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: Alder II Warehouse

2. Lead Agency Name: City of Rialto
Planning Division
150 South Palm Avenue
Rialto, CA 92376

3. Contact Person: Daniel Casey, Senior Planner
Phone Number: (909) 820-2525 ext. 2075

4. Project Location: West of Alder Avenue, North of Baseline Road, South of Miro Way

5. Geographic Coordinates of Project Site: Parcel Centroid: 34° 7'26 28" N, 117° 25' 11.02" W

6: USGS Topographic Map: Fontana 7.5-minute USGS Topographic Quadrangle

7: Public Land Survey System: Township 1 North, Range 5 West, Section 32

8. Thomas Guide Location: Page 575, Grid B5, San Bernardino & Riverside Counties 39th Edition

9. Assessor Parcel Number: 240-201-08, 240-201-41

10. General Plan and Zoning Designations: City of Rialto General Plan/Zoning-Renaissance Specific Plan (RSP); within an RSP land use and zoning designation of "Employment"

11. Description of Project:
CDRE Holdings 13 LLC (Project Proponent) is proposing the development of an 78,680 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility on a 4.4-acresite located on the westside of Alder Avenue north of Baseline Road and south of Miro Way. The property consists of

Assessor's Parcel Numbers 240-201-08 and -41. The property is currently vacant and surrounded primarily by industrial uses. There is vegetation on-site consisting of a red gum eucalyptus tree, the two Italian cypress trees, and ruderal vegetation.

The Project Site is within the City of Rialto's Renaissance Specific Plan (RSP) with zoning and land use designations of Employment. Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, drainage/water quality, and two points of access along Alder Avenue. Proposed off-site improvements along the project frontage of Alder Avenue includes street widening, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway improvements.

The proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the building is approximately 0.44. The Renaissance Specific Plan currently allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.40 for projects of this size, however, with incorporation of certain design features, the Renaissance Specific Plan allows for a FAR increase with approval of a Conditional Development Permit. Therefore, the Proposed Project will include the following incentives, at the request of City Staff, to achieve a FAR bonus:

- Public art (2%)
- Employee break area (2%)

This Initial Study addresses the potential impacts of the proposed warehouse/distribution facility referred to as "Alder II" Warehouse ("Proposed Project"), including the associated discretionary actions and approvals required to implement the Proposed Project, as well as all subsequent construction and operation activities.

12. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

	ZONING	**EXISTING**
PROJECT SITE	Employment (RSP)	Vacant
NORTH	Employment (RSP)	Vacant/ newly completed industrial building
EAST	Alder Avenue/ Employment (RSP)	Alder Avenue/ industrial warehouse facility
SOUTH	Employment (RSP) w/ Commercial Overlay	Single-Family Residence
WEST	Planned Industrial Development (I-PID) (RASP)	Prologis Storm Water Basin

NOTE: RSP: Renaissance Specific Plan
RASP: Rialto Airport Specific Plan

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:
  - Conditional Development Permit
  - Precise Plan of Design
  - Lot Line Adjustment/Lot Merger

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 eighteen (18) 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.

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

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 the development of an approximately 78,680 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility on the westside of Alder Avenue north of Baseline Road 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 within the northeastern portion of the City of Rialto on the west side of Alder Avenue north of Baseline Road, south of Miro Way, and approximately one-mile south of State Route-210 (SR-210). The Project Site consists of two San Bernardino County Assessor Parcels: 0240-201-08 and -41. The Project Site is within the boundaries of the Renaissance Specific Plan, adopted by the City of Rialto in 2010 and amended in 2016. Within the Specific Plan, the site is zoned as "Employment".

Figure 1, Regional Location, depicts the location of the Project Site in context to its regional setting. As shown on Figure 2, Project Vicinity, the Project Site consists of an approximately 4.4-acre site currently vacant with signs of previous disturbance and on-site vegetation. The Project Site is located within the SE ¼ of Section 32, Township 1 North, Range 5 West on the Fontana USGS 7.5-minute Quadrangle Map.

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CDRE, Holdings 13 LLC (Project Proponent) is proposing the construction of an 78,680 square-foot industrial warehouse/distribution facility on an approximate 4.4-acre site, of which development will occur on 4.1 acres. The discretionary actions by the City of Rialto include approval of the Project's Precise Plan of Design application, approval of a Conditional Development Permit, and approval of a Lot Merger application for the two (2) parcels.

As shown on Figure 3, Site Plan, the proposed building is designed to include an 76,180 square-foot ground floor and a 2,500 square-foot mezzanine. The proposed building is a reinforced concrete tilt-up building approximately 43 feet in height at its highest façade. The proposed Floor Area Ratio for the building is 0.44. The Renaissance Specific Plan currently allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.40 for Projects of this size. In consultation with Staff, the

Project is entitled to receive bonuses for FAR based on providing the following incentives: a public art piece and an employee break area.

The warehouse will accommodate 8 loading dock doors proposed on the southside of the building. Proposed parking includes: 78 automobile parking stalls. Access would be from a 72-foot wide driveway on the southeast corner of the Project Site and a second 26-foot wide driveway on the northeast corner, both from Alder Avenue. Approximately 24,161 square-feet around the entire perimeter of the Project Site (approximately 13 percent) would be landscaped.

Storm flows from the north property line will be directed to the south along curb and gutter systems into two proposed drop inlets. From there, flows will enter a proposed Stormtech underground chamber system with a capacity of 21,209 cubic-feet (CF). All post-development flows and volumes from on-site flows would be detained by the proposed infiltration basins. In the event of back to back storm events or off-site tributary flow, excess flows would be directed eastward and outlet to Alder Avenue and ultimately into the Santa Ana River, consistent with existing conditions.

Off-site improvements necessary to implement the Proposed Project include street widening and construction of curb and gutter as well as sidewalk and parkway improvements along Alder Avenue.

General Plan Designation and Zoning

The Project Site is located near the southwest corner of the Rialto Renaissance Specific Plan planning area and near the city limits at Baseline Road. The Project Site's designated zoning in the Rialto Renaissance Specific Plan is "Employment." The Employment land use category is intended to accommodate a mixture of professional office, light industrial, research and development, business park, light manufacturing, assembly, and related storage and support service uses. Warehousing is a permitted use under the Employment land use designation as indicated in Table 3-2 of the Specific Plan: General Permitted Uses in the Renaissance Specific Plan. The Specific Plan land use vision for Employment areas accommodates a mixture of professional office, light industrial, research and development, business park, light manufacturing, assembly, and related storage and support services uses.

2.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SURROUNDING LAND USES

The Project Site consists of two parcels; APN 0240-201-41 comprises the northern half of the Project Site and was previously developed with a single-family residential structure and detached garage; the improvements have since been removed except for remnant perimeter wood and chain link fencing. APN 0240-201-08 comprises the southern portion of the Project Site and is currently vacant with limited vegetation and no existing improvements. Under existing conditions there is a non-conforming single-family residence south of the Project Site. Immediately to the north is a narrow vacant lot and a newly completed industrial building; to the west a storm water basin, and industrial uses occur to the east across Alder Avenue.

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.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

SECTION 3
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

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. General Plan Policy 2-14.1 states that views of the mountains should be protected by ensuring that building heights are consistent with the scale of surrounding, existing development, and Policy 2-14.3 ensures that building materials do not produce glare, such as polished metals or reflective windows. The San Bernardino Mountains are located northeast of the Project Site and the San Gabriel Mountains are located northwest approximately four miles from the Project Site. The proposed warehouse/distribution facility would have a maximum height of 43 feet at its highest façade. Per the development standards identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan, the maximum allowed building height in the Employment zone is 75 feet. The proposed building height of 43 feet is comparable to the height of the nearby warehouse buildings located to the west, north, and east of the Project. The distribution center will be a concrete tilt-up structure similar to nearby warehouses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan and would not affect the scenic vistas of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **No Impact.** There are no significant scenic resources known to occur in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The Project Site is not adjacent to or in the vicinity of a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is currently vacant and located within a predominantly urbanized area with vacant land immediately to the north, non-conforming residential use to the south, warehouses to the east and a storm water basin to the west. Proposed development of the Project Site would be consistent with the surrounding development and would be required to comply with the Design Guidelines of the Renaissance Specific Plan. No impact to the existing visual character would occur. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project includes the installation of exterior lighting that will be designed to comply with City lighting requirements. Compliance with City standards would ensure that the Proposed Project would not produce substantial amounts of light or glare from artificial lighting sources.

