

**Final
Initial Study
&
Mitigated Negative Declaration
for the**

Alder Plaza Project

**City of Rialto
San Bernardino County, California**

Lead Agency:
City of Rialto
150 South Palm Avenue
Rialto, California 92376
Contact: Daniel Casey

Prepared by:
VCS Environmental
30900 Rancho Viejo Road, Suite 100
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675
Contact: Sean Noonan, AICP

February 2019

Page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
▪ Purpose	1
▪ Statutory Authority and Requirements	1
▪ Intended Uses of this Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration	2
▪ Tiered Documents and Incorporation by Reference	3
▪ Tiered Documents	3
▪ Incorporation by Reference	4
▪ Technical Studies	4
2. Initial Study / Environmental Checklist	6
▪ Background Information	6
▪ Project Title	6
▪ Lead Agency	6
▪ Project Contact	6
▪ Project Sponsor	6
▪ Project Location and Environmental Setting	6
▪ General Plan / Zoning Designations of the Project Site	6
▪ Project Description	7
▪ Sewer and Water Facilities	8
▪ Utility Providers	9
▪ Required Agency Approvals	9
▪ Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	11
3. Environmental Analysis	12
I. Aesthetics	13
II. Agricultural and Forest Resources	15
III. Air Quality	17
IV. Biological Resources	22
V. Cultural Resources	27
VI. Geology and Soils	32
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	36
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	39

IX.	Hydrology and Water Quality	44
X.	Land Use and Planning.....	49
XI.	Mineral Resources	51
XII.	Noise	53
XIII.	Population and Housing	57
XIV.	Public Services	59
XV.	Recreation.....	61
XVI.	Transportation and Traffic.....	62
XVII.	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	66
XVIII.	Utilities and Service Systems	70
XIX.	Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	74
4.	References	76

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Figures

- Figure 1: Regional Location Map
- Figure 2: Vicinity Map
- Figure 3: Site Plan
- Figure 4: Landscape Plan
- Figure 5: Soil Map
- Figure 6: Vegetation Communities Map
- Figure 7: California Natural Diversity Database Map
- Figure 8: WQMP Map

Appendix B: Architectural Renderings and Color and Materials Board

Appendix C1: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Appendix C2: Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Appendix D1: Biological Habitat Assessment

Appendix D2: Rare Plant Survey

Appendix E1: Cultural Resources Survey

Appendix E2: AB 52 Tribal Consultation Documentation

Appendix F: Geotechnical Engineering Investigation

Appendix G: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Appendix H: Water Quality Management Plan

Appendix I: Traffic Impact Study

Appendix J: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

List of Tables

Table 1: Utility and Public Service Providers	9
Table 2: Required Permits and Approvals	9
Table 3: Estimated Construction Emissions Annual Pounds Per Day	19
Table 4. Estimated Operational Emissions Annual Pounds Per Day.....	19
Table 5: Permitted Hours of Construction.....	54

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AB52	<i>Assembly Bill 52</i>
ADA	<i>Americans with Disabilities Act</i>
ADT	<i>Average Daily Traffic</i>
APN	<i>Assessor Parcel Number</i>
AQMP	<i>Air Quality Management Plan</i>
BMPs	<i>Best Management Practices</i>
CAAQS	<i>California Ambient Air Quality Standards</i>
CalEEMod	<i>California Emissions Estimator Model</i>
Caltrans	<i>California Department of Transportation</i>
CARB	<i>California Air Resources Board</i>
CCR	<i>California Code of Regulations</i>
CDP	<i>Conditional Development Permit</i>
CDFW	<i>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</i>
CERCLIS	<i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation & Liability Information System</i>
CEQA	<i>California Environmental Quality Act</i>
CNDDDB	<i>California Natural Diversity Database</i>
CNEL	<i>Community Noise Exposure Level</i>
CO ₂ e	<i>Carbon Dioxide Equivalent</i>
dB	<i>Decibel</i>
dCSS/dChap	<i>Disturbed Coastal Sage – Chaparral Transition</i>
DMA	<i>Drainage Management Areas</i>
DPM	<i>Diesel Particulate Matter</i>
EB	<i>East-bound</i>
EIR	<i>Environmental Impact Report</i>
EPA	<i>Environmental Protection Agency</i>
ESA	<i>Environmental Site Assessment</i>
FEMA	<i>Federal Emergency Management Agency</i>
F-I	<i>Freeway Incubator</i>
FTA	<i>Federal Transit Administration</i>
GBMI-KN	<i>Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation</i>
GHG	<i>Greenhouse Gas</i>
GPD	<i>Gallons Per Day</i>
HCP	<i>Habitat Conservation Plan</i>
In/sec	<i>Inch Per Second</i>
IS	<i>Initial Study</i>
IS/MND	<i>Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration</i>
SR-210	<i>State Route 210</i>
LID	<i>Low Impact Development</i>
LST	<i>Localized Significance Threshold</i>
MATES	<i>Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study</i>

MBTA	<i>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</i>
MND	<i>Mitigated Negative Declaration</i>
MLD	<i>Most Likely Descendant</i>
MRZ	<i>Mineral Resource Zone</i>
MSL	<i>Mean Sea Level</i>
MS4	<i>Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System</i>
NAAQS	<i>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</i>
NAHC	<i>Native American Heritage Commission</i>
NCCP	<i>Natural Community Conservation Plan</i>
ND	<i>Negative Declaration</i>
NNG-B	<i>non-native grassland – broadleaf dominated</i>
NPDES	<i>Nation Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System</i>
NPL	<i>National Priorities List</i>
PCC	<i>Portland Cement Concrete</i>
PPV	<i>Peak Particle Velocity</i>
PRC	<i>Public Resources Code</i>
QSR	<i>Quick Service Restaurant</i>
REC	<i>Recognized Environmental Concern</i>
ROW	<i>Right-of-way</i>
RWQCB	<i>Regional Water Quality Control Board</i>
SB	<i>Senate Bill</i>
SCAB	<i>South Coast Air Basin</i>
SCAG	<i>Southern California Association of Governments</i>
SCAQMD	<i>South Coast Air Quality Management District</i>
SCCIC	<i>South Central Coastal Information Center</i>
sf	<i>square feet/square foot</i>
SLIC	<i>Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups</i>
SMBMI	<i>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</i>
SRA	<i>Source Receptor Area</i>
TAC	<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>
TIS	<i>Traffic Impact Study</i>
TMDL	<i>Total Maximum Daily Loads</i>
USACE	<i>United States Army Corps of Engineers</i>
USFWS	<i>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</i>
UWMP	<i>Urban Water Management Plan</i>
VCS	<i>VCS Environmental</i>
WB	<i>West-bound</i>
WQMP	<i>Water Quality Management Plan</i>
WVWD	<i>West Valley Water District</i>
WWII	<i>World War II</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The City of Rialto (City) has determined that the proposed Alder Plaza Project (Project) and the required discretionary actions of the City for the Project require compliance with the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) addresses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects associated with the proposed Project.

Statutory Authority and Requirements

In accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21177) and pursuant to Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines set forth at Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the City of Rialto, acting in the capacity of Lead Agency, is required to undertake the preparation of an Initial Study (IS) to provide the City with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration (ND), or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation for the proposed Project.

The purpose of an IS is to: (1) identify potential environmental impacts; (2) provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or ND; (3) enable the Applicant or Lead Agency to modify a Project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared; (4) facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a Project; (5) provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a ND that a Project would not have a significant environmental effect; (6) eliminate needless EIRs; (7) determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used for a Project; and (8) assist in the preparation of an EIR, if required, by focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant, identifying the effects determined not to be significant, and explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant.

Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines identifies global disclosure requirements for inclusion in an IS. Pursuant to those requirements, an IS must include: (1) a description of the Project, including the location of the Project; (2) an identification of the environmental setting; (3) an identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries; (4) a discussion of ways to mitigate significant effects identified, if any; (5) an examination of whether the Project is compatible with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and (6) the name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the preparation of the IS.

According to Section 15065(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must be prepared for a particular project if any of the following conditions occur:

- The Project has the potential to: substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the

number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- The Project has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The Project has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual Project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects.
- The environmental effects of a Project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

According to Section 15070(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, a ND is deemed appropriate if the IS shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment.

According to Section 15070(b), a MND is deemed appropriate if it identifies potentially significant effects, but:

- Revisions in the Project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed IS/MND is released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and
- There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the Project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

This IS/MND has determined that the Project would result in potentially significant environmental impacts; however, mitigation measures are proposed that would reduce any potentially significant impact to less than significant levels. As such, an IS/MND is deemed as the appropriate document to provide the necessary environmental evaluations and clearance.

This IS/MND has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*); Section 15070 of the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (“CEQA Guidelines”), as amended (CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000 *et seq.*); applicable requirements of the lead agency, the City of Rialto.

Intended Uses of this Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

This IS/MND is intended to be an informational document for the City of Rialto as Lead Agency, the general public, and for responsible agencies to review and use when approving subsequent discretionary actions for the Project. The resulting documentation is not a policy document, and its approval and/or certification neither presupposes nor mandates any actions on the part of those agencies from whom permits and other discretionary approvals would be required.

The Notice of Intent to Adopt a MND (Appendix J) and supporting analysis was subject to a 20-day public and agency review period (December 15, 2018 to January 3, 2019). During this review, one comment letter on

the document was received from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) by the City of Rialto. Following review of the SCAQMD comments, the City of Rialto provided a response letter to SCAQMD in February 2019, considered these comments as a part of the Project's environmental review, and included them with the IS/MND documentation for consideration by the Rialto Planning Commission and City Council if needed.

Tiered Documents and Incorporation by Reference

Information, findings, and conclusions contained in this document are based on incorporation by reference of tiered documents, and technical studies that have been prepared for the Project, which are discussed in the following section.

Tiered Documents

As permitted in Section 15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, information and discussions from other documents can be included into this document. Tiering is defined as follows:

“Tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as the one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and Negative Declarations (ND)s on narrower Projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or ND solely on the issues specific to the later Project.”

For this document, the *“City of Rialto General Plan Update Final EIR”* (certified in 2010) (General Plan EIR) serves as the broader document, since it analyzes the entire City. However, as discussed, site-specific impacts which this broader document could not adequately address, are provided in this IS/MND for certain issue areas. This IS/MND evaluates each of those site-specific environmental issue areas and will rely upon analysis contained within the General Plan EIR with respect to remaining issue areas where appropriate.

Tiering also allows this document to comply with Section 15152(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which discourages redundant analyses, as follows:

“Agencies are encouraged to tier the environmental analyses which they prepare for separate but related Projects including the general plans, zoning changes, and development Projects. This approach can eliminate repetitive discussion of the same issues and focus the later EIR or ND on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy or program to an EIR or ND for another plan, policy, or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or ND.”

Section 15152(d) of the CEQA Guidelines further states:

“Where an EIR has been prepared and certified for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance consistent with the requirements of this section, any lead agency for a later Project pursuant to or consistent with the program, plan, policy, or ordinance should limit the EIR or negative declaration on the later Project to effects which:

1. Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or
2. Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the Project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.”

Incorporation by Reference

Incorporation by reference is a procedure for reducing the size of environmental documents and is most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background information, but do not contribute directly to the specific analysis of the Project itself. This procedure is particularly useful when an EIR or ND relies on a broadly-drafted EIR for its evaluation of cumulative impacts of related Projects. (*Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation v. County of Los Angeles* (1986) 177 Cal.App.3d 300.) If an EIR or ND relies on information from a supporting study that is available to the public, the EIR or ND cannot be deemed unsupported by evidence or analysis. (*San Francisco Ecology Center v. City and County of San Francisco* (1975) 48 Cal.App.3d 584, 595.) This document incorporates by reference the document from which it is tiered, the General Plan EIR, certified in 2011.

When an EIR or ND incorporates a document by reference, the incorporation must comply with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines as follows:

- The incorporated document must be available to the public or be a matter of public record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a)). The General Plan EIR is available, along with this document, at the City of Rialto, Development Services Department, 150 S. Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376.
- This document must be available for inspection by the public at an office of the lead agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(b)). This document is available at the City of Rialto, Development Services Department, 150 S. Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376.
- This document must summarize the portion of the document being incorporated by reference or briefly describe information that cannot be summarized. Furthermore, this document must describe the relationship between the incorporated information and the analysis in the General Plan EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(c)). As discussed above, the General Plan EIR addresses the entire City of Rialto and provides background and inventory information and data which apply to the Project site. Incorporated information and/or data will be cited in the appropriate sections.
- This document must include the State identification number of the incorporated document (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(d)). The State Clearinghouse Number for the General Plan EIR is 2006071021.
- The material to be incorporated in this document will include general background information (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(f)).

Technical Studies

The following technical studies were prepared for the Project and are available for public review concurrently with the IS/MND. Hard copies of the technical studies are available at the City’s Planning Division counter located at 150 South Palm Avenue in the City of Rialto. The IS/MND and supporting documents may also be

viewed on the City's web site at the following link (<http://yourrialto.com/City-hall/departments/development-services-department/planning-division/>)

- AB52 Consultation Status Email, sent by Daniel Casey – City of Rialto, October 16, 2018.
- AB52 Comment Email, sent by San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, January 31, 2018.
- AB52 Comment Letter, sent by Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, February 8, 2018.
- *Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment*, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., January 30, 2019.
- *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment*, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., October 20, 2017.
- *Biological Habitat Assessment*, prepared by Julie Fontaine of Trestles Environmental Corporation, June 26, 2017.
- *Cultural Resources Investigations (Survey)*, prepared by McKenna et al., June 21, 2017.
- *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation*, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., October 16, 2008.
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* SEC Casmalia Street & Alder Avenue, prepared by Herron Environmental, December 21, 2017.
- *Rare Plant Survey*, prepared by Trestles Environmental Corporation, May 16, 2018.
- *Traffic Impact Study for Rialto Retail Center (APN #1133-181-14)*, prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc., September 2018.
- *Water Quality Management Plan*, Rialto Commercial Development, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., August 18, 2017.

2. INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Background Information

Project Title

Alder Plaza Project

Lead Agency

City of Rialto
150 South Palm Avenue
Rialto, California 92376

Project Contact

Daniel Casey, Senior Planner
City of Rialto
Development Services Department, Planning Division
150 South Palm Avenue
Rialto, California
(909) 820-2525 x2075
dcasey@rialtoca.gov

Project Sponsor

Alessandro Service Station, LP
P.O. Box 1958
Corona, California 92878
(951) 280-3833

Project Location and Environmental Setting

Project Site

The Project site is 6.05 acres, but the proposed improvements would occur within approximately 3.9 acres on a total of 4 parcels in the City of Rialto, California (Appendix A, Figure 1, Project Regional Map and Figure 2, Project Vicinity Map). The site is bordered by State Route 210 (SR-210) to the south, N. Alder Avenue to the west and W. Casmalia Street to the north.

The Project site is relatively flat, ranging in elevation from 1,521 feet to 1,538 feet above mean sea level (MSL).

The Project site is located within Section 28, Township 1 North, Range 5 West of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic Map, 7.5 Minute Series, Devore, California Quadrangle, and is located on Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 1133-181-18, 1133-181-19, 1133-181-20, and 1133-181-22.

General Plan / Zoning Designations of the Project Site

General Plan Zoning Map Land Use Designation: Renaissance Specific Plan

Renaissance Specific Plan Land Use Plan Designation: Freeway Incubator

Existing Surrounding Land Uses of the Project Site

Existing land uses surrounding the Project site generally consist of commercial and industrial uses as well as undeveloped parcels. Surrounding uses comprise the following:

- North of the Project site is Casmalia Street; across the street is zoned as Employment and developed as an industrial warehouse;
- West of the Project site is Alder Avenue; across the street is vacant land zoned as Freeway Incubator;
- East of the Project site is vacant land zoned as Freeway Incubator; and
- South of the Project site is SR-210 within Caltrans right-of-way (ROW).

Project Description

Alessandro Service Station, LP is proposing improvements to an existing gas station, construction of two new drive-thru restaurants and construction of one new retail store at the southeast corner of the Alder Avenue and Casmalia Street intersection (Project) as shown in Figure 3, Site Plan. The Project would require lot line adjustments to four parcels.

The existing gas station includes a 2,900 square foot (sf) convenience store, a 1,000 sf retail store, a 700 sf car wash, a 4,395 sf eight-pump gasoline canopy covering eight gasoline dispensers, and an 800 sf two-pump diesel canopy covering two of the three diesel dispensers. Improvements to the existing gas station would include extension of the existing diesel canopy, installation of four new additional diesel dispensers (three fueling positions), construction of a new 1,262 sf four-pump diesel canopy, installation of two underground storage tanks (one 22,000-gallon diesel tank and one 8,000-gallon diesel exhaust fluid tank), and minor landscaping and lighting improvements (Figure 3, Site Plan). These improvements would occur on southern portions of the proposed adjusted Parcel 1.

The Project would also construct a new 3,200 sf quick service restaurant (QSR) with drive thru (proposed Parcel 2); a new 2,100 sf QSR with drive thru (proposed Parcel 3) attached to a new 2,000 sf retail store (proposed Parcel 3); and landscape and hardscape improvements with a total of 98 parking stalls (Figure 3, Site Plan and Figure 4, Landscape Plan). No development is currently proposed on Parcel 4.

Off-site improvements needed for the Project include a fair share contribution to off-site transportation improvements as well as work needed to connect to existing utilities adjacent to the project site.

Architectural Features

The new structures would feature stone veneer base separated from stucco by wood. The stucco around the building would consist of multiple colors of accentuating architectural details such as wall recesses, parapets, and trellises. Steel and Fabric Awnings would be located over glass doors and windows. Painted wood trellises would extend away from the buildings over drive-thru windows with stone veneer poles. The proposed roof line is a mix of parapets and sloping roof facade with roof tiles.

The new gas station canopy would feature poles with the same stone veneer with a wood accent at the top and a painted canopy. Please see Appendix B for architectural cross sections.

All existing and proposed buildings coordinate to provide visual cohesion throughout the Project site.

Signage

The Project site has four existing signs including one pylon sign and three monument signs. The existing pylon monument sign is located near the southwest corner of the site oriented to the freeway. An existing monument sign is located at the northwest corner of the site facing North Alder Avenue/West Casmalia Street intersection displaying the tenant and two monument signs with gas station pricing located at the west and north sides of the Project Site.

The existing gas station monument sign on the north boundary of the Project site within Parcel 2 would be replaced at the same general location by a monument sign for the new building tenants within Parcels 2 and 3. A new monument sign will be installed along the northern boundary of Parcel 1 along Casmalia Avenue.

Site Access and Parking

Primary regional access to the site is via the Alder Avenue exit from SR-210. The site is bounded by North Alder Avenue to the west and West Casmalia Street to the north. Two existing driveways provide vehicular access to the site from West Casmalia Street and would continue to do so once the Project is constructed. Pedestrian and bike access is available by sidewalks and the roadways of West Casmalia Street and North Alder Avenue along the Project site's frontage. A bike rack for three bicycles, a bike locker, low emission vehicle spaces and an electric vehicle charging station are proposed. A crosswalk is proposed between the QSR on Parcel 2 and the QSR and Retail Store on Parcel 3 for internal circulation.

The Project would provide 98 parking stalls across the entire site (including 5 ADA parking stalls), an increase of 64 additional stalls more than the 34 currently onsite.

Landscaping and Other Improvements

Landscaping for the Project has been designed to enhance the built environment and preserve water using drought-tolerant species. Existing trees along the Project's frontage are to remain, while new trees, shrubs and ground cover would be installed throughout the Project site (see Appendix A, Figure 4, Landscape Plan). Stamped concrete pavement would enhance driveways of the Project site. Lighting will be added and relocated as needed to provide optimal visibility at night.

Drainage/Water Quality

The Project would include 4 drainage management areas (DMAs). Each DMA would include its own bioretention/ infiltration system to reduce the surface flow of water and runoff (see Figure 8, Water Quality Management Plan; WQMP). Runoff from the gas station would be treated by a Flume Filter prior to entering the bioretention. The existing pre-developed pervious area condition is poor and post-development conditions would improve the drainage and reduce runoff (see WQMP, Appendix H).

Sewer and Water Facilities

The proposed Project would be supplied from existing West Valley Water District (WVWD) facilities. Wastewater treatment for the Project would be provided by the City of Rialto at the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant. Wastewater would be collected from the site and piped to an existing City sewer line that runs along West Casmalia Street (see Renaissance Specific Plan Figure 3-23, Conceptual Sewer Plan).

Utility Providers

All utilities and public services are currently available on or adjacent to the proposed Project site. Utility and Service providers are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Utility and Public Service Providers

Utility/Service	Provider
Electricity	Southern California Edison Eastern Division
Water	West Valley Water District (WVWD)
Sewer	City of Rialto/Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant
Gas	Southern California Gas Company
Cable	Spectrum/AT&T U-verse
Telephone	AT&T
Trash and Waste Disposal	Burrtec Disposal

Required Agency Approvals

Agency approvals required in support of this Project are discussed below in Table 2: Required Permits and Approvals. SCAQMD is a responsible agency pursuant to CEQA Section 21069 and may utilize this document for future approvals related to the Project.

Table 2: Required Permits and Approvals

Agency	Permit/Approval	Description	Status/Timing
City of Rialto	Conditional Development Permits	2 for drive-thru restaurants 1 for the service station	Pending Planning Commission Public Hearing Will be processed concurrently with Precise Plan of Design
	Lot Adjustment	Parcels must be adjusted to fit with new development and building locations	Pending Development Review Committee Review/Approval
	Precise Plan of Design	Required prior to the issuance of building or grading permits to ensure project design is consistent with the zoning, general plan, and specific plan requirements for the site	Pending Planning Commission Public Hearing Will be processed concurrent with Conditional Development Permits
	City Building Permits	Issuance of these permits is required to construct the proposed project.	Building permits would be obtained prior to construction activities
San Bernardino County Fire Department	Underground Storage Tank	Issuance of this permit is required for the proposed underground storage tank and fuel dispensers for expanded existing gas station.	Will be processed concurrent with Conditional Development Permits
South Coast Air Quality Management District		Permit or Modification of an existing permit to allow for the addition of diesel fuel station to an existing gas station.	

Agency	Permit/Approval	Description	Status/Timing
		Demonstrate compliance with applicable SCAQMD Rules, including, but are not limited to, Rule 201 – Permit to Construct, Rule 203 – Permit to Operate, and Rule 461 – Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing	

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

All of the potential environmental impacts listed below are addressed in this Initial Study. Those that are checked below have been identified as involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages for which mitigation measures have been identified to reduce the impact to less than significant.

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

DETERMINATION (To Be Completed By The Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ 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 could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the Project. 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" 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Signature:

Date:

Printed Name: Daniel Casey

Title: Senior Planner

3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The environmental analysis provided below in Sections 3-I through 3-XVIII is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines, as amended, and used by the City of Rialto in its environmental review process. For the environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the development's impacts and to identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No impact.** The development would not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- **Less than significant impact.** The development would have the potential to impact the environment, although this impact would be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- **Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.** The development would have the potential to generate impacts, which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially significant impact.** The development could have impacts which may be considered significant, and therefore additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

The following is a discussion of potential Project impacts as identified in the Initial Study/ Environmental Checklist. Explanations are provided for each item.

I. Aesthetics

Would the Project:

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

Aesthetics Discussion

a) *Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Rialto General Plan defines a scenic vista as a picturesque view that is visible from certain parts of the City. Examples include views of the San Gabriel Mountains, San Bernardino Mountains, foothills and natural landforms. The Project site is located in a developed area with no natural landforms onsite or nearby that would be disturbed or obstructed by Project implementation. Views of the San Bernardino Mountains, approximately 3.5 miles away, occur looking north and northwest from North Alder Avenue away from the Project site. Views of the mountains are also partially available but obstructed by the existing development looking to the northeast from North Alder Avenue and northbound SR-210 off-ramp. Implementation of the proposed Project would not change these existing views. In addition, the project would also match the general commercial character of the immediate area; therefore, the Project's potential impact is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) *Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. There are no state scenic highways located near the Project site and the site would not be visible from a scenic highway. The nearest officially designated state scenic highway, Route 138, is located over 9 miles away.

c) *Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would partially expand an existing gas station and develop additional restaurant and commercial pads on partially graded and disturbed vacant lots. The proposed Project would be consistent with the visual character and quality of its surroundings, which consist of existing

commercial and industrial development along with vacant parcels. The new gas station canopy is proposed to have aesthetic finishes that are consistent with and expand upon the existing visual character. The Project proposes aesthetic finishes (see Appendix B, Architectural Renderings and Color and Materials Board) with stone ledges, variable color painted stucco pallet, concrete roof tiles, signage and landscaping improvements as shown on the architectural renderings and color and materials board. Stamped concrete will be used to enhance the main driveway entrance and exit driveway of the Project site. Existing and new landscaping will enhance the built environment with a mix of different types of trees throughout the Project site along with scrubs and groundcover. All equipment, whether on the roof of the structure or ground shall be screened from public view. These aesthetic improvements are consistent the City of Rialto General Plan and the Renaissance Specific Plan and would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site or surroundings; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is partially developed with existing lighting for night operations. The addition of two restaurants, commercial space, and parking lot would create additional sources of night lighting at the Project site; however, these new sources of light are not anticipated to be substantial and all lighting would be consistent with City code requirements for reducing glare and light pollution. For example, the Project would utilize shielded, outdoor light fixtures to minimize light spillage onto adjacent properties. In addition, the Project would comply with the City's Municipal Code for Lighting (Section 18.61.140) to ensure light emitted by the Project does not exceed acceptable levels at nearby properties. Some of the existing yard lights on the Project site would be relocated to allow for the new structures as shown on the site plan. Also, none of the Project's proposed building materials are highly reflective. As such, glare from the sun or other light sources reflecting from the Project are not likely, and adverse effects to day and nighttime views in the area are not expected. Therefore, no significant light or glare impacts would result from the proposed Project and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: California Scenic Highway Mapping System (California Department of Transportation, Accessed February 2018); Google Earth Investigation (VCS Environmental, February 2018); Project Description; Rialto Municipal Code; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Site Plan (Absolute Design Methods, 2018); Landscape Plan (Absolute Design Methods, 2017); Architectural Renderings and Color and Materials Board (Absolute Design Methods, 2018).

II. Agricultural and Forest Resources

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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Agricultural and Forest Resources Discussion

a) *Would the Project 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?*

No Impact. The Project site is partially developed with an existing gas station, convenience store, and retail uses. The remainder of the site consists of disturbed and graded vacant land and disturbed vacant non-native grassland. The Project site contains no existing agricultural uses or evidence of historic agricultural uses. The Project site is identified as “Urban and Built-up Land,” and is surrounded by “Urban and Built-up Land” on the San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map (August 2017) produced by the California Department

of Conservation; none of the Project site is identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

b) Would the Project conflict with existing agriculture zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The Project site is zoned as Renaissance Specific Plan, with a land use designation of Freeway Incubator. In addition, the Project site is not involved in a Williamson Act Contract or other agricultural land contract based on review of the California Department of Conservation's San Bernardino County Williamson Act map. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the Project 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))?

No Impact. The Project site is not zoned by the City as forest land and contains neither timberland resources nor an association with timberland resources or timberland production. Therefore, no impacts would occur with Project implementation and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project site neither contains forest land nor would it result in the conversion of forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur with Project implementation and no mitigation is required.

e) Would the Project 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?

No Impact. The Project site contains neither farmland nor forest land. Project implementation would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: San Bernardino County Important Farmland 2016, Sheet 2 of 2 (FMMP Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2017); San Bernardino County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016, Sheet 2 of 2, (California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2016); Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Site Plan (Absolute Design Methods, 2018).

III. Air Quality

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality Discussion

The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Appendix C1) and Addendum (Appendix C2) were prepared to address issues related to air quality. Please refer to these technical studies for more in-depth details which was relied upon for the impact analysis below.

