INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Eastvale Self-Storage Project
(PROJECT 19-20047)

Project Proponent:

Gossett Development

Lead Agency:

CITY OF EASTVALE
Planning Department
12363 Limonite Avenue, Suite 910
Eastvale, CA 91752

June 2020

This page is intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBITS

TABLES

APPENDICES

This page is intentionally left blank.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. PURPOSE AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

The City of Eastvale is processing an application for a General Plan Amendment (GPA), Zone Change (ZC), Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and Major Development Review (MDR) for Eastvale Self-Storage (proposed project), which consists of development of a 142,839-square-foot self-storage facility and associated improvements.

This Initial Study has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.).

B. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SURROUNDING AREA

The project site is located in the City of Eastvale at directly north of Chandler Street, between Hall Avenue and Selby Avenue. The project site is bounded by Chandler Street to the south and the Riverside County Flood Channel to the north. The project site consists of three parcels, APNs 144-120-002, -003, and -004, totaling 4.1 acres. The regional and local vicinity of the project site are shown in **Exhibit 1, Regional Vicinity,** and **Exhibit 2**, **Project Location**.

The project site is currently designated by the Eastvale General Plan as Low Density Residential (LDR) and is proposed to be changed to Commercial Retail (CR); refer to **Exhibit 3, Land Use Map**. The project site is currently zoned Light Agriculture (A-1) and is proposed to be rezoned to General Commercial (C-1/C-P); refer to **Exhibit 4, Zoning Map**. The proposed self-storage facility is a conditionally permitted use in the General Commercial zone. The proposed GPA and ZC would apply only to the project site and would not include adjacent parcels. Refer to **Table 1, Surrounding Land Use and Designations and Zoning**.

Table 1: Surrounding Land Use and Designations and Zoning

North	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
	Zoning	Light Agriculture (A-1)
East	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
	Zoning	Light Agriculture (A-1)
South	Land Use Designation	Medium Density Residential (MDR)
	Zoning	Planned Residential Developments (PRD)/ One-Family Dwellings (R-1)
West	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
	Zoning	General Commercial (C-1/C-P)

C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project would include the development of 142,839-square-foot self-storage facility, described below and illustrated in **Exhibit 5**, **Proposed Site Plan.** The proposed project would have 901 storage units and consist of two two-story buildings, two single-story buildings, an office, an on-site caretaker's quarters, and 28 recreational vehicle parking spaces. Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, and drainage facilities. Proposed off-site improvements include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements along project site frontage on Chandler Street. The curb and gutter improvements would align with the existing curb and gutter in front of the fire station on the southeast corner of Selby Avenue and Chandler Street. The project includes a minimum 10-foot-high split face masonry block perimeter wall that would encompass the entire project site. Surveillance cameras and alarm systems would be installed throughout site.

Access to the project site would be provided via two 25-foot driveways on Chandler Street. Tenants would access the site via a key coded entrance and exit gate. Tenants would be able to access the site between 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. every day of the week. An on-site caretaker would also live on-site for security and maintenance purposes.

Exhibit 1: Regional Vicinity

This page is intentionally left blank.

Exhibit 2: Project Location

This page is intentionally left blank.

Exhibit 3: Land Use Map

This page is intentionally left blank.

Exhibit 4: Zoning Map

This page is intentionally left blank.

Exhibit 5: Proposed Site Plan

This page is intentionally left blank.

Exhibit 6: Existing Conditions Photos

This page is intentionally left blank.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Regulatory Setting

The Eastvale General Plan was adopted in 2012 and can be found on the City's website at https://www.eastvaleca.gov/government/community-development/planning/general-plan. As described previously, the General Plan land use designation for the project site is Low Density Residential (LDR).

The City's Zoning Code was adopted in 2013 and can be found on the City's municipal code hosting website at https://library.municode.com/ca/eastvale/codes/code_of_ordinances?__nodeId=PTBLADECO. The project site is zoned Light Agriculture (A-1).