The Proposed Project would involve the construction and operation of an approximate 78,680 square-foot distribution facility with exterior surfaces consisting of tilt-up concrete construction and windows with reflective glazing. While glazing has a potential to result in glare effects; such effects are considered minimal based upon the relative size of the proposed structure, placement on the parcel, and the proposed landscaping around the perimeter of the Project Site. 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 Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **No Impact**. The Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the Project Site as "other land" in its California Important Farmland Finder. No prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance occurs at the Project Site or in the immediate vicinity. Development of the Project Site would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not under a Williamson Act Contract as identified in the latest map prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. The City of Rialto General Plan and Renaissance Specific Plan do not designate the Project Site or in the immediate vicinity for agricultural use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **No Impact.** The Project Site does not support existing agricultural uses and no agricultural uses occur within the vicinity of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would not result in changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-farmland use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **No impact.** The Project Site does not support forest land. 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 anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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 Employment land use zone of the Renaissance Specific Plan area. Table 3-2, General Permitted Uses, of the Renaissance Specific Plan, demonstrates that all office and industrial uses are permitted within the Employment

zone. As such, the Proposed Project includes uses which are permitted within the Employment zone. 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 utilized to estimate the on-site and off-site 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 (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and particulates (PM_{10} 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. To remain consistent with the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by Urban Crossroads which anticipates an opening year of 2019, the construction phase in CalEEMod was modeled to begin in late 2018 and be completed in late 2019. 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	4.7	48.3	23.5	0.04	10.9	6.9
Grading	2.9	30.7	17.4	0.03	4.7	3.0
Building Construction	3.3	27.7	23.0	0.05	2.6	1.7
Paving	1.6	12.8	13.3	0.02	0.9	0.7
Architectural Coating	42.7	1.9	2.6	0.00	0.3	0.2
Highest Value (lbs/day)	**42.7**	**48.3**	**23.5**	**0.05**	**10.9**	**6.9**
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	4.7	48.3	23.3	0.04	10.9	6.9
Grading	2.9	30.7	17.3	0.03	4.7	3.0
Building Construction	3.3	27.7	22.3	0.04	2.6	1.7
Paving	1.6	12.8	13.1	0.02	0.9	0.7
Architectural Coating	42.7	1.9	2.5	0.00	0.3	0.2
Highest Value (lbs/day)	**42.7**	**48.3**	**23.3**	**0.04**	**10.9**	**6.9**
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 (PM_{10} 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 PM_{10} levels in 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 the TIA prepared by Urban Crossroads in September 2018 for the Proposed Project. The TIA assessed the potential traffic impacts resulting from a proposed 83,635 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility, however, the Proposed Project has since been revised to include a proposed 78,680 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility. Therefore, the TIA provides a conservative analysis of potential traffic impacts as larger buildings typically result in greater traffic impacts.

As described by the TIA, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate 300 total daily trips, of which 179 vehicle trips would be produced by passenger cars, while 121 vehicle trips would be produced by a combination of medium heavy-duty vehicles including 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4-axle+ trucks. 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	1.81	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.79	10.70	8.67	0.05	3.22	1.06
Totals (lbs/day)	**2.61**	**10.75**	**8.72**	**0.05**	**3.23**	**1.06**
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	**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	1.81	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.75	11.03	7.97	0.05	3.22	1.06
Totals (lbs/day)	**2.56**	**11.07**	**8.02**	**0.05**	**3.23**	**1.06**
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	**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 4.44 acres and therefore the "five-acre" LST thresholds were utilized as the five-acre size metric represents the actual size of the Project Site more closely than the one-acre and two-acre size metrics. The nearest sensitive receptor land use is the single-family residence which is located immediately south of the Project Site and therefore LSTs are based on an 82-foot (25-meter) distance. A comparison of the Proposed Project's construction and operational emissions with the appropriate LST thresholds is 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)	48.3	23.5	10.9		6.9	
Operational Emissions (Max. Total from Table 3 and Table 4)[1]	1.9	1.1	0.3		0.1	
Highest Value (lbs/day)	**48.3**	**23.5**	**10.9**	**0.3**	**6.9**	**0.1**
LST Thresholds	270	1,746	14*	4†	8*	2†
Greater Than Threshold	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: PM_{10} 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 five-acre site in Source Receptor Area No. 34, distance of 25 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 Proposed 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 Incorp.	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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc…) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** A General Biological Assessment of the Project Site was prepared by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI), dated August 14, 2018 (available at the City for review). As part of the biological assessment NRAI conducted a background data search for information on plant and wildlife species known occurrences within the vicinity of the Project, as well as information on jurisdictional waters. The data review included text on general and specific biological resource, and resources considered to be sensitive by various wildlife agencies, local government agencies and interest groups. A biological survey of the Project Site was conducted on July 12, 2018. The biological survey included an evaluation of the surrounding habitats and focused habitat assessment for species identified in the background data search.

The Project Site is dominated by ruderal plant species such as red brome (*Bromus madritensis var. rubens*), slender wild oats (*Avena barbata*), along with a few other weedy native and non-native forbs. There were three tree species found on-site including: an Italian cypress (*Cupressus semperivirens*), spiny redberry (*Rhamnus crocea*), and red gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus camalduensis*). Historically (based on aerial imagery) the site supported a grassland plant community and has since converted to a predominantly ruderal community.

NRAI determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of ruderal habitat and that the impact is not considered significant. The finding is consistent with the findings of the Biological Resources Assessment completed in support of the Renaissance Specific Plan (Michael Brandman Associates, 2008). As reported in the Renaissance Specific Plan no significant biological resources were recorded within the approximate 1,500-acre plan area during the environmental evaluation process for the Specific Plan. The disturbed/ruderal plant community is typically associated with a predominance of exotic species as a result of natural opportunistic invasions. Ruderal areas have generally been severely disturbed or are subject to recurring disturbance.

NRAI determined that of the sensitive species identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan, only the burrowing owl has the potential to occur on the Project Site. During the site review, NRAI determined that the Project Site did not have suitable habitat for the

burrowing owl. However, burrowing owl are known to occur on the former Rialto Municipal Airport lands located to the east of the Project Site. In addition, nearby vacant properties provide suitable habitat for the species. NRAI determined that if allowed to remain fallow, the Project Site might provide habitat for the species in the future. Therefore, possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measure is required as a condition of project approval to reduce impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measure is:

BIO-1: Prior to ground disturbing activities, such as grading and vegetation removal, a burrowing owl presence/absence survey shall be conducted following the protocols established by the CDFW. The burrowing owl pre-construction survey shall be conducted no more than three days prior to construction to confirm the absence of the species from the site.