- *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment* in support of *Proposed Retail Project Adler Avenue & West Casmalia Street, Rialto, California*, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., October 2017; and
- *Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment*, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., January 2019.

a) *Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

No Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed Project would produce emissions of nonattainment pollutants primarily from diesel combustion equipment and fugitive dust during construction and from on-road automobiles during operations.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) where the Project is located. The Project will comply with applicable SCAQMD Rules, including, but not limited to, Rule 201 – Permit to Construct, Rule 203 – Permit to Operate, and Rule 461 – Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing. The 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), completed by SCAQMD in March 2017, proposes emission-reduction measures that are designed to bring the SCAB into attainment of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Because AQMP attainment strategies include mobile source control measures and clean fuel projects that are enforced at the state and federal levels on engine manufacturers and petroleum refiners and retailers, proposed Project activities would comply with these control measures. Compliance with these requirements would further ensure that the proposed Project's activities would not obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

Growth projections from City general plans are provided to the SCAG, which develops regional growth forecasts. SCAG's regional growth forecasts are then used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP. Therefore, developments consistent with the growth projections in the City's General Plan are consistent with the AQMP. The proposed Project would be consistent with growth projections of the General Plan as discussed in the Population and Housing Section and Land Use Planning Section of this Initial Study. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact. To provide local lead agencies with guidance for determining significance of air quality impacts in CEQA documents, SCAQMD has adopted thresholds for pollutants within the SCAB region. A Project would be considered significant under CEQA if its impacts exceed these regional significance thresholds. The proposed Project's peak day emissions that would occur within SCAB borders were compared to SCAQMD's peak day regional emission thresholds for determination of significance. In addition, SCAQMD developed the Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology to assist CEQA lead agencies in analyzing localized air quality impacts from proposed Projects. The LST methodology is based on maximum day allowable emissions, the area of the emissions source, the ambient air quality within a Project's Source Receptor Area (SRA), and the distance to the nearest exposed individual. Table 3 and Table 4 utilize SCAQMD's regional and localized thresholds to evaluate the Project's potential impacts on air quality.

Construction-Related Impacts

Table 3 provides a summary of the emission estimates for construction of all proposed site improvements that would occur during various construction stages: Demolition, Grading Site Preparation, Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coatings. These projected emissions assume standard measures would be implemented to reduce emissions, as calculated with the *California Emissions Estimator Model* (CalEEMod). As shown in Table 3, temporary construction emissions would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds. Therefore, the emissions associated with construction would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Table 3: Estimated Construction Emissions Annual Pounds Per Day

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Regional Significance Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
<i>Significant?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Localized Significance Thresholds	N/A	263	2,738	N/A	42	12
<i>Significant?</i>	-	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	-	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Total Project Construction Emissions	1.70	12.06	9.5	0.0165	0.94	0.75
Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem 2017); Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem 2019).						

Operation-Related Impacts

The main operational impacts associated with the Project would be impacts from traffic emissions. Minor impacts would also be associated with energy use and area sources. Table 4 below presents the results of the CalEEMod emission calculations in pounds/day for operational emissions, with additional analysis provided for ROG emissions, which would result from the Project's gasoline and diesel fueling stations. As shown in Table 4, operational emissions would not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds. Therefore, the emissions associated with construction would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Table 4. Estimated Operational Emissions Annual Pounds Per Day

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Regional Significance Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
<i>Significant?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Localized Significance Thresholds	n/a	263	2,738	n/a	10	3
<i>Significant?</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Total Project Operational Emissions	20.50*	31.72	60	0.01	5.69	1.75
Source: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem 2017); Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem 2019).						
*As further detailed in the Project's air quality technical studies, the 20.50 pounds per day of total ROG emissions for the Project consists of emissions related to mobile source emissions associated with the gas station as well as the operational emissions that would result from the fueling process.						

Projects involving traffic impacts may result in the formation of locally high concentrations of CO, known as CO "hot spots." As described in the Project Traffic Study, the Project would not have a significant impact on traffic in the area and no intersections would degrade to unacceptable levels from direct Project impacts, as further summarized in Section XVI.b of this IS. The Project would have a cumulative contribution to the degradation of the Alder Avenue/SR-210 westbound ramp intersection, Alder Avenue/SR-210 eastbound ramp intersection, and Alder Avenue/Renaissance Parkway intersection. However, the Project's cumulative contribution to traffic congestion at these locations would be reduced through the standard payment of fees to the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee Program. Payment of these fees would pay the Project's fair share to fund future improvements at these intersections to ensure adequate levels of service are maintained, while accounting for non-Project related future growth in the area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not generate CO hotspots, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor but collectively significant projects. SCAQMD has developed a policy to address the cumulative impacts of CEQA Projects. The policy holds the cumulative threshold to be the same as the project-level threshold and indicates that project impacts are cumulatively considerable if they exceed the project-specific air quality significance thresholds. The ambient air quality of the SCAB provides a summary of the cumulative air quality impacts in the region. The proposed Project is located in the SCAB, which is currently in nonattainment with Federal and/or State standards for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Air quality in the SCAB has improved in the last several decades. The improvement in air quality can be attributed to emission reductions from industrial sources, introduction of low emission fuels used in on-road motor vehicles (e.g., low sulfur fuels, reformulated gasoline, etc.), and implementation of the AQMPs, which develop emission reduction strategies that are subsequently promulgated as enforceable regulations. Health impacts have also declined in the SCAB as a result of federal, state and local regulations. SCAQMD's 2015 Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES IV) study reported a SCAB-wide decrease of 57% from the previous MATES III study, despite continuing population growth. According to MATES IV, the background cancer risk in the Project area is approximately 880 per million.

The proposed Project would contribute to impacts from cumulatively related projects and to the existing pollution burden in SCAB. Per SCAQMD's policy, impacts from the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable if they exceed the project-specific air quality thresholds. Construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed Project are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 above. As shown in these tables, neither construction nor operations would result in an exceedance of either regional thresholds or localized thresholds. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. Existing land uses near the Project site are commercial, industrial, vacant parcels and the SR-210 Freeway. The nearest sensitive land uses are single-family homes, located over 0.5 mile away to the northeast and to the southwest of the Project site. No schools, hospitals or other sensitive uses are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. In addition, impacts to sensitive receptors are typically evaluated in terms of exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs). Proposed Project construction activities would result in short-term emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) from the combustion of diesel fuel in offroad construction equipment engines and onroad trucks during construction and operations. California Air Resources Board (CARB) classifies DPM as a TAC and uses PM₁₀ emissions from diesel exhaust as a surrogate for measuring DPM impacts. As shown in Table 3 and Table 4, daily on-site DPM emissions (as PM₁₀ exhaust) would not exceed SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}. Furthermore, the Project was analyzed using SCAQMD's risk assessment calculator (Risk Assessment Procedures Version 8.1), which indicated that the Project's fueling operations would not significantly affect any sensitive receptors in proximity to the fueling station. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC emissions and no mitigation is required.

e) Would the Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors; however, due to the distance of sensitive receptors to the Project site and the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with Project construction would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations. These land uses are not proposed for this Project. The nearest sensitive land uses are single-family homes, located over 0.5 mile away to the northeast and to the southwest of the Project site. No schools, hospitals or other sensitive uses are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. However, the Project does involve the addition of gasoline and diesel fueling stations as well as new restaurants, which may generate some localized nuisance odors. Additional analysis related to this is provided in the Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared in January 2019, which is provided as Appendix C2. Therefore, based on this information, potential odor impacts would be less than significant.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem Engineering Group, Inc., January 2019); Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem Engineering Group, Inc., October 2017); Project Description; Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (South Coast Air Quality Management District, March 2017); Traffic Impact Study for Rialto Retail Center (APN #1133-181-14) (Darnell & Associates, Inc., September 2018).

IV. Biological Resources

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on biological resources involved within a jurisdictional water feature as defined by federal, state or local regulations (e.g., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, Section 1602 of California Fish and Game Code, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Biological Resources Discussion

The following technical study, attached as Appendix D1, was prepared to address issues related to air quality. Please refer to this technical study for more in-depth details utilized for the impact analysis below.

Biological Habitat Assessment, prepared by Julie Fontaine of Trestles Environmental Corporation, June 26, 2017

a) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant. The Project site is highly disturbed and three of the four parcels have been partially graded or otherwise previously disturbed. Parcel 1133-181-18 is fully developed and contains a gas station with ancillary retail and a car wash. Parcels 113-181-19 and -20 have been graded and curbside landscaping has been installed within their northern boundaries. Parcel 1133-181-22 is undeveloped, but highly disturbed. This parcel contains non-native grassland – broadleaf dominated (NNG-B) habitat and disturbed coastal sage – chaparral transition (dCSS/dChap) habitat. The dCSS/dChap habitat has approximately 40 percent of its area occupied by NNG-B (Figure 6, Vegetation Communities Map). Topography of the Project site is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from approximately 1,521 feet above MSL to 1,538 feet above MSL.

Wildlife species documented onsite or in the vicinity include killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*), rock dove (*Columba livia*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottus*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicana*), European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), and California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*). None of these species observed during the rare plant survey (Appendix D2) are sensitive wildlife species. In addition, Figure 4 of the rare plant survey shows the historic occurrences of species recorded within approximately 1 mile of the Project site based on review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). According to the Biological Habitat Assessment, these recorded wildlife species have a low chance of occurrence due to the degraded nature of the Project site. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

One CNDDB occurrence of Parry's spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *parryi*) was recorded in 2010 and 2012 across West Casmalia Street along a powerline right of way. Habitat for this rare plant is present onsite; however, the onsite habitat is highly degraded. Despite the degraded state, the likelihood of Parry's spineflower occurring is moderate to high. This species is a California Rare Plant Rank List 1B.1 (1B = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere; .1 = Seriously endangered in California). At the time of the site survey, most herbaceous plants had senesced so confirmation of presence/absence was not possible and this species is very small and low growing. Moderately suitable habitat for Smooth tarplant (*Centromadia pungens* ssp. *laevis*), a California Rare Plant Rank List 1B.1 species, also occurs onsite. No CNDDB occurrence has been reported in the vicinity for Smooth tarplant but this disturbance-loving plant could occur. These species are not federally or State recognized, however, impacts to these plants could represent a potentially significant impact under CEQA. Rare Plant Surveys were conducted on April 12, 2018 and May 15, 2018 and there were no observations of either Parry's spineflower, Smooth tarplant or other sensitive species in either of the surveys (Salem Engineering, 2018) (Appendix D2); therefore, impacts are considered to be less than significant.

b) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not within any United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) designated Critical Habitat. The nearest designated critical habitat is approximately 0.85 mile to the north and is for San Bernardino Merriam's kangaroo rat (USFWS, ECOS Online Mapper, 2018). The Project site does not support any plant communities that are designated as "high inventory priority" habitats by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community is present onsite. The Natural Resource Conservation Service soils map of San Bernardino County (County), California identifies one soil series occurring onsite: Tujunga gravelly loam sand. This well-drained soil type is not classified as hydric soils and they do not support vernal pools.

The Project site contains three vegetation community/land cover types: NNG-B habitat and dCSS/dChap habitat. The existing vegetation community land cover types are depicted on Figure 5 of the Biological Habitat Assessment (Appendix D1) and described in further detail as follows:

- Disturbed/ Developed. This category includes areas that have been physically disturbed, such that few or no native plant species remain (disturbed) or areas that have been graded or otherwise physically altered such that conditions no longer exist to support native vegetation (developed). A disturbed area refers to areas that are no longer recognizable as a native or naturalized vegetation association. Disturbed areas are often associated with human-related activities such as clearing or grazing. The disturbed/developed category accounts for all of APN 1133-181-18 (gas station), 113-181-19 and all but a small area in the southern section of 113-181-20. This includes all landscaped areas along the perimeter of the Project site, dirt graded areas as well as paved areas and associated buildings. Disturbed/developed areas account for 3.19 acres of the Project site.
- Non-Native Grassland – Broadleaf Dominated. Annual grassland is found on APN 1133-181-22 and -20. Annual grassland is characterized by a sparse to dense cover of low (<3') annual grasses and native and nonnative herbaceous species. In addition to shortpod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), other nonnative grassland species noted include soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*), black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), and Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*). NNG-B habitat accounts for 1.89 acres of vegetation onsite.
- Disturbed Coastal Sage-Chaparral Transition. This plant community is a transition between Riversidian upland sage scrub and Granitic Northern Mixed Chaparral, with approximately 40% of plant cover comprised of NNG-B. This was found on APN 1133-181-22. Riversidian Sage Scrub species include California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), flat-topped buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var *polifolium*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), and deerweed (*Acmispon glaber*). Granitic Northern Mixed Chaparral species observed include chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), skunkbushsumac (*Rhus trilobata*), California croton (*Croton californicus*), and holly leaf cherry (*Prunus ilicifolia*). Several cactus species were present including beavertail cactus (*Opuntia littoralis*) and Cholla cactus (*Cylindropuntia californica*; formerly *Opuntia parryi*). The NNG-B species observed included primarily shortpod mustard scattered throughout the parcels. Disturbed coastal sage – chaparral transition habitat occurs on 0.97 acre of the Project site.

The Project site does not support any plant communities that are designated as “high inventory priority” habitats by CDFW. Based on the disturbed condition of the Project site and absence of sensitive plant communities, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on biological resources involved within a jurisdictional water feature as defined by federal, state or local regulations (e.g., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, Section 1602 of California Fish and Game Code, Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, etc.) through direct removal, filing, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. Aerial photography of the Project site and an onsite survey was conducted by the Project biologist as part of the Biological Habitat Assessment to look for any potential drainage features or water bodies that may be regulated under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or CDFW. No such drainage features were found within the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur with Project implementation and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The Biological Habitat Assessment analyzed wildlife movement corridors potentially associated with the Project site and its immediate vicinity based on information compiled from online databases, analysis of aerial photography and direct observations made in the field during the site visit. Because the Project site is generally surrounded by existing development and SR-210 to the south, the site does not represent a wildlife movement corridor and does not link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

The Project site offers no foraging or nesting opportunities for raptor species; however, the site does contain limited suitable nesting habitat for other avian species. Nesting birds are protected under section 3503 of CDFG code or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The MBTA makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird species listed in 50 CFR Part 10, including feathers or other parts, nests, eggs, or products, except as allowed by implementing regulations (50 C.F.R.21). In addition, sections 3505, 3503.5, and 3800 of the California Department of Fish and Game Code prohibit the take, possession, or destruction of certain bird species, their nests, or eggs. Several common bird species were observed within the site during the survey that may nest in the existing vegetation. Therefore, measure **BIO-1** implementation would avoid temporary impacts to nesting birds resulting from construction activities such as vegetation removal (including grubbing). Potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant and no additional mitigation is required.

e) Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The City of Rialto does not maintain a local policy or ordinance for the protection of trees located on private property. The Project would provide additional tree planting consistent with the landscape plan as approved by the City. There are no other biological resources associated with or protected by a local policy

or ordinance with the City or County occurring at the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur with Project implementation, and no mitigation is required.

f) Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the boundaries of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The nearest applicable HCP area is the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan located in Riverside County approximately seven miles south of the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur with Project implementation and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following measures would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts and to ensure impacts are less than significant:

BIO-1: The removal of potential nesting bird habitat will be conducted outside of the nesting season (February 1 to August 31) to the extent feasible. If grading or site disturbance is to occur between February 1 and August 31, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to vegetation removal within no more than 72 hours prior to scheduled vegetation removal or demolition, to determine the presence of nests or nesting birds. If vegetation removal occurs outside of nesting season or if no nesting birds are found, no further action is required. If active nests are identified, the biologist will establish appropriate buffers around the nesting site (typically 500 feet for raptors and sensitive species, 200 feet for non-raptors/non-sensitive species). All work within these buffers will be halted until the nesting effort is finished (e.g. the juveniles are surviving independent from the nest). The on-site biologist will review and verify compliance with these nesting boundaries and will verify the nesting effort has finished. Work can resume within the buffer area when no other active nests are found. Alternatively, in some circumstances a qualified biologist may determine that some construction can be permitted within the buffer areas and would develop a monitoring plan to prevent any impacts while the nest continues to be active (eggs, chicks, etc.). Upon completion of the survey and any follow-up construction avoidance management, a report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.