B. Physical Setting

The existing property contains five single-family dwellings, four detached garages, a storage shed, and an open storage structure. The remainder of the subject property contains yards associated with the on-site dwellings and undeveloped pastureland equipped with livestock fencing. The project proposes to demolish all existing structures and accessory improvements on the property. The northern boundary of the project site is adjacent to an 85-foot-wide Riverside County flood channel while the southern boundary of the project is located along Chandler Street between Selby Avenue and Hall Avenue. East and west of the project site are existing low-density, semi-agricultural dwellings.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. Project Information

1.	**Project Title:**	Eastvale Self-Storage (PLN19-20047)
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address**	CITY OF EASTVALE Planning Department 12363 Limonite Avenue, Suite 910 Eastvale, CA 91752
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number**	Jason Killebrew, Planning Manager: 951.361.0900
4.	**Project Location**	APNs 144-120-002, -003, and -004
5.	**Project Sponsor Name and Address**	Garrett Gossett 207 Monarch Bay Dana Point, CA 92629
6.	**General Plan Designation Existing**	Low Density Residential (LDR)
	General Plan Designation Proposed	Commercial Retail (CR)
7.	**Zoning Existing**	Light Agriculture (A-1)
	Zoning Proposed	General Commercial (C-1/C-P)
8.	**Description of Project**	The project proposes the development of a 142,839-square-foot self-storage facility, described below**.** The proposed project would have 901 storage units and consist of two two-story buildings, two single-story buildings, an office, an on-site caretaker's quarters, and 28 recreational vehicle parking spaces. Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, and drainage facilities. Proposed off-site improvements include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements along project site frontage on Chandler Street. The curb and gutter improvements would align with the existing curb and gutter in front of the fire station on the southeast corner of Selby Avenue and Chandler Street. The project includes a minimum 10-foot-high split face masonry block perimeter wall that would encompass the entire project site. Surveillance cameras and alarm systems would be installed throughout the site.

9.	**Surrounding Land Use Designations and Zoning**		
	North	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
		Zoning	Light Agriculture (A-1)
	East	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
		Zoning	Light Agriculture (A-1)
	South	Land Use Designation	Medium Density Residential (MDR)
		Zoning	Planned Residential Developments (PRD)/ One-Family Dwellings (R-1)
	West	Land Use Designation	Low Density Residential (LDR)
		Zoning	General Commercial (C-1/C-P)
10.	**Other Required Public Agency Approvals**		
	• Jurupa Community Service Department – Water and wastewater connection permits		
	• Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board – Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Approval		
	• State Water Resources Control Board – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Approval		
11.	**Have California Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3? If so, has consultation begun?**		
	Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File based on Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code Section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality. The City has established a Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) contact list pursuant to Public Resources code Section 21080.3. The City has distributed letters to applicable THPOs on the City's contact list, providing initial information about the project and inviting		

	consultation. See Section 17, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Initial Study for additional information.

B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact requiring mitigation to be reduced to a level that is less than significant as indicated in the checklist on the following pages.

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

C. Determination

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 of the incorporated mitigation measures and revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

City Representative

Gina Gibson-Williams,
Community Development Director

Date

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

1. AESTHETICS. Would the proposed project:						
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
e)	Interfere with the nighttime use of the Palomar Observatory, as protected through the Palomar Observatory Lighting Ordinance?			X	

DISCUSSION

1(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Determination: No Impact

According to the City's General Plan, the Santa Ana River corridor is an important resource of scenic beauty. The project site is located approximately 0.4 miles west of the Santa Ana River corridor. Views of the Santa Ana River are not afforded from the project site due to intervening topography, structures, and vegetation. Thus, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista in this regard.

1(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Determination: No Impact

There are no officially designated State scenic highways in the City of Eastvale. The nearest scenic highway is State Route 91 (SR-91) (designated as eligible for listing), which is located over 5 miles

to the southwest of the project site.[1] Views of the project site are not afforded from SR-91 due to intervening topography, structures, and vegetation. Thus, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State scenic highway. No impact would occur in this regard.

1(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The existing property contains five single-family dwellings, four detached garages, a storage shed, and an open storage structure. The remainder of the subject property contains yards associated with the on-site dwellings and undeveloped pastureland equipped with livestock fencing. The project proposes to demolish all existing structures and accessory improvements on the property. While the project site is located in the southwestern portion of the City that was once considered rural residential, lands in the project vicinity have been highly developed and urbanized to accommodate the City's recent growth. The area surrounding the proposed project site is predominantly low-density residential and commercial. Older residential properties and commercial development generally occurs on the north side of Chandler Street while new master planned residential properties occur to the south. Chandler Street is an east-west minor arterial that provides access to the City and intersects to the north-south major arterial Archibald Ave approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site. The existing visual quality of the project site and surrounding area is low-moderate due to the urbanized setting of the project vicinity and lack of scenic resources (refer to 1(a) and (b)).

