

South Coast Air Quality Management District
Lijin Sun, J.D., Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR
April 3, 2019

Response 1

The commenter provides general introductory and background information as well as a summary of the project and air quality analysis. The City of Rialto appreciates and values these comments during the IS/MND participation process. Responses to specific comments are provided below; no further response is required.

Response 2

The commenter provides a general summary of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and its emissions reduction goals. This comment does not raise a specific concern with the adequacy of the IS/MND. Therefore, no further analysis is warranted.

Response 3

The comment notes that the project's emissions are below the SCAQMD's thresholds. The commenter recommends additional mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures are required to avoid potentially significant impacts per State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15041, 15071, and 15126.4(a)(3). Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15041(a) requires mitigation to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment consistent with applicable constitutional requirements such as the "nexus" and "rough proportionality" standards established by case law. As demonstrated in the IS/MND and as summarized in the comment, the project would not result in an exceedance of an air quality threshold or standard and impacts were found to be less than significant. Therefore, mitigation measures are not required.

Response 4

The comment identifies CEQA Guidelines Section 15074 which requires lead agencies to consider the IS/MND together with comments received during the public review process. The SCAQMD also requests written responses to the comment letter. The City of Rialto intends to fully comply with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15074 as requested in the comment.

Response 5

Refer to Response 3, above. The suggested mitigation measures are not required since the project would not exceed thresholds or result in significant impacts. It should be noted that the level of mitigation is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and geographic scope of the project. Although the commenter provides several mitigation measures as recommendations, these are either infeasible, unnecessary, ineffective, or redundant.

For example, construction equipment that meets or exceeds California Air Resources Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 off-road emissions standards are not required because construction emissions would be less than significant. Further, more stringent off-road equipment emissions standards have been phased in since 1996. Beginning in 2011, new off-road mobile engines sold that are equal to or greater than 175 horsepower and non-emergency stationary engines less than 10

liters per cylinder and equal to or greater than 175 horsepower are required to meet Tier 4 Interim standards. Beginning in 2014, new off-road mobile engines sold that are equal or greater than 130 horsepower are required to meet Tier 4 Final standards (40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 1039). This equipment is already integrated into most construction fleets. Additionally, construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with various SCAQMD rules, including Rule 402 (Nuisance) and Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 identify measures to be implemented for the control fugitive dust generated during ground-disturbance activities. Compliance with idling restrictions are also required by state law and are not required as a project mitigation measure.

Regarding the recommended operational mitigation measures, trucks that run at least partially on electricity are projected by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to become available during the life of the project as discussed in its latest Regional Transportation Plan. The CARB Truck and Bus Regulation requires diesel trucks and buses that operate in California to be upgraded to reduce emissions. Newer heavier trucks and buses must meet particulate matter filter requirements beginning January 1, 2012. Lighter and older heavier trucks must be replaced starting January 1, 2015. By January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model year engines or equivalent. Additionally, at least 7 percent of all vehicle parking spaces (including for trucks) for the project must include electric vehicle charging stations per the latest California Green Building Standards Code. Such measures implemented at the project site would accelerate the use of zero and near-zero emissions technologies. In terms of implementing mitigation in order to require that the project is limited to the activities analyzed in the IS/MND, there is no requirement or nexus to support the imposition of a measure that would duplicate existing requirements under CEQA.

A similarly unnecessary recommended mitigation measure is the requirement to have truck routes marked with trailblazer signs so that no trucks will unnecessarily enter residential areas due to the orientation of the site and the specific location of truck access along Vineyard Avenue with access to Locust Avenue, the primary travel corridor to be utilized by the proposed project. The anticipated truck distribution and circulation for the project is also the most efficient, and there would be no incentive for trucks to enter residential neighborhoods.

The remaining recommended mitigation measures included in the comment suggest requiring the promotion of clean truck incentive programs as well as the implementation of electrical infrastructure to accommodate electric-powered trucks or consist of design features/best management practices and energy efficiency measures. As noted above, mitigation measures are considered feasible and required if they would reduce an impact that is significant and unavoidable. The IS/MND determined that the project's air quality impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, such measures are not required.

Response 6

Although the results reported in the tables of the IS/MND and Technical Appendices are correct, a typographical error in the body of the text resulted in the noted inconsistency. The typographical error has been corrected in the final IS/MND.