- **Occupied sites shall not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 – August 31) unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that either 1) the birds have not begun egg-laying or incubation or 2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of an independent survival flight.**
- **If the biologist is not able to verify one of the above conditions, then no disturbance shall occur during the breeding season within a distance determined by the qualified biologist for each nest or nesting site. For the burrowing owl, the recommended distance is a minimum of 160 feet.**

NRAI found that, although unlikely, nesting by bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act may occur at the Project Site. Therefore, possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measure is required as a condition of project approval to reduce impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measure is:

BIO-2: Initial site preparation such as grading, or any other project-related activity that increase noise and human activity on the Project Site shall occur outside the bird breeding season of February through August. If ground disturbing activities and removal of vegetation or other potential nesting habitat must occur during the nesting period, 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 determined 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 or independent survival.**

- **If the biologist is not able to verify one of the above conditions, then no disturbance for each nest or nesting site shall occur within a distance specified by the qualified biologist in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.**

With incorporation of the above mitigation measures, implementation of the Project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on sensitive species.

b) **No impact.** The Project Site does not support riparian habitat or a sensitive natural community. The Project Site is not identified in local plans, policies, and regulations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Development of the Project Site as proposed would not result in impacts to riparian vegetation or to a sensitive natural community because these resources do not occur on the Project Site. Therefore, no impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **No impact.** NRAI conducted a biological assessment survey of the Project Site on July 12, 2018. The biological assessment survey included an evaluation of potentially jurisdictional waters. It was concluded in NRAI's report that the Project Site does not support waters or wetlands habitat that would come under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; does not support waters or riparian habitat that would come under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and does not support stream, creeks, washes, or similar waterway, or any riparian habitat what would come under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Therefore, no impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **No impact.** The Project Site is in an area fragmented by existing urban development. There are few native habitats left in the nearby surrounding areas and impacts to wildlife movement and habitat fragmentation have already occurred. Development of the Proposed Project would not result in additional significant fragmentation to habitat. Therefore, no impact is 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 the local biological resources are found within Lytle Creek Wash, north of the Project Site. Neither the General Plan nor the RSP identify any policy for the protection of trees. Therefore, removal of the red gum eucalyptus tree, the two Italian cypress trees, and the ruderal vegetation that occurs on Site would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact is 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 Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as identified in either the CDFW California Regional Conservation Plans Map (October 2017), City of Rialto General

Plan, or the Renaissance Specific Plan. Therefore, no impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a,b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** CRM TECH prepared a Historical/Archaeological Resource Survey Report of the Project Site, dated August 2018 (available at the City for review). To adequately address the site, the following tasks were completed: 1) Archaeological Resources check; 2) Historic Land Use Research; 3) Native American consultation; and 4) a field survey. The archaeological records check was completed at the California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). Additionally, on July 3, 2018, CRM TECH submitted a written request to the State of California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for a record search in the commission's sacred lands file. Following the NAHC's recommendation and previously established consultation protocol, CRM TECH further contacted a total of 10 tribal representatives in the region in writing on July 6, 2018 for additional information on potential Native American cultural resources in the Project's vicinity.

The SCCIC record search indicated two large-scale overview studies in the Proposed Project's area, covering approximately 3,000 and 1,500 acres, completed in 1995 and 2006. SCCIC records identified 18 historical/archaeological sites covering almost all the land within a one-mile radius of the Project Site. The nearest historic sites to the Project Site consisted of two 1950s-era single-family residences, one adjacent to the southern border of the Project Site and the other approximately 400 feet north of the Project Site. However, the residences have since been demolished during recent industrial development or do not meet the criteria necessary to be listed as "historical resource" in the California Register of Historical Resources under CEQA guidelines. The other 16 historic/archaeologic sites identified by SCCIC were not found in the vicinity of the Project Site and none would be impacted by the Proposed Project.

A review of historic maps showed the Project area to be vacant until at least 1954. Prior to this time, the surrounding land was mostly dedicated to agriculture. In the 1850s-

1870s, the only development within the Project vicinity was an unpaved road running north-south, adjacent to the eastern edge of the Project Site, which was superseded by present-day Alder Avenue; not paved until approximately 2002-2003, just as industrial development began in the surrounding area. Between 1954 and 1959, three buildings were constructed on the northerly parcel of the Project Site (APN 0240-201-41). However, between 2016 and the present, all three buildings have been removed.
At the time of the site survey in July 2018, the northern parcel (APN 0240-201-41) and the southern parcel (APN 0240-201-08) were vacant. The single structure buildings were demolished, leaving only small piles of rubble and patches of asphalt pavement around their former sites. These features do not demonstrate a potential for historic significance.

Based on the recent historical research, field investigations, and documentation, the cultural resources investigation concluded that the Project Site, consisting of two parcels, yielding no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources, and no significant historical resources. However, 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:

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

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

c) **Less Than Significant.** Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of organisms from prehistoric environments found in geologic strata. Paleontological sites generally occur as small outcroppings visible on the surface or sites encountered during grading. Generally, it is geologic formations that contain fossils. Potentially sensitive areas for the presence of paleontological resources are based on the underlying geologic formation. Monitoring of excavations impacting the older alluvial deposits was recommended by McLeod (2016). McLeod (2016) identified the project area as being

within an area dominated by younger alluvium derived from the San Gabriel Mountains and the Lytle Creek drainage. These deposits are relatively deep and not known to be associated with fossil specimens. Nonetheless, the erosion of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains and the excessive debris flows from the Lytle Creek may carry fossil remains into the general area and, therefore, there is a slight possibility for fossils to be present. The nearest fossil finds relative to the Project Site have been identified in the Jurupa Valley area, near Norco and Mira Loma (approximately 13 miles southwest), suggesting the potential of fossils occurring in Rialto is very low. In case of a paleontological find Mitigation Measure CR-2 would ensure that no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

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. 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:

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
liquefaction?				
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) A Geotechnical Engineering Investigation was completed by NorCal Engineering on May 24, 2018 for the Project Site. The scope of work for the geotechnical investigation included: 1) site reconnaissance; 2) subsurface geotechnical exploration ad sampling; 3) laboratory testing; 4) engineering analysis of field and laboratory data; and 5) preparation of a geotechnical engineering report. Findings are summarized herein.

i. **Less Than Significant.** The Project Site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as identified in Exhibit 5.1 of the City of Rialto General Plan. The nearest fault zone is the San Jacinto Fault and it lies approximately five miles northeast of the Project Site. Potential for damage due to direct fault rupture is considered very remote and would result in minimal damage. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii. **Less Than Significant.** The Project Site occurs in a seismically active region with the San Jacinto Fault located approximately five miles northeast of the Project Site; the Lytle Creek Fault located approximately 3.5 miles northwest, and the Fontana seismic trend one miles to the south. Severe seismic shaking can be expected during the lifetime of the proposed structure. Construction of the warehouse/distribution facility in accordance with applicable requirements for construction as listed in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) would ensure that potential impacts are reduced to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, no

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

iii. **Less Than Significant.** The Project Site is not located in an area identified to have liquefaction susceptibility as shown in Exhibit 5.1 of the City of Rialto General Plan. Additionally, the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation determined that the potential for liquefaction at the Project Site is considered very low due to the depth of groundwater in excess of 450 feet within the vicinity area based on review of groundwater maps of the Upper Santa Ana River Basin (2016). Therefore, less than significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

iv. **Less Than Significant.** The Project Site is relatively level descending gradually from north to south on the order of a few feet. 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 Map FH21C, the Project Site is not located in an area likely to become unstable as a result of on- or off-site landslides. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **No Impact.** As described in the General Plan, the City of Rialto is subject to extensive windstorms related to Santa Ana winds that push through the Cajon Pass. Winds affecting Rialto can create dust storms where the soil type is susceptible to wind erosion. The majority of the Project Site's surface area is vacant and undeveloped. Development of the site will reduce the amount of exposed soil that may be subject to wind erosion. The Proposed Project includes a landscaping plan design in accordance with the Renaissance Specific Plan design guidelines. Landscaping would be provided over approximately 24,161 square-feet (13% of the Project Site) and would be designed to reduce the potential for wind and water erosion of topsoil. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Less than Significant.** Based on a site exploration, conducted by NorCal Engineering, that included subsurface exploratory trenches of existing soils. Surface soils were described as surficial fill and disturbed top soils consisting of fine to coarse grained, silty sand with gravel and some cobbles to a depth of one to two feet. Natural undisturbed alluvium soils consisting of fine to coarse grained gravelly sand were encountered directly beneath the fill; these soils were noted to be slightly silty with cobbles. The report sets forth a series of recommendations and guidelines to ensure that the proposed improvements would be safe from excessive settlements under the anticipated design loadings and existing conditions. Overall the report indicates that the proposed development of a distribution facility and associated improvements is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint provided that the recommendations presented in the report are followed in the design and construction of the project. Recommendations from the geotechnical report would be incorporated into Proposed Project design and reflected in the engineering plans to be submitted to the City during the Plan Review process. There