The project site is currently designated by the Eastvale General Plan as Low Density Residential (LDR) and is proposed to be changed to Commercial Retail (CR); refer to **Exhibit 3, Land Use Map**. The project site is currently zoned Light Agriculture (A-1) and is proposed to be rezoned to General Commercial (C-1/C-P); refer to **Exhibit 4, Zoning Map**. The proposed self-storage facility is a conditionally permitted use in the General Commercial zone. The proposed GPA and ZC would apply only to the project site and would not include adjacent parcels.

Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, and drainage facilities. Proposed off-site improvements include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements along project site frontage on Chandler Street. The curb and gutter improvements would align with the existing curb and gutter in front of the fire station on the southeast corner of Selby and Chandler. The project includes a minimum 10-foot-high perimeter wall that would encompass the entire project site. Refer to **Appendix 1: Architectural Plan Set** for visual renderings of the proposed project.

The project's frontage along Chandler Street is designed to provide visual relief by altering design features so large expanses of uninterrupted walls are not created along the public right-of-way. The design of the project would adhere to the requirements of General Plan Policy DE-37 which states that when more than one structure is on a commercial or other nonresidential site, they should be linked visually through architectural style, colors and materials, signage, landscaping,

[1] California Department of Transportation, List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, updated July 2019.

design details such as light fixtures, and the use of arcades, trellises, or other open structures. Consistent with General Plan Policy DE-34, project design would also provide variation in color and materials to present aesthetically pleasing buildings and project features. The project design would adhere to General Plan Policy DE-46, which states security fencing shall be incorporated into the visual/architectural design of the project and shall be complementary to surrounding uses.

While project implementation would change the visual quality of the site and its surroundings, the proposed project would not degrade the visual quality of the project area because the project is generally consistent with the surrounding uses. With adherence to the City's design policies and goals, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

1(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

As the project located in an urbanized area, sources of light and glare typically come from vehicles traveling on Chandler Street, streetlights, exterior lighting on surrounding buildings, and reflection from windows and roofs on the surrounding residential and commercial buildings. Light and glare impacts would be typical of industrial warehouse use.

Construction

Construction of the project would be restricted to the City's permitted construction hours. Construction would be prohibited between 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. Monday through Saturday and construction would be totally prohibited on Sundays and legal holidays. Although some lighting may be required in the early morning or late evening, the lighting would be minimal and consistent with the surrounding residential and commercial uses as well as the lights from the traffic along Chandler Street. Therefore, no adverse light or glare impacts to adjacent properties would result from temporary construction activities.

Operation

Project operations would create new light sources from interior and exterior illumination associated with building materials, windows, exterior lighting, and security lighting. As tenants would be able to access the site from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. every day of the week, additional light from car headlights may be present during non-daylight hours as well. As shown in the *Architectural Plan*, exterior building materials primarily consist of cement plaster, corrugated metal, brick and wood accents. The greatest source of potential glare would come from the corrugated metal used for the roof and roll-up doors for the storage units. However, the storage unit doors would be painted with nonreflective paint to reduce glare and parapets along the perimeter of the buildings would reduce glare from the roof (**Appendix 1: Architectural Plan Set**).

As shown in the *Photometric Plan*, the project's 10-foot-high perimeter wall would limit light spillage to the east, north, and west while light sources would be most visible to the south along the project's entrance on Chandler Street due to project design and operational features (e.g.,

office building, signage, security lighting). Interior and exterior lighting would conform to California Green (CALGreen) Building Standards Code and Eastvale Municipal Code requirements. All outdoor lighting would be automatic and programmable to turn on at certain times as necessary as well as adjustable to dim the light intensity between 40-80% to meet the efficiency requirements of California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Parts 6 and 11). Lighting would be shielded to prevent light and glare spill onto neighboring properties (**Appendix 2: Photometric Plan**). The placement of ornamental trees along the frontage on Chandler Street would further reduce light and glare (**Appendix 4: Preliminary Landscape Plan**).