Sources: California Natural Diversity Database (accessed in July 2018); Project Description; United States Fish and Wildlife Service Critical Habitat Map (accessed in June 2018); Biological Habitat Assessment (Trestles, June 2017); Rare Plant Surveys Report (Trestles, May 16, 2018).

V. Cultural Resources

Would the Project:

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

Cultural Resources Discussion

The information provided in this section is based in-part on the Cultural Resources Survey dated June 22, 2017, which was prepared for the Project site by Salem Engineering Group and is included in this IS/MND as Appendix E1. The Cultural Resources Survey comprises the following research methods: an archaeological records search at the California State University, Fullerton, South Central Coastal Information Center; historic land use data research conducted at the Bureau of Land Management General Land Office records (on-line), the San Bernardino County Archives, the San Bernardino County Assessor's Office and Recorder's, the San Bernardino County Surveyor's Office, and local historic databases; Native American consultation; paleontological overview from the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County; Field Survey; and preparation of the Cultural Resources Survey report in accordance with requirements of CEQA, Office of Historic Preservation, and the California State University, South Central Coastal Information Center.

During prehistoric times, the Project site would have exhibited a desert Sagebrush Scrub biotic community including big sage-brush in the form of yucca and pine nuts along with rabbit brush, cotton thorn, antelope brush, scale broom, beaver tail cactus, and salt brush. However, at the time of the field survey, the Project site was found to be partially developed with the existing gas station and undeveloped portions covered in dry, non-native grasses and weeds.

The Project site is culturally associated with Native Americans identified as Serrano or Vanyume. The Serrano/Vanyume were hunters and gatherers who practiced a system of seasonal movement and resource exploitation. As the seasons changed, the populations moved to areas which provided additional or varied resources (e.g. different animals or vegetation for food; different elevations for protection from adverse weather conditions; and/or differing locations for trade). Because settlements generally required a fresh water source, many of the known village sites have been located along major water courses (e.g. the Santa Ana River or Lytle Creek). Artifacts generally associated with these sites include metates, manos, mortars,

pestles, projectile points, flaked stone tools, bone tools, basketry, and occasionally pottery traded from populations along the Colorado River.

During historic times, the Project site was just outside the historic boundaries of the Rancho San Bernardino. The Rancho San Bernardino, originally granted to Jose del Carmen Lugo in 1842, was sold to Mormon settlers in 1851. Although not within the rancho, the Project site is relatively close to the eastern boundary of the rancho and may have been subjected to activities related to the cattle grazing and/or grain growing known to have been part of the overall ranching activities. After the enactment of the Homestead Act of 1862, the Project area was opened to homesteading, purchase, or trade.

a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

No Impact. The Project site is located within an area that was homesteaded in the 1890s; however, results of the Cultural Resources Survey confirmed no standing structures of historic significance were ever present within the Project site, as substantiated by the field survey, records search and review of United States Geological Survey maps, historic aerial photographs, and parcel map data. According to the Cultural Resources Survey, the presence of modern construction and materials (2010 or later) was observed during the field survey with the existing gas station, ancillary retail, car wash and parking lot as well as gravel surfaces used for parking and staging work (e.g. road or freeway construction), and modern refuse and debris resulting from recent activities within the properties. There was no evidence of historic or prehistoric cultural materials, no foundations suggesting the presence of historic buildings, and no indications the Project site was ever ranched or farmed. Therefore, the Project site is considered clear of any such historic resource, no impacts would occur with Project implementation and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The archaeological records search performed at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) confirmed the Project site had not been previously surveyed for cultural resources, but a minimum of 70 surveys had been completed within one mile of the Project site. From those surveys, eight resources were identified in the immediate “Project Area” but no resources were identified within the Project site. Records of these resources include:

- P-36-006250: Concrete foundation located northeast of Highland Avenue and Locust Avenue; burned and associated with household refuse scatter. In freeway ROW, now destroyed;
- P-36-006329: Subsurface, historic rock and mortar irrigation reservoirs/features (with historic refuse). Located north of Highland Avenue and west of Locust Avenue, within the freeway ROW, now destroyed;
- P-36-006781: Located at Baseline Road and Locust Avenue – a rock, mortar, and concrete foundation with potential origin in the 1930s. Site is within airport property – status unknown;
- P-36-021564: Raised concrete foundation identified southeast of Highland Avenue and Alder Avenue; large scatter of historic refuse with a preliminary assessment predating World War II (WWII) occupation. Status of site is unknown;

- P-36-021615: The site of the Art Scholl Memorial/Rialto Municipal Airport; buildings dating to the 1950s;
- P-36-029447: Historic complex including structural remains, foundations, corrals, and historic refuse scatter(s). Site estimated to post-date 1959, although potential owners not identified. Site is located south/southwest of Highland Avenue and Alder Avenue;
- P-36-029913: White Homestead identified on Alder Avenue north of Highland Avenue. Occupied at the time of recordation and still owned by descendants of the original homesteaders. Site includes a residence, garage, corrals, garden area, and open space. Debris in certain areas of property and property is slated for sale and redevelopment;
- P-36-060479: Historic scatter dominated by glass – tentatively dating to pre-WWII era and located within the Rialto Municipal Airport property.

According to the Cultural Resources Survey, all resources identified in the immediate Project Area are historic in nature and predominantly of residential origin. Other features common to the area, because agricultural activities dominated the area until the 1950s, include the foundations and irrigation features and associated refuse scatters (Cultural Resources Survey, 2017). The 1960s introduced plans for the SR-210 freeway ROW and, therefore, land along the alignment (associated with Highland Avenue) became more valuable for commercial uses as smaller ranches and farms were slowly converted to commercial lots. The potential for identifying resources in the Project site is considered low to moderate, considering previous disturbances resulting from the existing gas station and from previous freeway and road construction activities (Cultural Resources Survey, 2017).

In addition, the archaeological records search indicates the Project site and its surrounding properties are not sensitive for the presence of prehistoric archaeological resources. There is no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources within the Project Area and the potential for buried resources, while always possible, is unlikely based on the level of disturbance of the existing site and absence of recorded prehistorical resources within the Project Area.

The Project would involve grading, trenching for utilities, as well as other limited ground disturbances. Although the potential to uncover historic or prehistoric archaeological resources during Project construction is low, Measure **CUL-1** would require the Project Sponsor to contract a qualified archaeologist to notify and coordinate the schedule of Project ground disturbance activities with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (GBMI-KN), and to allow for a GBMI-KN monitor to be onsite during ground disturbance activities, in order to assess the significance of any cultural resources that may be uncovered during earth disturbance activities. This is consistent with recommendations made in the Cultural Resources Survey and recommendations made by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) and the GBMI-KN during AB 52 consultation. Based on the evidence above and with implementation of **CUL-1**, potential impacts would be less than significant.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. According to the Cultural Resources Survey, the Project site is within an area dominated by younger alluvium soil deposits 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 mountains and the excessive debris flows from the creek can carry fossil remains into the general area and, therefore, there is a slight possibility for fossils to be present. The nearest

fossils have been identified in the Jurupa Valley area, near Norco and Mira Loma, suggesting the general potential in Rialto is very low.

Excavations that exceed the relative depth of the younger alluvium soil deposits and disturb the more deeply buried older Quaternary alluvium sedimentary deposits may yield fossil specimens. Therefore, any such activities should be monitored according to recommendations made in the Cultural Resource Survey. The Project's proposed grading and trenching activities are anticipated to occur mainly within the first several feet of topsoil, well above where these highly sensitive paleontological soils are likely present; however, deeper excavations from ground surface level may occur with the installation of the proposed underground storage tank and/or structural footings which will be determined definitively during final design. Therefore, measure **CUL-2** described in detail below would provide for paleontological monitoring should it be determined that work would occur in older Quaternary alluvium sedimentary deposits. If excavation or trenching would occur in these sensitive sediments, implementation of **CUL-2** would ensure potential impacts are less than significant.

d) Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. No human remains are known to exist at the Project site and therefore no impacts are expected to occur; however, should human remains be discovered during ground disturbance, the Project Sponsor would be required to follow all standard protocols and regulations required of any project that uncovers human remains. To comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered, the County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. No further disturbance would occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner would notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which would determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Although no impacts are anticipated, measure **CUL-3** has been incorporated to include these standard protocols described above in the Project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program at the request of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians during the AB 52 consultation process.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following measures would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts and to ensure impacts are less than significant:

CUL-1. Archaeological Resources. The Lead Agency shall verify that the name and contact information of a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards, is included on the grading plan and applicable construction plan. Also, the Lead Agency shall verify that the grading plan and applicable construction plan also include the following note: "Prior to issuance of a grading permit or construction permit (requiring earthwork), the qualified archaeologist will notify and coordinate with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation regarding the Project's grading and ground disturbance schedule to allow them to provide a Tribal monitor to observe all ground disturbances if desired. If a potential or suspected archaeological resource or Tribal Cultural Resource is discovered during Project activities, all earthwork within a 60-foot radius of the discovery shall cease temporarily and the Project's qualified archaeologist will be notified to assess the find in coordination with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal

monitor. Work on other portions of the Project outside of the 60-foot buffer area may continue during this assessment period. If the resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be a significant cultural resource or a Tribal Cultural Resource, then the qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on measures to be implemented to treat the discovered resource. In accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, such measures may include but are not limited to avoidance, excavation of the finds, collection, evaluation of the materials, additional testing, relocation, and curation. If the resource is determined by the archaeologist in consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Monitor to be a Tribal Cultural Resource, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians will also be notified, provided information about the resource, and permitted/invited to visit the site and assess the find.”

CUL-2: Paleontological Resources. Prior to issuance of a grading permit or construction permit (requiring earthwork), the Project Engineer shall indicate on the grading plan and applicable construction plan the location(s) of any excavations that would reach to the depth of older Quaternary alluvium (i.e. potentially paleontologically sensitive sediments). If such excavations are not required for the Project, it shall be noted on the grading plans and verified by the City that no additional paleontological mitigation is required.

If excavations are required at depths described above, a qualified paleontologist shall be on-site at the pre-grade/pre-construction meeting to discuss monitoring protocols; a monitoring schedule shall be developed in coordination with the grading/construction contractor; and monitoring shall proceed as outlined in the grading plan note detailed below.

The City shall verify that the following note is included on the grading plan: “Areas of earth disturbance occurring in older Quaternary alluvium (i.e. potentially paleontologically sensitive sediments), shall be monitored during excavations by a qualified paleontological monitor. The monitor shall be equipped to record and salvage fossil resources that may be unearthed. If paleontological resources (fossils) are discovered, work will be halted in that area until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and to allow recording and removal of the unearthed resources. Any fossils found shall be offered for curation at an accredited facility approved by the City. A report of findings, including, when appropriate, an itemized inventory of recovered specimens and a discussion of their significance, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report and inventory, when submitted to the appropriate lead agency, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.”

CUL-3 Human Remains. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the Project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot radius 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.

Sources: Cultural Resources Survey (Salem Engineering, June 2017); AB 52 Comment Email (San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, January 31, 2018); AB 52 Consultation Request Letter (Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, February 8, 2018); AB 52 Consultation Status Email (Daniel Casey – City of Rialto, October 16, 2018); Desktop Review (VCS Environmental, January 2018).