would be no major risks related to on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **No Impact.** Expansive 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 geotechnical report prepared by NorCal Engineers identified the presence of slightly silty gravelly soils occurring on the Project Site. The findings of the geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project design and would be reflected in the final engineering plans. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **No Impact.** Sewer service is available to the Proposed Project. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed at the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) **Less than Significant.** Emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Parameters used to estimate construction emissions, such as the worker and vendor trips and trip lengths, utilized the CalEEMod defaults. To remain consistent with the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by Urban Crossroads which anticipates an opening year of 2019, the construction phase in CalEEMod was modeled to begin in late 2018 and be completed in late 2019. The TIA assessed the potential traffic impacts resulting from a proposed 83,635 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility, however, the Proposed Project has since been revised to include a proposed 78,680 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility. Therefore, the TIA provides a conservative analysis of potential traffic impacts as larger buildings typically result in greater traffic impacts. As described by the TIA, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate 300 total daily trips, of which 179 vehicle trips would be produced by passenger cars, while 121 vehicle trips would be produced by a combination of medium heavy-duty vehicles including 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4-axle+ trucks.

Many gases make up the group of pollutants that contribute to global climate change. However, three gases are currently evaluated and represent the highest concertation of GHG: Carbon dioxide (CO_2), Methane (CH_4), and Nitrous oxide (N_2O). 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 $MTCO_2E$ 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_20
Site Preparation	9.1	0.0	0.0
Grading	11.4	0.0	0.0
Building Construction	439.5	0.1	0.0
Paving	16.8	0.0	0.0
Architectural Coating	3.7	0.0	0.0
Total MTCO2e	**482.7**		
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_20
Area	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	75.8	0.0	0.0
Mobile	800.3	0.0	0.0
Waste	15.0	0.9	0.0
Water	81.3	0.6	0.0
MTCO2e	**1,014.5**		
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 $MTCO_2e$ 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 would be required to 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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a/b) **Less than Significant.** The specific business or tenant that will occupy the proposed warehouse/distribution facility is not known at this time. Based on the list of land uses permitted in the Employment zone of the Renaissance Specific Plan, it is possible that hazardous materials could be used during the course of daily operations. Examples of types of business that could occupy the proposed building include: warehouse/distribution, and repair facilities.

The specific business or tenant that will occupy the proposed industrial warehouse/distribution/manufacturing 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 at 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, 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**. Alder Middle School is located approximately 0.5-mile south of the Project Site; Locust Elementary School is located approximately 0.6-mile southeast of the Project Site, and Mango Elementary School is located approximately 0.85-mile southwest of the Project Site. With the implementation of the Best Management Practices, mentioned above (VIII. (b)), and compliance with applicable regulations potential hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within a one-quarter mile from a school would be lessened. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is not a known hazardous material site as identified in Exhibit 5.4 of the City of Rialto General Plan. The Project Site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites as compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 as reported in the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database (reviewed July 5, 2018). In the event hazardous materials are identified on the Project Site during construction, standard reporting and remediation regulations would be required. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **No Impact.** The Project Site is located approximately 0.4-mile west 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 Renaissance Specific Plan area comprises approximately 1,439 acres previously developed as the airport. 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 anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

f) **No Impact.** There are no private airfields or airstrips within the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

g) **No Impact.** The Project Site does not contain any emergency facilities, nor does its location 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 anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

h) **No Impact.** As shown in Exhibit 5.3 of the City of Rialto General Plan, the Project Site is not identified as occurring within an area of wildland fire risks. The Project Site occurs in a largely 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 anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 4.1 acres and is therefore subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES. Construction activities covered under the State'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 June 2018, a Preliminary WQMP was prepared for the Proposed Project by Thatcher Engineering & Associates, Inc. (available at the City 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. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is located within the Renaissance Specific Plan which is served by the San Gabriel Valley Water Company's Fontana Water Company (FWC) Division. FWC currently utilizes water from local groundwater basins (Chino Basin, Rialto-Colton Basin, Lytle Basin and No Man's Land Basin), local surface water (Lytle Creek), and imported surface water (State Water Project water from Inland Empire Utilities Agency and San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District). As stated in the 2016 Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment Draft EIR, at buildout demand within the FWC's service area is projected to be approximately 2,342 acre-feet annually (AFA). At build-out of the Renaissance Specific Plan, water demand district-wide is projected to be 50,959 AFA. With build-out of the Renaissance Specific Plan, and during a multiple dry year period, FWC's water supply is projected to be 50,959 AFA in 2035. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Employment land use zone and therefore would result in the requirement of groundwater resources that is already anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and evaluated in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR. 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. Therefore, no

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

c/d) **Less than Significant.** In June 2018, a Preliminary Drainage Study for the Proposed Project was completed by Thatcher Engineering & Associates, Inc. in conjunction with the Preliminary WQMP. As described in the Preliminary Drainage Study, post-development flows would continue as they have from the north to the south as sheet flow at an approximate grade of 1.9 percent. All flow intensities and volumes will be decreased from their pre-development conditions due to the proposed underground infiltration basin. Flows would enter an on-site storm drain system and drain into a proposed Stormtech underground chamber system. This Stormtech system was designed for water quality purposes and would have a total volume of 21,209 cubic-feet, which is more than the 100-year storm event on-site. Emergency flows and flows that are transmitted from the north would be allowed to flow out of the basin via a proposed under sidewalk drain outlet to Alder Avenue. No increase in flows or intensity from historic storm events is anticipated. Additionally, the Biological Assessment states that there are no natural drainages and no indications of direct flows or flooding areas present on the Project Site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Site or area. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **Less than Significant.** As stated in the Renaissance Specific Plan, the area south of SR-210 drains to Baseline Avenue which drains easterly toward Cactus Avenue; however, there are no storm drains in Baseline Avenue to intercept site runoff. As shown in Renaissance Specific Plan Figure 3-22, Conceptual Drainage Plan, development of the Renaissance Specific Plan area would require construction of four major east-west storm drain systems. Figure 3-15, Storm Drainage Plan of the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR, identifies the Project Site as being in an area which is proposed to drain to Basin 3, which is proposed to be located on the north side of Baseline Road, east of North Fitzgerald Avenue.

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Proponent shall coordinate the design and obtain approval of all flood control and storm drain structures as identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan Storm Drainage Plan. The Project Proponent shall provide evidence of approval to the City Public Works Department. Flood control and storm drain improvements must be consistent with any master planning efforts of the County to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Consistency with these requirements would be ensured by the City's project review, approval, and permitting process.