Although the project would increase light and glare in the surrounding area, project design features such as the placement of a perimeter wall and ornamental trees along Chandler Street would reduce light and glare spillage onto the neighboring properties. Furthermore, light and glare produced on-site would be similar to those of the surrounding commercial and residential properties. Adherence to state and local standards and regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

1(e) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Palomar Observatory, as protected through the Palomar Observatory Lighting Ordinance?

Determination: Less No Impact

The Palomar Observatory, located atop Palomar Mountain in north San Diego County, is a center for astronomical research and is home to three active research telescopes. Light pollution obstructs visibility and reduces the effectiveness of the telescopes. As such, Riverside County implemented Lighting Ordinance No. 655 which regulates lighting from development within 45 miles of the Palomar Observatory to reduce light and glare. The project site is located approximately 80 miles northwest of the Palomar Observatory. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impacts to the Palomar Observatory.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 proposed project:**					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (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))?				X
d)	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?			X	

DISCUSSION

2(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 nonagricultural use?

Determination: No Impact

According to the Department of Conservation's (DOC) California Important Farmland Finder Map, the proposed project and surrounding areas are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (DOC

2020). Therefore, although the project site currently supports limited agricultural uses, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), to non- agricultural use. No impact would occur in this regard.

2(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The project site is zoned Light Agriculture (A-1) and is proposed to be rezoned to General Commercial (C-1/C-P); refer to **Exhibit 4, Zoning Map**. Although the project site currently supports limited agricultural uses, the majority of the project site is vacant and/or developed with residential uses and ancillary structures. Further, the project site is not covered under an existing Williamson Act contract. Thus, impacts related to conflicting with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract would be less than significant.

2(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timber and zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

Determination: No Impact

The project site is zoned A-1 and is not occupied or used for forest land or timberland. Further, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning or result in the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur in this regard.

2(d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

Determination: No Impact

Refer to Response 2(c). No impact would occur in this regard.

2(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Responses 2(a) through 2(d). Less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

3. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b)	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?			X	
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* (Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. and dated January 27, 2020, provided as **Appendix 5** of this IS/MND.

DISCUSSION

3(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

The City is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction in the SCAB, which has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Areas that meet ambient air quality standards are classified as attainment areas, while areas that do not meet these standards are classified as nonattainment areas. The SCAQMD is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of the air pollutants for which the SCAB is in nonattainment.

In order to reduce emissions, the SCAQMD adopted the *2016 Air Quality Management Plan* (AQMP) which establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving state and federal air quality standards. The 2016 AQMP is a regional and multi-agency effort including the SCAQMD, California Air Resources Board (CARB), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The 2016 AQMP pollutant control strategies are based on the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the *2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (RTP/SCS), updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG's latest growth forecasts. SCAG's latest growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans. The SCAQMD considers projects that are consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the SCAB into attainment for all criteria pollutants, to also have less than significant cumulative impacts.

A proposed project should be considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook identifies two key indicators of consistency:

(1) Whether the project will result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.

(2) Whether the project will exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2016 or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

Criteria 1: Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations?

Based on the air quality modeling analysis contained in the project's Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis, short-term construction impacts would not result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD regional and local thresholds of significance. The Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis also found that long-term operations impacts would not result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD local and regional thresholds of significance; refer to Responses 3(b) and 3(c).

Therefore, the proposed project is not projected to contribute to the exceedance of any air pollutant concentration standards and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the first criterion.

Criteria 2: Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP?

Projections for achieving air quality goals are based on assumptions regarding population, housing, and growth trends, and the 2016 AQMP addresses cumulative impacts in the Basin based on growth projections in the SCAG RTP/SCS. SCAG utilizes growth projections from local jurisdictions adopted general plans; therefore, development consistent with the applicable general plan would be generally consistent with the growth projections in the 2016 AQMP. For this project, the City of Eastvale General Plan Land Use Map defines the assumptions that are represented in the AQMP.

