation with the Lead Agency, and/or Native American monitoring, shall be acknowledged through implementation of appropriate Conditions of Approval, at the City of Rialto's discretion.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **No Impact.** The Project Site is served by the City of Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The WWTP is permitted by the State of California under NPDES Permit CA0105295 which allows up to 11.7 million gallons per day (MGD) of tertiary treated and disinfected water to be discharged to the Santa Ana River at three points. The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone and would result in the generation of wastewater considered domestic and acceptable for treatment at the City's WWTP. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region and no mitigation measures are required. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- b) **Less than Significant.** Rialto Water Services is the public water utility that would provide water service to the Project Site as shown in Figure 1.2: Water System Facility Map of the City of Rialto's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Currently an existing eight-inch asbestos cement (A.C.) water line is located on the south side of Valley Boulevard and across the Project Site's frontage. The Proposed Project would be connected to the existing A.C. water line. The Project Proponent shall adhere to Rialto Water Services' requirements for ensuring that the appropriate connections are made to the existing mains to provide the Proposed Project with sufficient water supply. The Proposed Project's water demands would be minimal (office use and landscaping) and therefore would not result in the requirement for new or expanded water facilities. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to cause significant environmental effects and no mitigation measures are required.

The City of Rialto Water Resources Division manages the City's wastewater collection system. All of the wastewater flows from the City are collected by the City's local sewer mains and delivered to the WWTP. The City of Rialto would provide sewer service to the Project Site via either the existing 10-inch vitrified clay pipe (V.C.P.) located at the property (see City of Rialto Plan S-0435) or an existing 36-inch V.C.P. located on the north side of Valley Boulevard across from the Project Site (see City of Rialto Plan S-0328). Construction of the Project would require relocation of the existing 10-inch sewer line on-site. The sewer line would be rerouted around the proposed building to allow for future access in the event maintenance or replacement of the sewer line is necessary. The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone and would not result in the requirement of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, less than significant environmental effects are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **Less than Significant.** As stated in the Preliminary Drainage Study, any potential increase in post-development volume from pre-development conditions on-site has been mitigated through the use of an underground Stormtech infiltration system which will have a total capacity of 16,111 cubic feet. This system has been sized for water quality purposes. Flows from back to back 100-year storms will be allowed to leave the Project Site by backing up in the proposed catch basin along the south property line and flow to the existing concrete spillway to CalTrans right-of-way. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan

of Design and a Variance and would not create or contribute an amount of water runoff that is not already anticipated by the City of Rialto General Plan and the Gateway Specific Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- d) **Less than Significant.** As stated in the UWMP, Rialto Water Services obtains its water supply from several sources. The primary source of water supply for the City is from groundwater supplies. The groundwater is pumped from the Rialto Basin, Chino Basin, North Riverside Basin, and the Lytle Creek Basin. The City also receives water from the West Valley Water District (WVWD) and the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD). The UWMP provides a supply reliability analysis which includes future supply and demand comparisons for the service area. As shown in Table 5.10 of the UWMP, the projected 2030 multiple dry year water supply is approximately 14,650 acre-feet (AF), while the projected 2030 multiple dry year water demand is approximately 12,020 AF. Therefore, the City can expect to meet future demands through 2030 for all climatologic classifications. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design, and a Variance and therefore would not result in the requirement of water supplies that are not already anticipated by the UWMP. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- e) **Less than Significant.** See XVIII. b) above. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- f) **Less than Significant.** Solid waste from the City of Rialto is transported to and disposed of at the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill (MVSL) located in the northern portion of the City. The landfill has a maximum throughput of 7,500 tons per day and has an expected operational life through 2033. According to CalRecycle's Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, "Manufacturing/Warehouse" land uses are estimated to generate approximately 1.42 pounds of solid waste per 100 square-feet per day. Therefore, the proposed 74,466 square-foot industrial warehouse/distribution facility would generate approximately 0.53 tons of solid waste per day; or approximately .007 percent of the maximum permitted throughput at the MVSL of 7,500 tons per day. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the I-P land use zone with approval of a Precise Plan of Design and a Variance and therefore would not result in the requirement for increased landfill capacity that was not already anticipated by the City of Rialto General Plan. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
- g) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project will be required to comply with the City of Rialto waste reduction programs, including recycling and other diversion programs to divert the amount of solid waste disposed of at landfills and recycle demolition waste. Therefore, the Project Applicant will be required to work with the local refuse hauler to develop and implement feasible waste reduction programs, including source reduction,

recycling, and composting. Additionally, in accordance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (CA Pub Res. Code § 42911), the Proposed Project is required to provide adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials where solid waste is collected. The collection areas are required to be shown on construction drawings and be in place before occupancy permits are issued. Implementation of the waste reduction and recycling programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project and diverted to landfills. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Less than Significant. In June 2018, NRAI prepared a Biological Assessment for the Proposed Project. As part of the Biological Assessment, NRAI conducted a data search for information on plant and wildlife species with known occurrences within the vicinity of the Project Site. The data reviewed included biological texts on general and specific biological resources, and those resources considered to be sensitive by various wildlife agencies, local government agencies and interest groups. Additionally, NRAI conducted a biological assessment of the development area on April 18 th and May 12 th of 2018. The field survey included habitat assessment surveys for resources covered under local, state, and federal laws and regulations.				