As stated in the Preliminary Drainage Study, any potential increase in post-development volume from pre-development conditions on-site would be mitigated through the use of an underground Stormtech infiltration basin which will have a total capacity of 21,209 cubic- feet. Flows from large storms and sheet flows that are transmitted from the north will be allowed to leave the site via a proposed storm drain line that will flow east to a proposed under sidewalk drain along Alder Avenue. The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Employment zone and therefore would not create or contribute

a significant amount of water runoff that was not already anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and evaluated in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR. 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/h) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project does not include housing. The Project Site is not identified to be within a 100-year floodplain as shown in Exhibit 5.2 of the City of Rialto General Plan and within the Renaissance Specific Plan Draft EIR. 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. The Project Site is also identified to be outside of the 500-year floodplain as shown in Exhibit 5.2 of the General Plan. In addition, there are no dams, reservoirs or large water bodies near the planning area. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

i) **No Impact.** According to the City's General Plan Exhibit 5.2, the Project Site is located outside of the 500-year floodplain area and is not located within a potential 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.

j) **No Impact.** Due to the inland distance from the Pacific Ocean and any other significant body of water, tsunamis and seiches and mudflows are not potential hazards to the Project Site. 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 Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project is the development of a 4.1-acre warehouse/distribution facility. The Project Site is currently vacant and is zoned as Employment in the Renaissance Specific Plan. Surrounding land uses are primarily industrial; vacant and industrial north of the Site, large industrial facilities to the east (abutted by Alder Avenue), single-family non-conforming residential to the south, and Prologis Storm Water Basin to the west. The Proposed Project is consistent with the City of Rialto General Plan and would not require the relocation of any residential structures in the vicinity. The Proposed Project is consistent with existing development in the vicinity. The Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **No Impact.** The Project Site is located near the southwest corner of the Renaissance Specific Plan area. The Renaissance planning area is proposed to be developed into an integrated community that would include various housing types and be closely linked to employment, retail, recreation, services, and schools. The Proposed Project is the development of a warehouse/distribution facility on a site designated as Employment in the Renaissance Specific Plan. The Proposed Project is consistent with the land use designation and development guidelines of the Renaissance Specific Plan.

The proposed FAR for the building is approximately 0.44. The Renaissance Specific Plan currently allows a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.40 for projects of this size, however, with incorporation of certain design features, the Renaissance Specific Plan allows for a FAR increase through a Conditional Development Permit. Therefore, the Proposed Project will include the following incentives, at the request of City Staff, to achieve a FAR bonus:

- Public art (2%)
- Employee break area (2%)

The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Proposed Project area. Therefore, no 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 a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No conflicts related to this type of land use plan would occur. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a/b) **Less than Significant.** As identified in Exhibit 2.7 of the City of Rialto General Plan, the Project Site occurs in an area designated as MRZ-2 by the State Geologist. MRZ-2 designations apply to areas where geologic data indicate that significant PCC-Grade aggregate resources are present. However, heavy industrial uses such as mining are not permitted land uses within the Renaissance Specific Plan.

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 in areas were mining activity is feasible. The Project Site is not located within an area protected by the City for mining development; therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** Noise can be measured in the form of a decibel (dB), which is a unit for describing the amplitude of sound. The predominant rating scales for noise in the State of California are the Equivalent-Continuous Sound Level (L_{eq}), and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which are both based on the A-weighted decibel (dBA). The L_{eq} is defined as the total sound energy of time-varying noise over a sample period. The CNEL is defined as time-varying noise over a 24-hour period with a weighted factor of 5 dBA applied to the hourly L_{eq} for noise occurring from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. (defined as relaxation hours) and 10 dBA applied to events occurring between (10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. defined as sleeping hours). The State of California's Office of Noise Control has established standards and guidelines for acceptable community noise levels based on the CNEL and L_{dn} rating scales. The purpose of these standards and guidelines is to provide a framework for setting local standards for human exposure to noise.

Urban Crossroads, Inc. prepared a Noise Impact Analysis for the Proposed Project in September 2018 (available at the City for review). The dominant noise source in the Project area is from vehicles traveling along Alder Avenue, which has a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour. Other significant sources of noise include the Union Pacific Railroad lines running adjacent to Interstate 10 and Metrolink, which runs directly through the City's downtown. The City's acceptable noise ranges for "Business Park" and "Light Industrial" were used as a substitute for "Employment", which is a land use designation only within the RSP. Business Park and Light Industrial acceptable CNEL ranges from 55 dBA to 70 dBA. Acceptable conditions for Residential land uses range from 50 dBA to 60 dBA.

Project-related operational uses include: 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. Construction activities would generate noise associated with the transport of workers and movement of construction materials to and from the area, ranging from ground clearing/excavation, grading, and building activities. Nearby sensitive receptors include a residence (non-conforming use) approximately 10 feet south of the Project Site. Construction activities would be short-term and would comply with the construction hours permitted by the City per Chapter 9.50 of the Municipal Code. Permitted construction hours in the City are identified in Subsection 9.50.070(B) of the Municipal Code and are as follows:

Permitted Construction Hours

October 1st through April 30th	
Monday – Friday	7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Saturday	8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Sunday	No permissible hours
State Holidays	No permissible hours
May 1st through September 30th	
Monday – Friday	6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Saturday	8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Sunday	No permissible hours
State Holidays	No permissible hours

Limiting project construction to the hours in which construction activities are exempt from the Municipal Code will minimize the significance of construction noise impacts at nearby sensitive receptors.

The City of Rialto Municipal Code does not identify specific exterior noise level standards therefore, the County of San Bernardino Development Code standards are used in the noise analysis to evaluate potential impacts at adjacent sensitive receiver locations per CEQA Guidelines. The San Bernardino County Code, Title 8 Development Code, Section 83001.080 (c) establishes the noise level standards for stationary noise sources. Since the Proposed Project's industrial land use will potentially impact adjacent noise-sensitive uses in the study area, the noise study relied on the more conservative residential noise level standards to describe potential operational noise impacts. For residential properties, the exterior noise level shall not exceed 55 dBA during daytime hours (7AM-10PM) and 45 dBA during nighttime hours (10PM-7AM).

To assess the potential for long-term operational and short-term construction noise impacts, five receiver locations were identified as representative locations for focused analysis (R1-R5 identified in the 2018 Noise Impact Analysis), which are as follow:

- R1: Existing non-conforming noise-sensitive Residential use located in the Business Center land use designation approximately 776 feet north on Alder Avenue.

- R2: Existing non-conforming noise-sensitive Residential use located in the Employment land use designation approximately 10 feet south, and adjacent to the Project Site.
- R3: Existing non-conforming noise-sensitive Residential use located in the Employment land use designation approximately 781 feet southwest of the Project Site on Tamarind Avenue.
- R4: Existing Residential use located approximately 898 feet south of the Project Site on Baseline Road.
- R5: Existing Residential use located approximately 1,084 feet south of the Project Site on Baseline Road.

Potential operational noise impacts were estimated by taking reference noise level measurements from similar types of activities related to development and operation of the Proposed Project. The projected noise levels assume the worst-case noise environment with idling trucks, delivery truck activities, back up alarms, as well as loading and unloading of dry goods, roof-top air conditioning units, and parking lot vehicle movements all operating continuously.