VI. Geology and Soils

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a Known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994 or most current edition), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Geology and Soils Discussion

Salem Engineering Group, Inc. (Salem) prepared a “Geotechnical Engineering Investigation” (Geotechnical Report) for the Project site (Appendix F). The investigation included research of local geology; a field exploration including 11 test borings to depths of approximately 3 to 39 feet below existing ground surface and laboratory testing of soil samples from the Project site. The purpose of the investigation was to prepare the Project’s Geotechnical Report to provide information in support of CEQA and provide site recommendations for Project implementation, including the feasibility of the proposed underground infiltration basin, relating to geology and soils. The findings made in this section are partially based on results of the Geotechnical Report.

a) Would the Project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

And/or

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located in Southern California, which is a seismically active area; however, it does not occur within or immediately adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated by the State of California or fault per the Rialto General Plan, Exhibit 5.1 *Seismic and Geologic Hazards*, 2010. The nearest Alquist-Priolo zone is over three miles away to the east and the nearest fault Barrier H (Rialto-Colton Fault) is located approximately one mile away to the southwest. With no active faults present on the Project site, no further investigation of the Project site such as geophysical surveys or fault trenching is necessary, and potential impacts from seismic faulting and ground shaking are less than significant. In addition, the Project would be constructed to current building codes and regulations, which would ensure adequate structural integrity of the buildings during a future seismic event. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Liquefaction is a ground failure hazard that typically occurs during seismic events in areas where loose sandy soils exist below shallow groundwater (less than 50 feet deep underground). Soils beneath the Project site consist predominately of medium dense to very dense silty sands and sands. The Project site is not located in an area of liquefaction susceptibility as designated by the County of San Bernardino Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, FH21 C Devore or the Rialto General Plan, Exhibit 5.1 *Seismic and Geologic Hazards*. The nearest such location is over two miles away to the north. In addition, the Project site is relatively flat and the depth to the groundwater table is greater than 50 feet below the existing ground surface (Geotechnical Report). The potential for liquefaction is considered to be low based on the absence of shallow groundwater. Based on County mapping, City mapping and approximate depth of groundwater (greater than 50 feet below the existing ground surface), liquefaction potential, seismic settlement and other geologic

hazards such as lateral spreading on this site are low (Geotechnical Report). Therefore, no potential impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The Project site and vicinity are relatively flat with no hills or steep slopes nearby which could result in landslides. The Project site is not mapped in an area susceptible to landslides according to the County of San Bernardino General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlays Map, FH21 C Devore. Therefore, no potential impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site and surrounding area are relatively flat with characteristics that are not indicative of erosive conditions. The proposed expanded development would be comprised of 67% of impervious surfaces and 10% of landscaped areas. Impervious surfaces and landscaped areas would be vegetated and include swales and bioretention basins designed to manage onsite flows and reduce the chances of erosion or loss of topsoil; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Would the Project 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. Based on County maps and anticipated depth of groundwater (greater than 50 feet below the existing ground surface), liquefaction potential, seismic settlement, and other geologic hazards, such as lateral spreading, on this site should be considered low. The upper organic-free, on-site, native soils are predominately silty sands. These soils will be suitable for reuse as non-expansive Engineered Fill, provided they are cleansed of excessive organics, debris and rocks over 3 inches in size (Geotechnical Report). Therefore, given no evidence of geologic or soil instability, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks of life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. Expansive soils are characteristically clay that are prone to large volume changes (swelling and shrinking) directly related to changes in water content. Based on the findings of the Geotechnical Report, soils underlying the Project site consist of silty sand mixed with gravel and not clay or expansive soils. According to the Geotechnical Report, the Project site would be suitable for the proposed construction based upon geotechnical conditions encountered in the test borings, provided the geotechnical engineering recommendations contained in the report are implemented in the design and construction of the Project. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) Would the Project 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?

No Impact. The Project does not propose septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, therefore, there would be no impact.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Salem Engineering, 2008); Project Description; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); County of San Bernardino General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlays, FH21 C Devore (accessed March 22, 2018).

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the Project:

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Discussion

a) Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the staff proposal for an interim greenhouse gas (GHG) significance threshold for projects where the SCAQMD is lead agency. On September 28, 2010, the SCAQMD recommended a threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e (carbon dioxide equivalent) as a Tier 3 threshold for all residential and commercial land uses under CEQA. Therefore, for the purpose of this evaluation a threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e is used to assess significance of greenhouse gas emissions.

According to the Air Quality of Greenhouse Gas Assessment, the proposed Project would generate an estimated total of 91 metric tons of CO₂e emissions during construction (Salem Engineering Group Inc., October 2017). The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emissions to operational emissions over the project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project would generate approximately 9.35 metric tons of CO₂e on an annualized basis.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod, the Project would generate a total of 2,725 metric tons of CO₂e emissions annually from operations (Salem Engineering Group Inc., October 2017). By adding the amortized construction emissions results with the operational annual CO₂e emissions, the Project would produce 2728.08 metric tons over a 30-year period. This cumulative level is below the SCAQMD's recommended Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e emissions for residential and commercial land uses. Therefore, the proposed Project is not expected to have a significant cumulative impact on greenhouse gas emissions and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

No Impact. The Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 established GHG emission reduction targets for the state as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. In response to this Executive Order, California adopted AB 32, which codified S-3-05 goals as statewide targets and instructed CARB to adopt regulations that reduce emissions from significant sources of GHGs and establish a mandatory GHG reporting and verification program. In 2008 CARB developed the AB 32 Scoping plan which laid out a suite of measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In 2014 CARB developed the 1st Update to the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which highlighted California's progress toward meeting the near-term 2020 GHG emission reduction goals, highlighted the latest climate change science and provided direction on how to achieve long-term emission reduction goals described in Executive Order S-3-05.

In 2015 the Governor issued Executive Order B-30-15, establishing a mid-term GHG reduction target for California of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. In response to this Executive Order, California adopted Senate Bill (SB) 32, which codified B-30-15 goals as a statewide target and instructed CARB to adopt regulations to meet the target. The CARB is moving forward with a second update to the Scoping Plan to reflect the 2030 target set by Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by SB 32.

AB 32 and SB 32 codified state targets and directed State regulatory agencies to develop rules and regulations to meet the targets; AB 32 and SB 32 do not stipulate Project-specific requirements. Specific requirements are codified in rules and regulations developed by regulatory agencies such as CARB and SCAQMD, and local City actions.

AB 32 Scoping Plan and Scoping Plan update strategies include, but are not limited to the renewables portfolio standard, the low carbon fuel standard, mobile source measures (vehicle efficiency measures, zero vehicle emission technologies), solar roof programs, carbon sequestration systems, etc. CARB and SCAQMD develop regulations based on these strategies, which are enforced at the state level on utility providers and automobile manufacturers.

Construction of the proposed Project would comply with CARB and SCAQMD requirements. Similarly, visitors to the proposed Project would use vehicles that are regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CARB. Further, the SCAQMD GHG CEQA threshold was developed to aid the attainment of the Executive Order S-3-05 and considered the 2050 goal of GHG reduction to 80 percent below 1990 levels. The SCAQMD Board approved the SCAQMD GHG threshold and at that time determined consistency with AB 32.

The proposed Project analysis has quantified GHG impacts as discussed above in Section VII.a. The proposed Project would comply with existing regulations, applicable to Project activities, and would, by law, comply with future regulatory requirements, applicable to Project activities, developed as part of the Scoping Plan. The proposed Project would, therefore, not preclude the State's implementation of the AB 32 Scoping Plan or Plan Update. In addition, the proposed Project would not conflict with Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Green Building Code Standards or the City's Municipal Code and as part of the conditions set forth in the building permit. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Salem Engineering Group Inc., October 2017); Project Description.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the Project:

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

Hazards and Hazardous Materials Discussion

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the Project site by Herron Environmental in December 2017 (Appendix G). The following tasks were completed in order to conduct the Phase I: public agency databases were reviewed in order to provide insight into the previous and current uses of the Project

site with respect to environmental impairments and conditions; Federal, state, local, tribal, and proprietary lists and databases were reviewed to ascertain the presence of known environmentally impaired sites within the immediate area, and to determine their impact, if any, to the site; historical aerial photographs, topographic maps, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and city directories were examined to investigate the past use(s) of the Project site; and a site reconnaissance was conducted to assess current conditions of the site and adjacent properties, and visibly identify areas of potential contamination that may impact the site.

a) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

and

b) Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project may create an additional possible hazard to the public or the environment through the temporary transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and debris resulting from Project construction. However, due to the limited quantity and nature of these materials and standard regulations governing the safe transport and disposal of materials, these impacts are considered less than significant. In addition, the Phase 1 ESA found no evidence of Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs) or soil contamination at the Project site, therefore no transport or disposal would be needed. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

During the Project's operational phase, the site would continue to function as a commercial center with expanded gas station and new restaurants. No industrial uses are proposed onsite that would involve use of hazardous materials. A new underground storage tank is proposed to support the three new diesel fueling stations, which would be regulated under a permit issued by the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The purpose of this permit is to ensure some additional hazardous materials would also be stored on the premises; however, those used would be commonly associated with typical commercial restaurants and gas stations. In addition, the Project would construct onsite swales and basins to treat storm water of residual fuels and grease, that may otherwise be released, and would implement regular Best Management Practices (BMPs) to clean the site per the Project's WQMP. Therefore, given the common nature and limited potential for exposure of these materials to the environment during Project operations, less than significant impacts would result and no mitigation is required.

c) Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The Project is not within one-quarter mile of a school. The nearest school is Wilmer Amina Carter High School, which is located approximately 0.8 mile northwest of the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. After a review of the Cortese List, which includes sites with Hazardous Waste and Substances, the Project site was found to contain no recognized or significant environmental conditions and is not on any hazardous materials site list pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, there is a previously environmentally impaired property located within a quarter mile of the Project site at 2610 North Alder Avenue called Denova Environmental, Inc. The facility is an inactive off-site hazardous waste treatment, storage and transfer facility and Corrective Action is taking place to clean up the potentially affected soil, and would not be impacted by the Project (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2018).

According to the Phase I ESA, the one REC associated with the Project site is the likely presence of contaminants in deep groundwater resulting from historic industrial operations in the vicinity. The historic operations include the Rockets Fireworks site, the former BF Goodrich National Priorities List (NPL) site, the Mid Valley Sanitary Landfill, the Rialto Perchlorate site and the Marquardt Corporation site. A description of these sites and their status is summarized as follows:

- The Federal NPL database listing (Rockets Fireworks the former BF Goodrich NPL Site) is considered to be a REC; however, the site is considered to be of low potential impact to the Project because remediation controls have been implemented, which include soil vapor extraction followed by liquid phase carbon extraction. The site is 0.853 mile (4,504 feet) north of the Project site.
- The Federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation & Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database listing (Mid Valley Sanitary Landfill) is considered to be a REC; however, the site is considered to be of low potential impact to the Project because this site is not an actual landfill, but is listed because it is part of the BF Goodrich NPL site. The site is 0.03 mile (158 feet) west of the Project site.
- The Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups (SLIC) database listing (Rialto Perchlorate I) is considered to be a REC; however, the site is considered to be of low potential impact to the Project because it is only listed due to its historic association with the original BF Goodrich NPL site that is within the geographic boundaries of the perchlorate plume. The site has been in open remediation since November 2015. This site is located approximately 2,286 feet north-northeast of the Project site.
- The SLIC database listing (Marquardt Corporation) is considered to be a REC because of perchlorates in the soil and groundwater; however, the site is considered to be of low potential impact to the Project also because of its historic association with the original BF Goodrich NPL site, which is on the Final NPL. This site is located approximately 444 feet northwest of the Project site.

The above-referenced sites are of low potential impact to the Project because groundwater is estimated at 400 feet below ground surface, remediation systems are in place and the practical effect of perchlorate on the Project site is negligible and no additional testing is required (Herron, March 15, 2018).

The previously and actively hazardous sites are not anticipated to create impacts to the Project. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project site is not within 2 miles of an active public airport or public use airport. The former Rialto Municipal Airport is located approximately 1 mile southwest of the Project site and has an airport land use plan (January 1991). As of 2014, the airport has been closed to air traffic and has since been demolished and redeveloped. Therefore, no impacts related to this threshold would result from the Project and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There are no private airstrips within at least two miles of the Project. In addition, the Project includes no elements that would create safety hazards associated with airports or air travel. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

g) Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The Project will neither physically impact nor impact implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan upon review of the Rialto General Plan, the Rialto Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, or the County of San Bernardino Emergency Operations Plan. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

h) Would the Project 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?

No Impact. The Project site is located in a developed area designated for urbanized commercial and industrial land uses. There are no wildlands on or adjacent to the Project site and no fire hazard zones near the site according to review of the General Plan Exhibit 5.3 – Fire Hazards. Therefore, the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires is low and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Google Earth Pro (Google, 2017); Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Herron Environmental, 2017); Renaissance Specific Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); 2012: Multi-hazard Mitigation Plan (City of Rialto, 2013); San Bernardino County Emergency Operations Plan (San Bernardino County Fire Department, Office of Emergency Services, 2013); Cortese List (California Department

of Toxic Substances Control (Envirostor), 2018); Water Quality Management Plan, Rialto Commercial Development (Salem Engineering Group, Inc., August 18, 2017).

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the Project:

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

Hydrology and Water Quality Discussion

The San Bernardino County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4 Permit) requires that a WQMP be prepared for this Project and approved prior to the issuance of land use entitlements. The WQMP is a planning tool to improve integration of required water quality elements, storm water management, water conservation, and flood management in land use planning and the development process. Through a combination of Site Design/Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs, Source Control, and/or Treatment Control BMPs, Project-specific WQMPs are required to address all identified pollutants and hydrologic conditions of concern from new development or re-development Projects. Salem Engineering Group prepared a WQMP for the Project (Appendix H), from which the responses below are partially drawn.

The Project site is a partially developed site with existing commercial development consisting of a gas station, ancillary retail, car wash and parking lot. Most of the Project site has been graded and is heavily disturbed with the exception of proposed Parcel 4 that is not proposed for development for this Project. Proposed improvements associated with expansion of the existing development include asphalt and concrete pavement, curb gutter and sidewalk, landscaping, underground utilities and offside street improvement work.

The Project would be designed to manage storm water flows through installation of curb and gutters, Bio Clean media flume filters, and bioretention areas and onsite storm water BMPs including vegetated swales and infiltration basins (Figure 8). The proposed landscaping area is approximately 60,380 sf (approximately 23% of the entire site). Flows would be retained and infiltrated onsite during lesser storm events and treated prior to release into the existing municipal stormwater system during larger storm events.

a) Would the Project violate or conflict with any adopted water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously discussed, the Project site is partially developed with an existing commercial center and parking lot. These uses and impermeable surfaces are current sources of pollutants, and would continue to be once the rest of Project site is developed similar to existing conditions. According to the Project-specific WQMP, potential pollutants of concern would include Pathogens (Bacterial / Virus), Nutrients – Phosphorous, Nutrients – Nitrogen, Noxious Aquatic Plants, Sediment, Metals, Oil and Grease, Trash/Debris, Pesticides/Herbicides, Organic Compounds and Oxygen Demanding Compounds. The presence and generation of these pollutants of concern would be increased due to expanded on-site parking lots, landscaping areas, and general use of the site for commercial gas station and restaurant uses. The expanded use could impact water quality standards or requirements, if not properly designed and managed per MS4 Permit requirements.

The immediate downstream receiving water from the Project site is the Cactus Channel, which has no Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)¹ requirements and is not on the 303(d) list of impairments². The next downstream receiving water from the Cactus Channel is Reach 4 of the Santa Ana River, which has TMDL requirements because it is on the 303(d) list for Pathogens.

According to the Santa Ana Region Basin Plan, the Cactus Channel is not listed as having beneficial uses, although downstream, Reach 4 of the Santa Ana River is listed as having the following existing or potential beneficial uses³: Spawning, Reproduction and Development (SPWN), Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species (RARE), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC2), Water Contact Recreation (REC1), Groundwater Recharge (GWR) and Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN).