The project proposes development of a self-storage facility on a site that is currently designated as Low Density Residential (LDR) by the General Plan. As a result, the project proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the designation of the project site from LDR to Commercial Retail

(CR). However, the project and General Plan Amendment would not necessarily constitute a conflict with the AQMP since amending the site from residential/agriculture to commercial is not expected to result in population growth beyond that assumed in the AQMP assumptions; refer to Section 14, Population and Housing, of this IS/MND. The SCAQMD acknowledges that strict consistency with all aspects of the AQMP is not required in order to make a finding of no conflict. Rather, a project is considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies. The project would implement contemporary energy-efficient technologies and regulatory/operational programs required per the CALGreen Code, Title 24, and City standards. Generally, compliance with SCAQMD emissions reductions and control requirements also act to reduce project air pollutant emissions. In combination, project emissions-reducing design features and regulatory/operational programs are consistent with and support overarching AQMP air pollution reduction strategies. Project support of these strategies promotes timely attainment of AQMP air quality standards and would bring the project into conformance with the AQMP.

Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the AQMP assumptions for the project site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the second criterion.

Based on the analysis above, the proposed project would not result in an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

3(b) 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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

The following short-term construction activities would have the potential to generate air emissions:

- Demolition of approximately 5,000 square feet of existing residential buildings;
- Site preparation of approximately 10 percent of the site (0.4 acres) to remove existing vegetation/hardscape;
- Grading of approximately 4.08 acres;
- Construction of 142,839 square feet of self-storage use (78,136 square foot building footprint) and landscaping of approximately 22,300 square feet;
- Paving of 76,544 square feet (includes a parking lot with 7 parking spaces); and
- Application of architectural coatings.

The project would be constructed over approximately 9 months. Exhaust emission factors for

typical diesel-powered heavy equipment are based on the program defaults of the most recent version of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2016.3.2; the analysis of daily construction emissions has been prepared using CalEEMod. Refer to **Appendix 5** for the CalEEMod outputs and results. The construction-related criteria pollutant emissions for each phase are shown below in **Table 3.1, Construction-Related Regional SCAQMD Emissions**. As shown in **Table 3.1**, none of the project's short-term construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, construction-related air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3.1: Construction-Related SCAQMD Pollutant Emissions

Activity		Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM10	PM2.5
Demolition	On-site[1]	3.17	31.44	21.57	0.04	1.65	1.46
	Off-site[2]	0.08	0.29	0.59	0.00	0.19	0.05
	Subtotal	3.24	31.73	22.15	0.04	1.84	1.51
Site Preparation	On-site[1]	0.19	1.90	2.26	0.00	0.14	0.11
	Off-site[2]	0.09	0.05	0.67	0.00	0.20	0.05
	Subtotal	0.27	1.95	2.93	0.01	0.35	0.16
Grading	On-site[1]	1.95	20.86	15.27	0.03	3.51	2.18
	Off-site[2]	0.22	6.25	1.42	0.02	0.73	0.21
	Subtotal	2.16	27.11	16.69	0.05	4.24	2.39
Building Construction	On-site[1]	2.38	21.07	23.13	0.04	1.10	1.03
	Off-site[2]	0.54	3.74	4.09	0.02	1.41	0.39
	Subtotal	2.92	24.81	27.22	0.06	2.51	1.42
Paving	On-site[1]	1.23	9.52	12.19	0.02	0.49	0.45
	Off-site[2]	0.09	0.05	0.68	0.00	0.22	0.06
	Subtotal	1.32	9.57	12.88	0.02	0.71	0.51
Architectural Coating	On-site[1]	38.51	1.41	1.81	0.00	0.08	0.08
	Off-site[2]	0.09	0.05	0.68	0.00	0.22	0.06
	Subtotal	38.60	1.46	2.50	0.01	0.31	0.14
Total for Overlapping Phases[3]		42.85	35.84	42.59	0.08	3.53	2.08
SCAQMD Thresholds		75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Thresholds?		No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis. January 27, 2020. Table 6, p. 31.

Notes:

(1) On-site emissions from equipment operated on-site that is not operated on public roads. On-site site preparation and grading PM-10 and PM-2.5 emissions show mitigated values for fugitive dust for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, which requires properly maintaining mobile and other construction equipment; replacing ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; watering exposed surfaces three times daily; covering stock piles with tarps; watering all haul roads twice daily; and limiting speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.

(2) Off-site emissions from equipment operated on public roads.

(3) Construction, painting and paving phases may overlap.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

Long-term air quality impacts would consist of mobile source emissions generated from project-related traffic, and emissions from stationary area and energy sources. Emissions from each source are discussed in more detail below.