The noise analysis shows that the unmitigated Project-related operational noise levels would exceed the County of San Bernardino exterior noise level standards at location R2, 10 feet south of the Project Site. It was found to exceed Residential Noise Level Thresholds during nighttime hours. Therefore, 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:

N-1: **A minimum 8-foot high noise barrier at the Project building's southern property line adjacent to the truck loading dock area is required. The barrier shall provide a weight of at least four (4) pounds per square-foot of face area with no decorative cutouts or line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the roadways, or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dba. The barriers shall consist of a solid face from top to bottom. Unnecessary openings or decorative cutouts shall not be made. All gaps should be filled with grout or caulking. The noise barriers shall be constructed using either masonry block; an earthen berm; or any combination of construction materials capable of the minimum weight of four (4) pounds per square foot or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dBA.**

b) **Less than Significant.** It is expected that ground-borne vibration from construction activities would cause intermittent localized intrusion. Ground-borne vibration levels would result primarily from heavy construction equipment and trucks hauling materials to the Site. 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 using data published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Construction activities that would have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration within the Project Site mainly include grading. Project vibration impacts were estimated using the vibration source level of the construction equipment anticipated on Site (small bulldozer, jackhammer, loaded trucks, and large bulldozer), and the construction vibration assessment methodology published by the FTA. At distances ranging from 20 to 1,113 feet from the construction activity, construction vibration velocity levels are expected to approach 0.12 in/sec PPV. Based on the County of San Bernardino vibration standards, the unmitigated construction vibration levels would satisfy the 0.2 in/sec PPV threshold at all of the nearby sensitive receiver locations. Additionally, construction will adhere to the hours in the City of Rialto Municipal Code and would ensure impacts from construction would be less than significant. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Less than Significant.** As depicted on the Site Plan (refer to Figure 3), all truck loading docks are proposed to be located on the southside of the warehouse/distribution facility. The County of San Bernardino Development Code Title 8, Section 83.01.080 establishes an exterior noise level standard of 55 dBA for daytime use (7AM-10PM) and 45 dBA for nighttime use (10PM-7AM). Alder Avenue is designated as a Major Arterial within the Renaissance Specific Plan area and the posted speed limit is 50 miles per hour. Post-construction noise associated with the Project Site would be project-generated traffic. As depicted on the City's General Plan, Exhibit 5.6 – Baseline Noise Contours, noise contours at the Project Site boundary are 65 CNEL. Exhibit 5.7 – Future Noise Contours (2014) as substantial change in the noise contour at the Project Site is not anticipated. Existing and future traffic noise along the Proposed Project streets is not considered significant. The Renaissance Specific Plan EIR found that the build-out of the Renaissance Specific Plan area would result in project-level and cumulative off-site noise impacts associated with vehicular traffic traveling to and leaving the site.

The ultimate tenant of the warehouse/distribution facility is not yet known and may include any of the uses permitted within the Renaissance Specific Plan Employment land use district. The primary stationary noise-generating activities expected with the Proposed Project are that of 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. The nearest sensitive receptor to the Project Site is a single-family residential structure (R2) located approximately 10 feet south from the southern Project Site boundary. Operational noise levels associated with the warehouse/distribution facility are expected to exceed the County of San Bernardino exterior noise levels for daytime and nighttime hours. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1 above, the construction of a minimum 8-foot high noise barrier at the southern Project Site boundary, the Project operational noise levels would satisfy the County of San

Bernardino exterior noise level standards at all receiver locations and no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels would occur. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Less than Significant.** Construction activities are expected to create temporary and intermittent high-level noise conditions at receiver locations surrounding the Project Site. Using sample reference noise levels to represent the planned construction activities of the Proposed Project, the noise analysis estimates the Project-related construction noise levels at nearby sensitive receiver locations. Since the City of Rialto and County of San Bernardino General Plan and Municipal Codes do not identify specific construction noise level thresholds, a threshold is identified based on the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) limits for construction noise, which is consistent with criteria established by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The worst-case Project-related short-term construction noise levels are expected to range from 37.2 to 81.4 dBA Leq and would satisfy the 85 dBA Leq threshold identified by NIOSH at all receiver locations. A temporary increase in ambient noise above levels during the construction of the Proposed Project would not be substantial. Further, limiting project construction to the hours in which construction activities are exempt from the Municipal Code will minimize temporary construction noise impacts at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearby Rialto Municipal Airport 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 Ontario International Airport, located approximately 12 miles southwest of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts related to excessive noise levels from airport operations were identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

f) **No Impact.** The Project Site is not located near a private airfield and there are no private airfields or airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site. The Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no impacts associated with operations of a private airstrip were identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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,	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 permitted uses of the Employment land use designation of the Renaissance Specific Plan. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate in the Riverside/San Bernardino/Ontario region as of July 2018 was 4.6 percent. 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 by the local work force and would not result in population growth not already anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan or the City's General Plan. The Project Site is served by existing public roadways, and utility infrastructures exists to serve the Project. 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/c) **No Impact.** Project Site consists of two vacant parcels; the Proposed Project is a warehouse/distribution facility. The Proposed Project would not reduce the number of existing housing units, displace people, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Fire Protection

Less Than Significant. Fire emergency response at the Proposed Project would be provided by the 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 station to the Project Site is located on Ayala Drive approximately 2.5 miles from 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. The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Employment land use zone and therefore would not result in the requirement of fire protection services beyond that anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and evaluated in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR. The City would be able to provide adequate fire protection service, and the Proposed Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities. In addition, the collection of development impact fees would ensure appropriate fire services would be met in the future. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Police Protection

Less Than Significant. Police protection emergency response at the Proposed Project would be provided by the Rialto Police Department. The Rialto Police Department provides a full range of law enforcement and community programs. The Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Employment land use zone and therefore would not result in the requirement of police protection services beyond that anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and evaluated in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR. 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. In addition, the collection of development impact fees would ensure appropriate police protection services would be met in the future. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Schools

No Impact. The Proposed Project would not create a direct demand for public school services, as the subject property would be developed as 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 and would not result in substantial growth that was not already anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and the City's General Plan. 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 Employment land use zone and therefore would not result in the requirement of public schools that is not already anticipated by the Renaissance Specific Plan and evaluated in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR. The Proposed Project is not expected to draw significant new residents to the region and would not result in the need to construct new or physically public-school facilities. In addition, the applicant would be required to pay the applicable school impact fees. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Parks

No Impacts. 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. In addition, the collection of development impact fees would ensure appropriate recreational facility needs would be met. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or 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. Additionally, the applicant would be required to pay the applicable development impact fees. Therefore, no

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

XV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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. TRANSPORATION/TRAFFIC

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a/b) **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** A Focused Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) study was prepared by Urban Crossroads in September 2018 (available at the City for review) to provide an assessment of potential traffic impacts resulting from a proposed 83,635 square-foot warehouse/distribution facility. The Project Site Plan was later revised to reduce the footprint to 78,680 square-feet, therefore, providing for a more conservative TIA analysis. The TIA identifies the traffic mitigation measures necessary to maintain the established level of service standard for the elements of the impacted roadway system. The Proposed Project is anticipated to be developed in a single phase with an anticipated Opening Year of 2019. The TIA was prepared in accordance with the City of Rialto Traffic Impact Study Guidelines and requirements as identified by the San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program (CMP) guidelines and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies.

Currently the City of Rialto has an Alder Avenue Widening project underway. It is anticipated to be complete prior to the construction of the Proposed Project. The City's Alder Avenue Widening project will install curb and gutter at the ultimate location along the west side of Alder Avenue. Proposed driveways (Driveway 1 and Driveway 2) for the Proposed Project will be cut into the installed curb and gutter at the time of construction.

The TIA analyzed the following driveways for ingress/egress:

1. Driveway 1 at Alder Avenue – Right in/Right out (RIRO) access (Passenger cars only)
2. Driveway 2 at Alder Avenue – RIRO access (Passenger cars and trucks)

Trips generated by the Proposed Project's land uses were estimated based on trip generations rates according to the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, 2012. The Project is anticipated to generate a net total of 500 passenger car equivalent (PCE) (300 total daily trips, of which approximately 121 vehicles trips would produce a combination of 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4-axle+ trucks).

Based on a San Bernardino County and City of Rialto approved scoping agreement, the following study area intersections and roadway segments were analyzed in the traffic impact study:

North-South Street	**East-West Street**
1. Alder Avenue	Walnut Avenue
2. Alder Avenue	Miro Way
3. Alder Avenue	Driveway 1
4. Alder Avenue	Driveway 2
5. Alder Avenue	Baseline Road

Study area roadway segment included:

1. Alder Avenue Between Walnut Avenue and Renaissance Parkway

The City of Rialto Level of Service Standards as defined in the General Plan include:

Policy 4-1.20: Design City streets so that signalized intersections operate at Level of Service (LOS) D or better during the morning and evening peak hours and require new development to mitigate traffic impacts that degrade LOS below that level.