The Project-specific WQMP requires the Project to implement non-structural BMPs and LID design to contain pollutants onsite and treat runoff for pollutants prior to any release of water into the downstream stormwater system. Applicable examples of non-structural BMPs that will be implemented include employee training, regular landscaping and catch basin trash/debris removal, maintenance activities such as vacuum sweeping of parking lots, preventative maintenance such as “no littering” signage and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) compliance under the Construction General Permit. Applicable examples of LID design that will be implemented by the Project include the use of infiltration facilities and vegetated swales to capture water for percolation into the soil first, and secondarily releasing any excess water into the stormwater system. In addition, prior to entering the bioretention basins, runoff would be pretreated by a flume filter as described in more detail in the WQMP.

According to the WQMP, the LID BMP performance criteria for capturing pollutants of concern would be achieved through adequate capacity to capture runoff within the proposed onsite natural infiltration system. The on-site infiltration system and the pretreatment of pollutants using a flume filter would achieve water quality standards prior to any release into the stormwater system that may occur during larger storm events (WQMP). Water during lesser storm events would be captured and percolate into the ground. Based on the absence of TMDLs and 303(d) impairments in the immediate downstream area and considering the proposed non-structural BMPs and LID design strategies, potential impacts to water quality and beneficial uses would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project’s proposed addition of an existing commercial center would include the addition of impervious surface area, which would result in a 67 percent increase in impervious area for the total Project site (WQMP, 2017). However, landscaping areas, vegetated drainage swales and

¹ Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) is a regulatory term in the U.S. Clean Water Act, describing a plan for restoring impaired waters that identifies the maximum amount of a pollutant that a body of water can receive while still meeting water quality standards.

² The 303(d) list identifies receiving waters where standards are not met, pollutants or toxicity contributing to standards exceedance, and the TMDL completion schedule.

³ A beneficial use is one of the various ways that water can be used for the benefit of people and/or wildlife.

bioretention infiltration basins would be added to capture water and promote natural infiltration. Per the WQMP, the Project is designed to treat and retain a 2-year storm. The Project proposes no pumping or extraction of groundwater. The Project would not deplete groundwater supplies and would not interfere with groundwater recharge by building additional wells or by altering a stream or wetland because these resources are not found within the Project site. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a watercourse or wetland, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would alter the onsite drainage pattern to manage and treat onsite flows prior to release into the existing offsite City stormwater system (Appendix A, Figure 8). As previously discussed, the Project has incorporated the use of onsite LID BMPs, including vegetated swales and bioretention infiltration basins to promote onsite percolation. The onsite facilities have been designed and adequately sized to ensure no substantial impacts would occur to the stormwater system. No watercourse or wetland is present on the site (Biological Assessment, 2017) and the Project would not impact the adjacent concrete-lined Cactus Channel to the south. Post-development site flow would substantially mimic existing drainage conditions and flow over impervious surfaces. No substantial erosion on- or off-site would occur. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the NPDES under the Construction General Permit to ensure no temporary impacts associated with erosion of exposed soils during grading would occur. Consequently, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing drainage pattern of the site would not be substantially altered, although minor grading as well as increased imperviousness would occur. The drainage needs of the redeveloped site would be altered as shown in Appendix A, Figure 8. The Project would incrementally increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of additional pavement and hardscaped surfaces; however, vegetated swales and bioretention infiltration basins would treat and retain the WQMP. All other areas of the Project site are currently impervious except for landscaped areas, so development of these areas is not expected to substantially alter site drainage. The Project's proposed onsite bioretention areas would be located on the southern and northern sides of parcels 2 and 3. Consequently, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above, the proposed vegetated swales and bioretention infiltration basins at the southern portion of the site and manage the flow rate of water prior to release into the stormwater system. Runoff would be pretreated before entering the stormwater system. Consequently, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above, beneficial issues include Spawning, Reproduction and Development (SPWN), Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species (RARE), Wildlife Habitat (WILD), Warm

Freshwater Habitat (WARM), Non-contact Water Recreation (REC2), Water Contact Recreation (REC1), Groundwater Recharge (GWR) and Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN). These would not be substantially degraded as any pollutants expected to be generated on the Project site are to be pretreated before being released into the storm water system. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required

g) Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. No housing would be constructed as part of this Project. Furthermore, the Project site is not within the 100-year floodplain, according to Exhibit 5-2, *Flooding Hazards Zones* of the General Plan. However, the Project is located approximately 1.6 miles away from the flood plain of Lytle Creek. Therefore, no impact or mitigation is required for the implementation of this Project.

h) Would the Project place structures or fill within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. According to Exhibit 5-2, *Flooding Hazards Zones* of the General Plan, the Project site is located outside the 500-year floodplain and is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100 Year Floodway or a 100-Year Floodplain. Exhibit 5-2 shows that portions of Rialto are still vulnerable to inundation from 100-year flood events associated with Lytle Creek and in a low-lying area of Sycamore Flat. However, the Project is located approximately 1.6 miles away from the flood plain of Lytle Creek. Therefore, no impact or mitigation is required for the implementation of this Project.

i) Would the Project 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?

No Impact. The Project proposes structures, however, no levees or dams are located upstream of the Project site. The nearest levee or dam is approximately 1.6 miles away for the Project site. Therefore, no impact or mitigation is required for the implementation of this Project.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The Project is not located near any large bodies of water that would expose the Project to a potential seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact would be associated with this issue.

Source(s): City of Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Water Quality Management Plan (Salem Engineering Group, Inc, 2017); Biological Habitat Assessment (Salem Engineering Group, Inc, 2017); Project Description

X. Land Use and Planning

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Land Use and Planning Discussion***a) Would the Project physically divide an established community?***

No Impact. The Project would expand an existing gas station and add an adjacent commercial center that would consist of a retail tenant and two drive-thru restaurants. The Project site is surrounded by existing industrial development, a freeway and vacant land. The Project would not physically divide an established community. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project 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?

No Impact. The Rialto General Plan is the applicable land use plan for the Project site. According to the Rialto General Plan, the Project site's land use designation is Renaissance Specific Plan Overlay. Its zoning designation within the Renaissance Specific Plan is Freeway Incubator (F-I). Under Table 3-2 of the Renaissance Specific Plan Development Criteria, permitted uses for F-I zoning include restaurants and various types of retail uses. When specific occupants are identified for the outparcel retail uses, they would be required to conform to the City's zoning and land use designations before building/occupancy permits are issued. F-I zoning also allows for fast food restaurants; however, two Conditional Development Permits (CDPs) would be required for the fast-food drive-thru restaurants. In addition, the Project would comply with the Renaissance Specific Plan Development Standards for building height, bulk and space requirements. There are no prohibited uses associated with the Project per Table 3-2 of the Renaissance Specific Plan Development Criteria and the Project site is not located in an area with a local coastal program. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. As discussed in Section IV Biological Resources, the Project site is not located within the boundaries of a Coastal NCCP or HCP area. The nearest HCP is the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan located approximately 7 miles to the south.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Biological Habitat Assessment (Salem, 2017); Project Description; City of Rialto Municipal Code; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010), Renaissance Specific Plan.

XI. Mineral Resources

Would the Project:

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

Mineral Resources Discussion

a) Would the Project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Exhibit 2.6 of the Rialto General Plan shows that the Project site is located within a sector designated by the State Mining and Geology Board as an area lost to land uses incompatible with mining since 1987; and therefore, is not a suitable location for mining or mineral resource recovery. The Project site is designated and zoned by the City for Freeway Incubator development, not for mining or mineral resource recovery. The nearest sector designated by the State Mining and Geology Board as containing regional significant Portland cement concrete (PCC)-grade aggregated resources is located approximately one mile south of the Project site. Aggregate sector areas exist to the north and northwest of the Project site. Project implementation would not impede mining or mineral resource recovery activities at this location or any other similar operations in the area. Therefore, Project construction and implementation would have a less than significant impact on mineral resources.

b) Would the Project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Rialto General Plan establishes protection of mineral resources through the use of special mineral resource zone designations for compliance with the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, which requires that all cities address significant mineral resources during land use considerations. Exhibit 2.7 of the Rialto General Plan indicates that the site lies mostly within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2 (PCC-1)), which indicates an new area where significant mineral deposits are present or there is a high likelihood for their presence in specific areas. The Project site also lies partially within a MRZ-2 Mineral Resource Zone 2, which indicates significant mineral deposits are present or there is a high likelihood for their presence. Although the potential for significant mineral resources exists, the Rialto General Plan does not use MRZ-2 (PCC-1) or MRZ-2 zone boundaries to determine land uses or to restrict types of development that can occur within those zones. Areas that are considered significant and would be restricted are sites considered important to the region. As discussed in Section XI.a above, no resources of regional importance occur on-site. In addition, the Project site is designated and zoned for Freeway Incubator

development, not for mining or mineral resource recovery. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Source(s): Project Description; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010).

XII. Noise

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Noise Discussion

a) Would the Project result in 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City's General Plan Chapter 5, *The Safety and Noise Chapter*, establishes land use compatibility criteria in terms of the Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL) for various developments, including residential uses. The City of Rialto has adopted a land use compatibility threshold of 60 decibels (dB) CNEL as "normally acceptable" at exterior areas of noise-sensitive land uses, including residential developments and public and school facilities. An exterior noise level of 65 dB CNEL is "conditionally acceptable" for most noise-sensitive land uses; and an exterior noise level of 70 dB CNEL is "conditionally acceptable" for commercial, mixed-use and office uses. In addition, the City of Rialto maintains permitted hours of construction shown in Table 5 that are generally exempt from the noise standards described above.

Table 5: Permitted Hours of Construction

Day of Week	October 1 through April 30	May 1 through September 30
Monday to Friday	7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.	6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Saturday	8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.	8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Sunday	No permissible hours	No permissible hours
State Holidays	No permissible hours	No permissible hours
Source: City of Rialto Municipal Code, Section 9.50.070.B		

Existing land uses near the Project site are commercial, industrial, vacant parcels and the SR-215 Freeway. The nearest noise-sensitive land uses are single-family homes, located over 0.5 mile away to the northeast of the Project site. No schools, hospitals or other sensitive uses are located within 0.5 mile of the Project. The nearest commercial building is located approximately 250 feet to the north, which is buffered by a block wall and commercial loading dock.

Because construction noise is temporary in nature and would take place during the City's permitted hours of construction shown above, and given that no sensitive noise receivers are in proximity to the Project site, temporary construction noise impacts are anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Once the Project is constructed, the Project site would continue to operate as a commercial center, similar to existing conditions. No new sources of substantial onsite noise would occur. The improved site would incrementally increase onsite noise with additional activity and would incrementally influence traffic flow and associated traffic generated noise in the local vicinity, but potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant as further discussed below in Section XIIc. Therefore, operational impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities within the Project site may include site preparation/minor demolition and fine grading where necessary, which would have the potential to generate low levels of ground borne vibration. Potential impacts of vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to structural damage at the highest levels. Site ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they may be perceived in buildings very close to a construction site.

The nearest structure to the Project site is a commercial building located approximately 250 feet to the north of the Project site. Since the City's Municipal Code does not provide a quantifiable vibration threshold, the Caltrans FTA guidance has been utilized in this assessment⁴. The guidance defines the threshold of human perception at 0.010 inch per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV), distinctly perceptible at 0.040 in/sec

⁴ See page 32, 37 and 38 and Tables 17 through 20 of the Caltrans FTA guidance document for assumptions and formulas utilized for impact calculations.

PPV, strongly perceptible at 0.100 in/sec PPV and severe at 0.400 in/sec PPV. The structural damage threshold for modern industrial/commercial buildings is set at 0.500 in/sec PPV.

The primary source of potential vibration during the site preparation/grading phase would be from the operation of a bulldozer. A larger bulldozer would create a vibration level of 0.089 in/sec PPV at 25 feet. Based on proposed equipment and the distances between the nearest commercial building and Project disturbance footprint (250 feet), vibration levels from a large bulldozer are expected to reach 0.004 in/sec PPV, which would be well below the thresholds for human perception and structural damage. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Operation of the proposed Project would entail use of the repurposed and improved Project site for commercial, retail and restaurant uses. Use of large equipment, typically associated with industrial uses that could result in excessive vibration, is not proposed. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated with proposed Project operations and no mitigation is required.

c) Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site would continue to operate as a commercial center, once expanded, similar to existing conditions. No new sources of substantial onsite noise would occur; but, the improved site would incrementally raise the level of onsite noise with increased activity and would influence traffic flow and associated traffic-generated noise in the local vicinity. However, this incremental increase in noise is anticipated to be within acceptable levels based on the Project site's zoning within the Renaissance Specific Plan, land use designation of Freeway Incubator, proximity to the freeway, and absence of sensitive receptors along roadways serving the Project site⁵. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

Less than Significant Impact. Use of area roadways by construction worker vehicles and construction trucks used for hauling materials to and away from the Project site would be a temporary source of additional roadway noise in the Project vicinity. However, construction noise and deliveries would be restricted to the City's permitted hours of construction as discussed in Section XII.a above. In addition, temporary construction traffic noise is not anticipated to significantly impact local roadways or sensitive receptors based on travel routes anticipated to serve the Project site, as previously discussed above in Section XII.c. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project site is not within 2 miles of an active public airport or public use airport. The former Rialto Municipal Airport is located approximately 1 mile southwest of the Project site and has an airport land

⁵ Figure 6 of the Project Traffic Study shows primary roadways anticipated to serve the Project site.

use plan (January 1991). As of 2014, the airport has been demolished, therefore, no impact related to safety hazards for people residing or working at the Project site would result. Therefore, no impacts related to this threshold would result from the Project and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There are no private airstrips within at least two miles of the Project. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Project Description; City of Rialto Municipal Code; City of Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (Federal Transit Authority, 2006); Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans June 2004).

XIII. Population and Housing

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Population and Housing Discussion

a) Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would modify an existing gas station with additional diesel fueling station pumps, as well as construct new retail and restaurants on adjacent parcels within the Project site. There are no new homes or roads proposed. Existing road infrastructure would support the proposed commercial buildings on the site. The Project site is located within an urbanized area, zoned for Freeway Incubator development and is adjacent to the SR-210 Freeway, immediately accessible from the North Alder Avenue exit. The Project would not directly induce population growth but may indirectly and marginally induce population growth due to new employment opportunities at the proposed businesses. However, it is anticipated that current City residents would fill many of these new employment opportunities due to an unemployment rate of 13.8% for the City of Rialto according to the American Factfinder 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact.

b) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project site contains existing commercial development only. There are no existing housing units that would be impacted during Project implementation; therefore, Project implementation would have no impact.

c) Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The Project would modify an existing gas station and construct new commercial buildings on vacant and disturbed parcels within the site, which would not result in the demolition of existing housing units or displacement of residents. Therefore, no impacts are associated with Project construction or implementation and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Desktop Investigation (VCS Environmental, February 2018); Project Description; American Factfinder (US Department of Commerce, November 2018).