NRAI concluded that of the seven species of concern identified by USFWS, CDFW, CNDDDB, and CNPS databases as having the potential to occur on or within the vicinity of the Project Site, none are expected to be present on the Project Site due to a lack of suitable habitat. Furthermore, no drainages or riparian habitat occur on the Project Site and there is no indications of direct flow or flooding areas on the Project Site.

Standing trees on-site could provide nesting bird habitat and if the breeding season cannot be avoided for ground disturbing activities, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce the potential for significant impacts. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or a wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, and reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

McKenna et al. prepared a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation for the Proposed Project in May of 2018. Based on historical research, field investigations, and documentation, McKenna et al. concluded that the Project Site yielded no evidence of paleontological resources, no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources, and no evidence of historic archaeological resources. There are no and never were any standing structures on the property. The Project Site is not culturally significant or sensitive and the proposed development would not result in any adverse environmental impacts, however, the possibility of discovering significant examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory remains. Therefore, possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the Mitigation Measure CR-1 and Mitigation Measure CR-2, listed in Section V(a, b), above, are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant; no additional mitigation is warranted.

- b) **Less than Significant.** Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual affects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the development when added to the impacts of other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future developments. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, developments taking place over a period. The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (a) and (b), states:

- (a) Cumulative impacts shall be discussed when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.
- (b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.

Impacts associated with the Proposed Project would not be considered individually adverse or unfavorable. The Proposed Project is a compatible use identified in and previously evaluated as part of the Gateway Specific Plan. An EIR was prepared and certified by the City of Rialto for the area plan. No cumulative impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** The incorporation of mitigation measures, City of Rialto policies, standards, and guidelines and proposed mitigation measures would ensure that the Proposed Project would have no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly on an individual or cumulative basis. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

SECTION 4 REFERENCES

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. October 2017. *California Regional Conservation Plans*. Accessed on 4/3/2018 from <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline>.
- California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Accessed on 4/3/2018 from <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. *San Bernardino County Williamson Act FW 2015/2016 Sheet 2 of 2*. 2016. Accessed on 4/3/18 from ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/SanBernardino_so_15_16_WA.pdf.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor*. Accessed April 3, 2018.
- California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Accessed on 4/3/18 from http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/.
- CalRecycle. *Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates*. Accessed on 5/17/18 from <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>.
- CalRecycle. *Facility/Site Summary Details: Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0055)*. Accessed on 5/17/18 from <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail>.
- City of Rialto. *General Plan*. December 2010.
- City of Rialto. *Gateway Specific Plan Land Use Map*.
- City of Rialto. *Specific Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report for Rialto Gateway Area*. January 1990.
- County of San Bernardino. *General Plan*. Adopted March 13, 2007 and Amended April 24, 2014.
- Kunzman Associates, Inc. *Gateway Specific Plan Warehouse Traffic Impact Analysis*. Prepared June 6, 2018.
- McKenna et al. *Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation*. Prepared on May 8, 2018.
- Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. *General Biological Assessment: Valley Boulevard Warehouse Project*. Prepared on June 20th, 2018.
- SA Associates. *City of Rialto 2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. August 2011.

- South Coast Air Quality Management District. *SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds*. Revised March 2015.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology*. Revised July 2008.
- Thatcher Engineering and Associates, Inc. *Preliminary Drainage Study*. Prepared on April 25, 2018.
- Thatcher Engineering and Associates, Inc. *Water Quality Management Plan*. Prepared on April 25, 2018.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. *Web Soil Survey*. Accessed on 4/3/18 from <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Soil Survey of San Bernardino County: Southwestern Part, California*. January 1980.
- United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Economy at a Glance: Riverside-San Bernardino- Ontario, CA*. Accessed on 4/4/18 from https://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.ca_riverside_msa.htm.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *Final Recovery Plan for the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly*. Approved on September 14, 1997.
- Urban Crossroads. *Gateway Specific Plan Warehouse Noise Impact Analysis*. Prepared on July 3, 2018.