Policy 4-1.21: Design City streets so that un-signalized intersections operate with no vehicular movement having an average delay greater than 120 seconds during the morning and evening peak hours and require new development to mitigate traffic impacts that increase delay above that level.

The following study area intersections are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS during morning and/or evening peak hours for the Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Plus Cumulative (EAPC) traffic conditions:

North-South Street	**East-West Street**
1. Alder Avenue	Walnut Avenue
2. Alder Avenue	Miro Way
3. Alder Avenue	Baseline Road

Per the TIA all potentially significant impacts within the study area intersections and roadway segments may be reduced to a level below significant with roadway improvements. Off-site improvements to reduce impacts to less than significant EAPC traffic conditions are summarized in Table 8 below.

Table 8
Summary of Off-Site Improvements

Location	Improvement
Alder Avenue & Walnut Avenue (#1)	- Add a NB right turn lane - Add a SB right turn lane - Restripe the EB right turn lane to a shared through-right turn lane - Restripe the EB through lane to a left turn lane - Modify the traffic signal to implement lead-lag left turn operations on the EB and WB approaches and a 110 second cycle length
Alder Avenue & Miro Way (#2)	- Modify the traffic signal to implement a 110 second cycle length
Alder Avenue & Baseline Road (#5)	- Add a 2nd NB through lane - Add a NB right turn lane - Add a 2nd SB left turn lane - Add a 2nd SB through lane - Add a 2nd EB through lane - Add an EB right turn lane - Modify the traffic signal to implement a 110 second cycle length

Source: Urban Crossroads 2018

Based on the analysis of Project operations, off-site improvements would be required to minimize potentially significant traffic impacts associated with development of the Project and projected ambient growth, cumulative conditions, and General Plan build-out conditions. The Project Proponent would be required to make fair share contribution for the improvements listed in Table 8 above based on the proportion of the traffic that would be contributed to the study area relative to the total new traffic volume for General Plan build-out conditions. Therefore, 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:

TT-1: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Proponent shall participate in the City's DIF program by paying the requisite DIF fee at the time of building permit; and in addition, shall pay the Project's fair share amount for the improvements identified in Table 8.

TT-2: The Project Proponent shall contribute to the City of Rialto their fair share amount for the intersections that either share a mutual border with the City of Fontana or are wholly located within the City of Fontana that have recommended improvements for Project Buildout.

c) **No Impact.** The Project Site is located approximately 0.4-mile west of the former Rialto Municipal Airport runway. The airport was officially closed in September 2014. Development of the Proposed Project would not affect air traffic patterns of other regional airports. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d/e) **No Impact.** The Proposed Project would not create substantial hazards due to a site design feature or incompatible uses. The site plan includes access to the site from Alder Avenue with two driveways proposed; one at the Project Site's northeast corner and the second in the southeast corner. The Site Plan will be reviewed for approval by the City of Rialto during the Plan Review process to ensure that adequate access occurs. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

f) **No Impact.** The Project Site is located in the Renaissance Specific Plan. According to the Renaissance Specific Plan, Alder Avenue is a Renaissance Truck Route, Major Arterial, and an On-Street Public Bike Lane/Sidewalk. The Project Site is currently vacant and undeveloped and does not accommodate pedestrian or bicycle circulation. The nearest transit stop in the area is the Omnibus stop south of the Project Site on the corner of Baseline and Alder Avenue. The Proposed Project includes sidewalks and curb and gutter improvements which would follow the RSP development criteria. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) 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?				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or?				
ii)	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) also contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

i) **Less than Significant.** On July 11, 2017 CRM TECH completed a historical/archaeological resource search at the South-Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), California State University, Fullerton, which is the State of California's official cultural resource records repository for the County of San Bernardino. The records search examined any previously identified cultural resources and existing cultural resource reports occurring within one-mile of the Project Site. According to those searches, the Project Site does not fall within a listing under the California or National Register of Historical Resources or any local register of historical resources as defined in PRC section 5020.1 (k). The Project Site was not found to contain any evidence of "historical resources" eligible for the National or California Register of Historical Resources in accordance with CEQA. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) **Less than Significant.** 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.

In December 2018, the City of Rialto contacted tribes, receiving responses from two. The City received responses from both the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation

and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians declined consultation while the Gabrieleño Kizh Nation requested consultation. Attempts at consultation with the Gabrieleño Kizh Nation have been pursued and ultimately the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians tribe concurred with foregoing consultation as long as standard mitigation measures were incorporated into the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. Therefore, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level:

TCR-1: The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and is listed under the NAHC's Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. This list is provided by the NAHC. The monitor/consultant will only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project area. The Tribal Monitor/consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and monitor/consultant have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.

Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction projects will be consistent with current professional standards. Principal personnel must meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified.

TCR-2: Upon discovery of any archaeological resources, contractor shall cease construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.

If the resources are Native American in origin, the appropriate tribal representative shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Tribe will request reburial or preservation for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation takes place (CEQA Guidelines Section15064.5 [f]). If a resource is determined by the qualified

archaeologist to constitute a "historical resource" or "unique archaeological resource", time allotment and funding sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures, or appropriate mitigation, must be available. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources.

The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted and notified of any pre-contact cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with SMBMI, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents SMBMI for the remainder of the project, should SMBMI elect to place a monitor on-site.

TCR-3: **Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and excavation halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and PRC 5097.98 shall be followed.**

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

Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the land owner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and

a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. The Tribe will work closely with the qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be taken which includes at a minimum detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Tribe for data recovery purposes. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure completely recovery of all material. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location is considered a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created. Once complete, a final report of all activities is to be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does NOT authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive diagnostics on human remains.

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

Additionally, any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to SMBMI. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with SMBMI throughout the life of the project.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) **Less Than Significant.** Wastewater collected in the City of Rialto is treated at the Rialto Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). The WWTP has a design capacity of approximately 12 MGD. The WWTP is permitted by the State of California under NPDES Permit CA 0105295 which allows up to 11.7 MGD discharge of tertiary treated and disinfected water to the Santa Ana River at three points.

The Proposed Project is consistent with the Employment zoning in the Renaissance Specific Plan which was included in the Renaissance area buildout for the City's wastewater services to meet Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Santa Ana Region treatment requirements. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Less Than Significant.** As shown on Figure 3-21 Conceptual Water Plan of the Renaissance Specific Plan, existing water lines on Alder Avenue are available to serve the Project Site. Wastewater treatment requirements associated with build-out of the

Renaissance Specific Plan area were analyzed in a 2006 update to the Waste Water Collection System Analysis prepared by TRC. According to the TRC analysis sufficient capacity is available at the Rialto Sewer Plant to service the Renaissance Specific Plan area. In 2013 the City of Rialto entered into a 30-year concession agreement with Veolia Water North America for the management of the City's water and waste water system. The agreement includes $41 million in needed city-wide capital improvements to the water and wastewater treatment system including repairs and renovations at the City's Waste Water Treatment Plant. Such projects are not a direct result of Renaissance Specific Plan build out; individual projects are identified and evaluated for environmental impacts by the Rialto Water Services Capital Improvement Program. Development of the Proposed Project would not require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) **Less Than Significant.** The Development Criteria of the Renaissance Specific Plan requires that development south of Miro Way and north of Baseline Avenue include temporary detention basins until downstream facilities of the conceptual drainage system described in the Renaissance Specific Plan are completed. According to the conceptual drainage plan a reinforced concrete box storm drain will be constructed within Baseline Avenue to intercept runoff from the area south of Miro Way; the storm drain would outlet into the San Bernardino County Flood Control District's Cactus Basin 2.

Mitigation in the Renaissance Specific Plan EIR requires that prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant or his designee, must coordinate the design and obtain approval of all flood control and storm drain structures associated with development of the project. Flood control and storm drain improvements must be consistent with any master planning efforts of the County to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Consistency with these requirements would be ensured by the City's project review, approval, and permitting process.