XIV. Public Services

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	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 following public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Public Services Discussion

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 government 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 following public services?

i) Fire protection

Less Than Significant Impact. One of two existing fire stations would provide service to the Project site in the event of a service call, consistent with existing conditions. The Rialto Fire Department Station Four at 3288 North Alder Avenue is approximately 2.5 miles from the site via North Locust Avenue and the Rialto Fire Department Station Three is located approximately 1.8 miles away at 1550 North Ayala Drive. Both stations are adequate for servicing the Project; no alterations to existing fire facilities or construction of new fire facilities are required. The Project would incrementally increase the demand for service for both Fire Stations because of the additional square footage in the new commercial buildings, but this increase is not anticipated to cause a noticeable change in service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. This determination is based on the Project's proposed scope, and safety measures. In addition, the Project would pay development impact fees to address incremental impacts to fire protection resources. This would provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment, purchases, and fire station equipment. As a result, the Project would not result in activities that create significant impacts. Any impacts would be incremental and can be offset through the payment of the Project's development impact fees. The

incremental change resulting from the proposed development of the Project site would have less than significant impacts on fire services and no mitigation is required.

ii) Police protection

Less Than Significant Impact. The Rialto Police Department would provide service to the Project site in the event of a service call, with the nearest station located approximately 5 miles away at 128 North Willow Avenue. Police service would continue at the Project site similar to existing service conditions. As previously discussed, the payment of standard development impact fees and preparation of a standard Business Emergency Plan would ensure any incremental or cumulative increase in demand for service would not impact facilities or response times. New businesses within the Project will contain standard surveillance systems. In addition, the Project would pay development impact fees to address impacts to police protection resources. This would provide funding for capital improvements such as land, equipment, purchases, and police station equipment. As a result, the Project would not result in activities that create significant impacts. Any impacts would be incremental and can be offset through the payment of the Project's development impact fees. The incremental change resulting from the proposed development of the Project site would have less than significant impacts on police protection services and no mitigation is required.

iii) Schools

No Impact. The Project proposes to modify an existing gas station and convenience store as well as construct new retail and restaurants. The Project does not include residential uses that would increase use of existing school facilities or require the construction of new school facilities. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

iv) Parks

No Impact. The Project proposes no change to existing park facilities. The Project does not include residential uses that would increase use of existing park facilities or require the construction of new park facilities. No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

v) Other public facilities

No Impact. The Project proposes no change to other existing public facilities. The Project does not include residential uses that would increase use of existing public facilities or require the construction of new public facilities such as libraries or public works facilities.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: County of San Bernardino General Plan (County of San Bernardino, 2007); Project Description; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Google Maps (December 2017).

XV. <u>Recreation</u>				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Recreation Discussion

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?

No Impact. The Project proposes no new residential uses that would increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would be associated with Project construction or implementation and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project site includes an existing gas station and commercial retail uses, which would be expanded with two new drive-through restaurants and additional retail space that are located along a major freeway corridor (SR-210). The Project neither proposes the development of recreational facilities nor does it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would be associated with Project construction or implementation and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: Desktop Investigation (VCS Environmental, February 2018); Project Description.

XVI. Transportation and Traffic

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an adopted plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Transportation and Traffic Discussion

The findings in this section are partially drawn from the Project's Traffic Impact Study (TIS) (Appendix I) prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc. in September 7, 2018.

a) Would the Project conflict with an adopted 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?

Less than Significant with Mitigation.

As described in more detail within the TIS, the Project's additional development is estimated to generate approximately 3,040 average weekday trips, including 281 and 210 trips during the AM and PM peak hours at the Project driveways, respectively. With a pass-by trip credit, the Project is estimated to generate approximately 2,382 average weekday trips, including 220 and 167 trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. These trips are in addition to the existing development.

Analysis of the study area roadways, intersections, and project driveways shows that they are expected to operate at LOS D or better with the addition of Project traffic to Existing and Opening Day 2019 Plus Project traffic conditions as described in Sections V, VI, and VII of the TIS. Therefore, the project does not create any significant direct impacts.

However, a cumulative impact analysis of the study area intersections found the Alder Avenue intersections at SR-210 west-bound (WB) ramp, SR-210 east-bound (EB) ramp and Renaissance Parkway to operate at LOS F without and with the project during the Cumulative 2019 Plus Project traffic volume scenario (Section VII of TIS). Within the City of Rialto, the threshold for acceptable operating conditions for signalized and unsignalized intersections is LOS D or better pursuant to the City of Rialto Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines and Requirements (City of Rialto, 2013). To mitigate Opening Day 2019 Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Projects AM and PM peak hour LOS F conditions, the improvements identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee Program and/ the Alder Avenue Corridor Study were analyzed and found to improve each intersection to LOS D or better. Therefore, mitigation measure **TRA-1** would require the Project to contribute a fair share for cumulative impacts. The Project will contribute to these improvements by payment of the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee and/or 3.66% fair-share (Table 14 from TIS and any corresponding text) of the Alder Avenue Corridor Project costs to mitigate the Project's cumulative impacts to be less than significant. As described in the TIS, the Project's fair-share should be reduced by any payments paid for the Renaissance Specific Plan Fees due to the Alder Avenue Corridor Improvements being already accounted for in the Renaissance Specific Plan Fee Improvements.

Furthermore, the Project would be consistent with applicable requirements of the Renaissance Specific Plan and the City of Rialto General Plan.

Therefore, with mitigation in the form of payment of the Project's fair-share of the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee and/or fair-share for the Alder Avenue Corridor Improvements, project impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

b) Would the Project conflict with an adopted congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the appropriate congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less than Significant. All intersections and driveways adjacent to the Project site are forecasted to operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of the project traffic to Existing and Opening Day 2019. The increase in delay at the study intersections are not considered to be a project significant impact since all intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS. As a result, no additional intersection improvements are required and/or recommended. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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?

No Impact. The Project entails improvements to an existing gas station and construction of two, single-story commercial buildings. The Project is not related to air traffic, nor is there an airport or airstrip within the vicinity of the Project site.

d) Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact. Access to the Project Site is currently provided and would continue to be provided at one signalized, full-access driveway and one right-in/right-out only, unsignalized driveway located along Casmalia Street. According to the TIS, Project driveways are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours, accounting for Project traffic and cumulative traffic growth in the area. On-site circulation and access were reviewed as part of the TIS and found to be satisfactory.

e) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. Access to and from the site would be provided via Casmalia Street. On-site circulation has been designed to accommodate emergency vehicles and the Project has no potential to result in inadequate emergency access. No mitigation is required.

f) Would the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, pedestrian facilities, or other alternate transportation or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. As previously discussed, the Project site would continue to operate as a gas station including separate diesel semi-truck fueling pumps with ancillary retail and a drive-thru car wash. The addition of diesel pumps and canopy along with two new commercial buildings for restaurant and retail uses would not decrease the performance or safety of existing alternative forms of transportation. The Project site would maintain existing pedestrian access from the sidewalk along Alder Avenue and add a pedestrian path of travel from the sidewalk along Casmalia Street via the west side of the signalized driveway. The Class III Bike Route (e.g. no street striping or bike symbols) along Casmalia Street (General Plan Exhibit 4.4 *Bicycle Routes*) would be maintained as existing. Internal pedestrian circulation would connect to the sidewalk along Alder Avenue and Casmalia Street. No bus routes exist along Alder Avenue or Casmalia Street or within a half-mile radius of the Project site (General Plan Exhibit 4.2 *Transit and Rail Routes*). Implementation of the proposed Project would have no impact on the performance or safety of these facilities and no mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following measures would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts and to ensure impacts are less than significant:

TRA-1: Prior to occupancy of the newly constructed buildings, the Project Sponsor shall contribute a portion of funds to the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee to improve intersections along the Alder Avenue, specifically intersections at SR-210 WB ramp, SR-210 EB ramp and Renaissance Parkway.

Sources: Traffic Impact Study for Rialto Retail Center (APN #1133-181-14) (Darnell & Associates, Inc., September 2018); City of Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); Site Plan (Absolute Design Methods, June 2018); Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines and Requirements (City of Rialto, 2013).

XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Would the Project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

Tribal Cultural Resources Discussion

Information provided in this section is based in-part on response letters received from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (GBMI-KN) during the Project's tribal consultation period, which was conducted by the City in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) (See Appendix E2 for a copy of the SMBMI response letter, the GBMI-KN response letter, and an email record of consultation with GBMI-KN).

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 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 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. As part of the Cultural Resources Survey, the NAHC was contacted to inquire about the presence/absence of Native American sacred or religious sites in or near the Project site. After multiple inquiries with no responses, the Cultural Resources Survey applied the results from an earlier investigation, including the findings described in this Section “V.” above. The Cultural Resources Survey found that, in general, no such resources have been identified or reported.

The City of Rialto also initiated tribal consultation in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) in January 2018. Notices were sent by the City to six tribes and two response letters were received during the review period. One response was received from the SMBMI on January 31, 2018 and the second was received from the GBMI-KN on February 8, 2018.

The SMBMI indicated that the Project did not represent a source of concern to SMBMI; however, the letter provided suggested measures that SMBMI requested be incorporated as part of the Project’s permits/conditions of approval (see Appendix E2). Per this SMBMI request, measures **CUL-1**, **CUL-3** and **CUL-4** have been incorporated as part of the Project. The SMBMI letter concluded that no additional consultation pursuant to CEQA would be required unless there is an unanticipated discovery of cultural resources during Project implementation.

The GBMI-KN indicated that the Project site is located within their ancestral tribal territory and that they would like to be consulted. A consultation meeting occurred between GBMI-KN and the City of Rialto on May 10, 2018 for this Project. The GBMI-KN requested the ability to have a cultural monitor present on the Project site during all ground disturbance activities. Per this GBMI-KN request, the opportunity for GBMI-KN to provide tribal monitoring for the Project has been incorporated within measures **CUL-1** and **CUL-4**, which are described below. With implementation of these measures, impacts would be less than significant and no additional mitigation is required.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

The following measures would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts and to ensure impacts are less than significant:

CUL-1. Archaeological Resources. The Lead Agency shall verify that the name and contact information of a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards, is included on the grading plan and applicable construction plan. Also, the Lead Agency shall verify that the grading plan and applicable construction plan also include the following note: “Prior to issuance of a grading permit or construction permit (requiring earthwork), the qualified archaeologist will notify and coordinate with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation regarding the Project’s grading and ground disturbance schedule to allow them to provide a Tribal monitor to observe all ground disturbances if desired. If a potential or suspected archaeological resource or Tribal Cultural Resource is discovered during Project activities, all earthwork within a 60-foot radius of the discovery shall cease temporarily and the Project’s qualified archaeologist will

be notified to assess the find in coordination with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal monitor. Work on other portions of the Project outside of the 60-foot buffer area may continue during this assessment period. If the resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be a significant cultural resource or a Tribal Cultural Resource, then the qualified archaeologist shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on measures to be implemented to treat the discovered resource. In accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, such measures may include but are not limited to avoidance, excavation of the finds, collection, evaluation of the materials, additional testing, relocation, and curation. If the resource is determined by the archaeologist in consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Monitor to be a Tribal Cultural Resource, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians will also be notified, provided information about the resource, and permitted/invited to visit the site and assess the find.”

CUL-2: Paleontological Resources. Prior to issuance of a grading permit or construction permit (requiring earthwork), the Project Engineer shall indicate on the grading plan and applicable construction plan the location(s) of any excavations that would reach to the depth of older Quaternary alluvium (i.e. potentially paleontologically sensitive sediments). If such excavations are not required for the Project, it shall be noted on the grading plans and verified by the City that no additional paleontological mitigation is required.

If excavations are required at depths described above, a qualified paleontologist shall be on-site at the pre-grade/pre-construction meeting to discuss monitoring protocols; a monitoring schedule shall be developed in coordination with the grading/construction contractor; and monitoring shall proceed as outlined in the grading plan note detailed below.

The City shall verify that the following note is included on the grading plan: “Areas of earth disturbance occurring in older Quaternary alluvium (i.e. potentially paleontologically sensitive sediments), shall be monitored during excavations by a qualified paleontological monitor. The monitor shall be equipped to record and salvage fossil resources that may be unearthed. If paleontological resources (fossils) are discovered, work will be halted in that area until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and to allow recording and removal of the unearthed resources. Any fossils found shall be offered for curation at an accredited facility approved by the City. A report of findings, including, when appropriate, an itemized inventory of recovered specimens and a discussion of their significance, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report and inventory, when submitted to the appropriate lead agency, would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.”

CUL-4 Tribal Cultural Resources. If Tribal Cultural Resources, as defined by CEQA [PRC 21074(a)], are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, a Secretary of Interior Standards-qualified archaeologist shall be retained to develop a cultural resources Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation for review and comment.

- a. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall be notified and provided the opportunity to perform tribal monitoring of all in-field investigations, assessments, and/or data recovery enacted pursuant to the finalized Treatment Plan

b. The Lead Agency and/or Project Sponsor shall, in good faith, consult with San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

Sources: Cultural Resources Survey (Salem Engineering, June 2017); AB 52 Comment Email (San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, January 31, 2018); AB 52 Consultation Request Letter (Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, February 8, 2018); AB 52 Consultation Status Email (Daniel Casey – City of Rialto, October 16, 2018); Desktop Review (VCS Environmental, January 2018).

XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the Project:

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

Utilities and Service Systems Discussion

a) Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would require adequate sewer and treatment services to support the proposed expanded development of two restaurants, similar to facilities serving existing commercial uses at the Project site. These services would be provided by existing utility lines with approval by the City Engineer and in accordance with the Rialto General Plan's Implementation Plan. The Project would pay all applicable sewer service fees to ensure adequate services are maintained. In addition, wastewater services would also comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. The Project would have no additional wastewater treatment elements that could exceed Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

Therefore, impacts associated with Project implementation would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Would the Project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would require water and wastewater treatment to support operations. The size and scope of the Project would create an incremental increase on demand of these existing utilities, as approximately 5,300 sf of additional restaurant and 2,000 sf of commercial retail development is proposed beyond what currently exists onsite. Restaurants with toilet facilities are expected to use 7-10 gallons per day (GPD) per patron. Considering that some patrons would not be entering the building and using the drive-thru, those patrons can be calculated at 3 GPD of water use. Combined, the rate would be an average of 5 GPD per patron. According to the TIS, the average daily traffic (ADT) generated traffic for both restaurants is 2,630 vehicles with 1.5 patrons assumed per vehicle the total number of patrons is 3,945 each day. At 5 GPD per patron, the total daily water use is estimated to be 19,725 GPD for the proposed restaurant uses. Retail stores are calculated at 400 GPD per toilet room. With two toilet rooms assumed, the water use rate is estimated to be 800 GPD for the retail use. Altogether, the new building would use an additional 20,525 GPD above pre-project conditions.

According to the Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide 2006, sewage generation for retail stores are 80 GPD per 1,000 sf and restaurants with a drive-thru generate 20 GPD per seat. The amount of sewage generated is 160 GPD for the retail and 2,000 GPD for the restaurants based on an assumed average of 50 seats within each restaurant. This is well within the capacity of the existing water and wastewater facilities that serve the Project site. Consistent with the Rialto General Plan's Implementation Plan, the Project would pay all applicable Utility Improvement Fees and/or applicable Water and Sewer Connection Fees to ensure the Project's incremental increase on existing service is less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

c) Would the Project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would incrementally increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of additional pavement and hardscaped surfaces. The Project proposes four drainage management areas with incorporated vegetated swales and bioretention basins to promote retention and infiltration. Additionally, potential pollutants would be filtered prior to release into the stormwater system using Media Flume Filters and the onsite facilities would be adequately sized to manage storm water flows prior to release into the City's storm water system (WQMP, 2016). Consequently, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Rialto General Plan Exhibit 3.2, the Project is within the WVWD. WVWD is authorized to draw water from five groundwater basins and treats surface water from Lytle Creek and State Water Project water at its Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility to serve over 20,000 water service connections (UWMP, 2016).

The Project would incrementally increase demand for water resources. Sufficient water supplies are currently available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources per Section 11.7.9 and Section 11.8 of the 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP, 216).

The UWMP shows that the West Valley Water District would have an excess of 20,450-acre feet above demand under the third year of multiple dry years by the year 2040, accounting for growth projections in demand (see UWMP Tables 11-19 through 11-27). Nonetheless, to ensure adequate long-term supply and service, the Project would comply with the Rialto General Plan Policy 3-8.1 and pay all applicable water connection fees to ensure the Project's incremental increase on demand for service is less than significant. In addition, the Project would employ the use of drought tolerant landscaping and water conservation fixtures in accordance with the City of Rialto Municipal Code, Title 12 – Public Utilities, Division 1 – Water, Sewer and Underground Utilities, Chapter 12.20 Water Conservation Requirements. Payment of applicable impact fees and use of water conservation landscaping BMPs described above would reduce potential impacts to less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) Would the Project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. See answer XVIII.b above.

f) Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Rialto contracts with private waste haulers for the collection, transfer, recycling, and disposal of waste. Most refuse is disposed of at the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill located within the City limits (Rialto, 2010). The Project is anticipated to be served by this Landfill and create an incremental increase on services. The Mid-Valley Landfill is estimated to close in April of 2033. As of September 1, 2009 (i.e. most currently assessed status date), it had a remaining capacity of 67,520,000 cubic yards. Recycling facilities located at Agua Mansa Landfill (10 miles via SR-210, Riverside and Agua Mansa) and Ramco (9 miles via SR-210 and Riverside) are capable of recycling common construction waste such as asphalt, concrete, metal, wood, roofing tiles and mixed loads. Because there is adequate capacity as described above, the Project's incremental contribution to solid waste is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

g) Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The Project would produce solid waste associated with the site preparation, construction and occupancy stages of the Project. All stages would implement required solid waste reduction measures to reduce the amount of waste generated, encourage reuse and/or recycling of materials to the greatest extent feasible, utilize materials made of post-consumer materials where possible, and dispose of solid waste at an appropriate facility in compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Consistent with the Rialto General Plan's Implementation Plan Measure 8.44, the target goal for reuse and/or diversion of the Project's construction and demolition material would be 50 percent or more of all new construction waste and 25 percent or more of demolition material. Compliance with this City standard requirement would ensure impacts are less than significant.

AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

Sources: 2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (WSC, Drafted June 2016); Project Description; Rialto General Plan (City of Rialto, 2010); City of Rialto Municipal Code; Facility/Site Summary Details: Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0055) (CalRecycle, California, accessed on March 23, 2018); Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide (City of Los Angeles, 2006); Water Conversion Table (Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, 2012).

XIX. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Mandatory Findings of Significance Discussion

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?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. As concluded in Section IV Biological Resources, the Project site contains limited suitable nesting habitat for other avian species. To avoid potential harm or disturbance to such species during Project construction, mitigation measure **BIO-1** would require preconstruction surveys to establish the absence of individuals prior to demolition and vegetation trimming/removal activities. If any individuals are observed, the measures provide for avoidance buffers and possible relocation to ensure impacts remain less than significant. No other potentially significant biological resources were identified on the Project site and no additional mitigation is required.

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)?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. The Project's TIS (Appendix I) found that the Alder Avenue intersections at SR-210 west-bound (WB) ramp, SR-210 east-bound (EB) ramp and Renaissance Parkway would operate at LOS F without and with the project during the Cumulative 2019 Plus Project traffic volume scenario (Section VII of TIS). To mitigate Opening Day 2019 Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Projects AM and PM peak hour LOS F conditions, the improvements identified in the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee Program and/ the Alder Avenue Corridor Study were analyzed and found to improve each intersection to LOS D or better. Therefore, mitigation measure **TRA-1** would require the Project to contribute a fair share for cumulative impacts. The Project will contribute to these improvements by payment of the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee and/or 3.66% fair-share of the Alder Avenue Corridor Project costs to mitigate the Project's cumulative impacts to be less than significant. No other potentially cumulative impacts have been identified that would require additional mitigation.

c) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. Previous sections of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration reviewed the Project's potential impacts. The Project would result in less than significant environmental impacts with implementation of standard conditions as well as recommended mitigation measures related to Cultural Resources, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Transportation/Traffic among other environmental issue areas.

For cultural and tribal cultural resources, **CUL-1** through **CUL-4** plan for potential archaeological, paleontological and/or cultural resources discovered during project construction.

As described above, for traffic/transportation, mitigation measure **TRA-1** would require the Project to contribute a fair share for cumulative impacts. The Project will contribute to these improvements by payment of the Renaissance Specific Plan Traffic Fee and/or 3.66% fair-share of the Alder Avenue Corridor Project costs to mitigate the Project's cumulative impacts to be less than significant.

Therefore, with implementation standard conditions and the specified mitigation, the Project would cause less than significant adverse effects on human beings.

4. REFERENCES

AB52 Consultation Status Email, sent by Daniel Casey – City of Rialto, October 16, 2018. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix E2 of this IS/MND).

AB52 Comment Email, sent by San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, January 31, 2018. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix E2 of this IS/MND).

AB52 Comment Letter, sent by Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, February 8, 2018. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix E2 of this IS/MND).

Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., January 30, 2019. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix C2 of this IS/MND).

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., October 20, 2017. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix C1 of this IS/MND).

Biological Habitat Assessment, prepared by Julie Fontaine of Trestles Environmental Corporation, June 26, 2017. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix D1 of this IS/MND).

Cultural Resources Investigations (Survey), prepared by McKenna et al., June 21, 2017. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix E1 of this IS/MND).

Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, October 16, 2008. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix F of this IS/MND).

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment SEC Casmalia Street & Alder Avenue, prepared by Herron Environmental, December 21, 2017. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix G of this IS/MND).

Rare Plant Survey, prepared by Trestles Environmental Corporation, May 16, 2018. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix D2 of this IS/MND).

Traffic Impact Study for Rialto Retail Center (APN #1133-181-14), prepared by Darnell & Associates, Inc., September 2018. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix I of this IS/MND).

Water Quality Management Plan, Rialto Commercial Development, prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., August 18, 2017. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and provided as Appendix H of this IS/MND).

Electronic Resources

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines. 2017. (available at https://www.califaep.org/images/ceqa/statute-guidelines/2017/CEQA_Handbook_2017_with_covers.pdf).

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (DRR). "Facility/Site Summary Details: Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0055)." California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). (Accessed on March 23, 2018 at <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/Detail/>).

California Department of Conservation. *FMMP Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program*. Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/. Map Title: San Bernardino County Important Farmland 2016, Sheet 2 of 2. Map published August 2017. (Accessed on January 11, 2018 at ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/sbd16_so.pdf).

California Department of Conservation. *San Bernardino County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Sheet 2 of 2*. (Accessed in January 2018 at http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwjP97mt_e7YAhVIGMKHS5UAV4QFggmMAA&url=ftp%3A%2F%2Fftp.consrv.ca.gov%2Fpub%2Fdlrp%2Fwa%2FSanBernardino_so_15_16_WA.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0f9Oa6NvTQQFTAK6kNL3nY).

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. *California Natural Diversity Database*. (Accessed in July 2018 at <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB/Maps-and-Data>).

California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. (Accessed in - February 2018 at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/).

California Department of Toxic Substances (Envirostor). *Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List)*. (Accessed in January 2018 at [https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM,COLUR&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+\(CORTESE\)](https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CITES,OPEN,FUDS,CLOSE&status=ACT,BKLG,COM,COLUR&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+(CORTESE))).

City of Los Angeles. *Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*, 2006. (Accessed on October 12, 2018 at <http://www.environmentla.org/programs/Thresholds/M-Public%20Utilities.pdf>).

City of Rialto. *Multi-Hazard Functional Plan*. 2012. (Accessed in January 2018 at <http://yourrialto.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Rialto-2012-Hazard-Mitigation-Plan.pdf>).

City of Rialto Municipal Code. (Available at <http://yourrialto.com/residents/municipal-code/>).

City of Rialto General Plan Update. City of Rialto. December 2010. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto and online at <http://yourrialto.com/general-plan/>).

City of Rialto. *Traffic Impact Analysis Report Guidelines and Requirements*. December 2013.

City of Rialto Renaissance Specific Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report. City of Rialto. November 23, 2010. (This document is available for Public Review at the City of Rialto).

County of San Bernardino. *General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlays*. (Accessed March 22, 2018 at <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/planning/zoningoverlaymaps/hazardmaps.aspx>).

County of San Bernardino. *Emergency Operations Plan* (San Bernardino County Fire Department, Office of Emergency Services, 2013).
http://cms.sbcounty.gov/portals/58/Documents/Emergency_Services/Emergency-Operations-Plan.pdf

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *Envirostor*. (Accessed January 11, 2018).
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>

Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. *Water Conversion Table*, 2012. (Accessed on October 12, 2018 at <http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/water/water-rights/docs/forms/615.pdf>).

United States Department of Commerce. *American Factfinder*. Accessed in November 2018 at https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_16_5YR_S_2301&prodType=table.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *“Online Mapper” for Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species Critical Habitat Map*. Accessed in June 2018 at <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77>.

Water Systems Consulting, Inc. *2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan*. Amended June 2016. (Available at <http://www.sbvwmwd.com/home/showdocument?id=4196>).

South Coast Air Quality Management District. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan*, March 2017. Accessed in October 2018 at <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf>.

Page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A

Figures

Page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A

Figure 1: Regional Location Map

Appendix A

Figure 2: Vicinity Map

Appendix A

Figure 3: Site Plan

Appendix A

Figure 4: Landscape Plan

Appendix A

Figure 5: Soil Map

Appendix A

Figure 6: Vegetation Communities

Appendix A

Figure 7: California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) Map

Appendix A

Figure 8: Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Map

Appendix B

Architectural Renderings and Color and Materials Board

Page intentionally left blank.

APPENDICES C THROUGH I:

Due to size constraints, the following appendices are available to review in person at the City of Rialto Planning Division counter and online at the City of Rialto website <http://yourrialto.com/City-hall/departments/development-services-department/planning-division/>

Appendix C1: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Appendix C2: Addendum to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Appendix D1: Biological Habitat Assessment

Appendix D2: Rare Plant Survey

Appendix E1: Cultural Resources Survey

Appendix E2: AB 52 Tribal Consultation Documentation

Appendix F: Geotechnical Engineering Investigation

Appendix G: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Appendix H: Water Quality Management Plan

Appendix I: Traffic Impact Study

Page intentionally left blank.

Appendix J

Notice of Intent to Adopt a

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Page intentionally left blank.



**CITY OF RIALTO
PUBLIC NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE A
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project Title: Alder Plaza Project (Related Files: Conditional Development Permit Nos. 810-812, Precise Plan of Design No. 2452, & Environmental Assessment Review No. 16-26)

Lead Agency Contact Person: Daniel Casey, Senior Planner

Phone & Email: (909) 820-2535 – dcasey@rialtoca.gov

Project Location: Southeast corner of Alder Avenue and Casmalia Street (APNs: 1133-181-18, -19, -20 & -22)

Project Description: Development of a new 4,100 square foot multi-tenant commercial building with drive-thru service, a new 3,200 square foot restaurant building with drive-thru service, a new diesel fuel station consisting of a 1,262 square foot canopy and four (4) fuel dispensers, and associated paving, drainage, lighting, fencing, and landscaping on 6.06 gross acres of land.

Project Proponent & Address: Alessandro Service Station, LP
P.O. Box 1958
Corona, CA 92878

Contact Name & Telephone: Ino Cruz - (909) 280-3833

This is to notify the public and interested parties of the City of Rialto's intent to adopt a **Mitigated Negative Declaration** for the above reference project. The mandatory public review period will begin on **December 15, 2018** and end on **January 3, 2019**. The Initial Study and supporting technical studies are available for public review at the public counter in the Development Services Department, Planning Division, 150 South Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376. For additional information about the project, call (909) 820-2535.

The project site is not listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (E).

Following the public review period, the project and proposed **Mitigated Negative Declaration** is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the City's **Planning Commission** on **January 30, 2019** in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 150 South Palm Avenue, Rialto, California 92376.

Signature: _____

Daniel Casey, Senior Planner

Date: _____

12-10-2018

Page intentionally left blank.