As described in the Preliminary Drainage Study, post-development flows would continue as they have from the north to the south as sheet flow at an approximate grade of 1.9 percent. All flow intensities and volumes will be decreased from their pre-development conditions due to the proposed underground infiltration basin. Flows would enter an on-site storm drain system and drain into a proposed Stormtech underground chamber system. This Stormtech system was designed for water quality purposes and would have a total volume of 21,209 cubic-feet, which is more than the 100-year storm event on-site.

The drainage facilities of the Proposed Project have been designed to be consistent with the guidelines of the Renaissance Specific Plan. There were no demands on existing off-site storm water drainage facilities or the need for expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

d) **Less than Significant.** The Project Site is served by the Fontana Water Company (FWC). The FWC produces water from wells in the Chino Basin, Lytle Basin, Rialto Basin, the No Man's Land Basin, and from surface water flow diverted from Lytle Creek. The FWC also purchases untreated State Water Project water from the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District. Emergency interconnections are maintained with the Cucamonga Valley Water District water distribution system to purchase water for limited emergency purposes.

According to the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the Fontana Water Company Division the FWC district-wide water demand for 40,140 acre-feet for 2020 and 56,562 for 2040. The UWMP indicates that the Fontana Water Company's available water supply is projected to be 40,140-acre feet in 2020 and 56,562 in 2040 all under multiple dry years scenarios.

More recently the Fontana Water Company submitted a Water Supply Reliability Certification to the State Water Resources Control Board on June 22, 2016. The Certification demonstrates the surplus available supplies to meet projected demands over the next three years under continued drought conditions.

The Proposed Project is consistent with the Renaissance Specific Plan, which determined that Fontana Water Company to have sufficient water supply. The FWC 2015 Urban Water Management Plan projects sufficient supplies through the year 2040 under the multiple dry years scenario. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) **Less Than Significant.** As shown in Figure 3-14 of the Renaissance Specific Plan Draft EIR, an existing 12-inch sewer pipe serves development on Alder Avenue. As discussed in the Renaissance Specific Plan, the entire planning area will be served by an existing sewer line located within Cactus Avenue. This sewer extends southerly from Baseline Road in Cactus Avenue, easterly in Valley Boulevard, southerly in Riverside Drive, and easterly in Santa Ana Avenue to the City of Rialto sewage treatment plant. In 2006 an update to the Waste Water Collection System Analysis evaluated the Rialto Airport Redevelopment Wastewater Master Plan Update, an early iteration of the Renaissance Specific Plan that would have developed a large portion of the Renaissance planning area with residential uses. The Renaissance Specific Plan adopted in 2010 significantly decreased the number of residential units and increased the amount of business-related development.

Wastewater collected in the City of Rialto is treated at the Rialto Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). The WWTP has a design capacity of approximately 12 MGD. The WWTP is permitted by the State of California under NPDES Permit CA 0105295 which allows up to 11.7 MGD discharge of tertiary treated and disinfected water to the Santa Ana River at three points. The 2013 Sewer Master Plan shows that the treatment system has capacity for the projected additional future flows associated with buildout of the City. No deficiencies were projected to occur within the Renaissance Specific Plan area or in its immediate vicinity; the City of Rialto WWTP has sufficient capacity to accept sewage

flows from the Proposed Project. Therefore, 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. The landfill has a maximum throughput of 7,500 tons per day and has an expected operational life through 2033. The Renaissance Draft EIR projects that at buildout commercial uses within the plan area would generate approximately 34,645 tons of waste annually. Based on the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill capacity of 67,520,000 cubic yards reported September 2009, the landfill's potential for vertical expansion, and payment of impact fees, the Renaissance Specific Plan Draft EIR determined that the RSP buildout would have less than significant impacts related to landfill capacity and solid waste disposal. The Proposed Project is consistent with the Renaissance Specific Plan and the Project Proponent would be responsible for paying City impact fees related to the new development. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

g) **Less than Significant.** The Proposed Project would 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 in landfills. As such, the Project Proponent would be required to work with refuse haulers 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 these programs would reduce the amount of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project and diverted to landfills, which in turn will aid in the extension of the life of affected disposal sites. The Proposed Project would comply with all applicable solid waste statues and regulations. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly Or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) **Less than Significant**. A Biological Resources Assessment of the Project Site was completed by Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. (NRAI, August 14, 2018). As part of the biological assessment NRAI conducted a background data search for information on plant and wildlife species known occurrences within the vicinity of the project, as well as information on jurisdictional waters.

NRAI determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the loss of ruderal habitat and that the impact is not considered to be significant. The finding is consistent with the findings of the Biological Resource Assessment completed in support of the Renaissance Specific Plan (Michael Brandman Associates). As reported in the Renaissance Specific Plan no significant biological resources were recorded within the approximate 1,500-acre plan area during the environmental evaluation process for the Specific Plan.

NRAI determined that of the sensitive species identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan only burrowing owl has the potential to occur on the Project Site. NRAI found that at the time of the survey the Project Site did not have suitable habitat for the burrowing owl. However, burrowing owl are known to occur on the former Rialto Municipal Airport lands located to the east of the Project Site. In addition to the known occurrence of

burrowing owl within the vicinity, there are a few mature trees within the area that may provide habitat for nesting birds. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would ensure potential impacts to the burrowing owl and nesting birds are reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is warranted.

Based on the recent historical research, field investigations, and documentation, the cultural resources investigation concluded that the project area, yielded no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources, and no significant historical resources. The project area is not culturally significant, and the proposed development would not result in any adverse environmental impacts. However, in the event of an unanticipated find, implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, contained within this Initial Study, would ensure potential impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is necessary.

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. Potential Cumulative impacts related to traffic were identified in the Traffic Impact Analysis. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TT-1 and TT-2 would ensure that cumulative impacts are reduced to a level less than significant.

c) Less than Significant. The incorporation of design 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.

SECTION 4
REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed on 6/28/2018 from http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. 2013. "San Bernardino County Williamson Act FW 2012/2013 Sheet 2 of 2."

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. August 2015. *California Regional Conservation Plans*. Accessed on 7/2/2018 from https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor Database. Accessed on 7/5/2018 from http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

City of Rialto. December 2010. Rialto General Plan.

City of Rialto. October 2010. Renaissance Specific Plan.

County of San Bernardino. 2007. General Plan.

CRM Tech. *Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Assessor's Parcel Nos. 0240-201-08 and -41*. Prepared August 24, 2018.

Fontana Water Company. June 2016. Water Supply Reliability Certification. Access on 7/2/2018 from http://www.fontanawater.com/

Kimley Horn. June 2016. Renaissance Specific Plan Amendment Draft Environmental Impact Report. Prepared for City of Rialto.

Michael Brandman Associates. May 3, 2010. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Renaissance Specific Plan.

Michael Brandman Associates. October 26, 2010. Response to Comments/Final Environmental Impact Report Renaissance Specific Plan in the City of Rialto, San Bernardino County, California.

Natural Resources Assessment, Inc. *General Biological Assessment: Alder II Warehouse*. Prepared on August 14, 2018.

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 in June 2018.

Thatcher Engineering and Associates, Inc. *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan*. Prepared in June 2018.

United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Unemployment data accessed on 7/3/2018 from https://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.ca_riverside_msa.htm.

Urban Water Management Plan. Fontana Water Company Division. Accessed on 10/1/2018 from https://www.sgvwater.com/wp-content/uploads/San-Gabriel-Fontana_Amended-Final-December-2017-1.pdf.

Urban Crossroads. *Focused Traffic Impact Analysis: Alder II*. Prepared October 29, 2018.

Urban Crossroads. *Noise Impact Analysis: Alder II*. Prepared September 21, 2018.