Mobile Sources

Mobile sources include emissions from the additional vehicle miles generated from the proposed project. The vehicle trips associated with the proposed project have been analyzed by inputting the project-generated vehicular trips (trip generation rate) from the Trip Generation Analysis (January 2020) that was prepared for the project. The Trip Generation Analysis found that the proposed project would generate approximately 157 total trips per day with a trip generation rate of 1.10 trips per thousand square foot per day for the self-storage use. As the land use "mini warehouse" is not available in CalEEMod, the project was modeled as “unrefrigerated warehouse - no rail.” The program then applies the emission factors for each trip which is provided by the EMFAC2014 model to determine the vehicular traffic pollutant emissions.

Area Sources

Area sources include emissions from consumer products, landscape equipment and architectural coatings. Landscape maintenance includes fuel combustion emissions from equipment such as lawn mowers, rototillers, shredders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chain saws, and hedge trimmers, as well as air compressors, generators, and pumps. As specifics were not known about the landscaping equipment fleet, CalEEMod defaults were used to estimate emissions from landscaping equipment. No changes were made to the default area source parameters.

Energy Usage

Energy usage includes emissions from the generation of electricity and natural gas used on-site. No changes were made to the default energy usage parameters.

Project Impacts

The worst-case summer or winter criteria pollutant emissions created from the proposed project’s long-term operations have been calculated and are shown below in **Table 3.2, Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions**. As shown in **Table 3.2**, total operational emissions for the worst-case summer or winter scenario would not exceed established SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Table 3.2: Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources	3.24	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage	0.01	0.08	0.07	0.00	0.01	0.01
Mobile Sources	0.32	2.36	4.28	0.02	1.45	0.40
Total Emissions	3.56	2.44	4.37	0.02	1.45	0.40

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM10	PM2.5
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis. January 27, 2020. Table 9, p. 37.

Notes:

(1) Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment.

(2) Energy usage consists of emissions from generation of electricity and on-site natural gas usage.

(3) Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust.

3(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Those who are sensitive to air pollution include children, the elderly, and persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illness. For purposes of CEQA, the SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a location where a sensitive individual could remain for 24 hours, such as residences, hospitals, or convalescent facilities. Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition because employees do not typically remain on-site for 24 hours. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site include the existing residential dwelling units located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north (across the Riverside County Flood Channel), and approximately 115 feet south (across Chandler Street) of the project site. Other air quality sensitive land uses are located farther from the project site and would experience reduced impacts.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction-related air emissions may have the potential to exceed the state and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the SCAB. The proposed project has been analyzed for the potential local air quality impacts created from construction-related fugitive dust and diesel emissions and toxic air contaminants.

Local Air Quality Impacts from Construction

The SCAQMD has published a "Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds." CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment. In order to compare CalEEMod reported emissions against the localized significance threshold (LST) lookup tables, the CEQA document should contain the following parameters:

(1) the off-road equipment list (including type of equipment, horsepower, and hours of operation) assumed for the day of construction activity with maximum emissions;

(2) The maximum number of acres disturbed on the peak day;

(3) Any emission control devices added onto off-road equipment; and

(4) Specific dust suppression techniques used on the day of construction activity with maximum emissions. The CalEEMod outputs in **Appendix 5** show the equipment used for this analysis.

Because CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily soil disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment, **Table 3.3, Maximum Number of Acres Disturbed Per Day**, is used to determine the maximum daily disturbed acreage for comparison to LSTs.

Table 3.3: Maximum Number of Acres Disturbed Per Day

Activity	Equipment Type	Equipment Quantity	Acres Disturbed per 8-Hour Day	Total Acres Disturbed per Day
Demolition	Rubber Tire Dozers	2	0.5	1
Total for Phase		-	-	1
Site Preparation	Crawler Tractors[1]	1	0.5	0.5
Total for Phase		-	-	0.5
Grading	Rubber Tire Dozers	1	0.5	0.5
	Graders	1	0.5	0.5
	Crawler Tractors	3	0.5	1.5
Total for Phase				2.5

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis. January 27, 2020. Table 7, p. 32.

Notes:

(1) Tractor/loader/backhoe is a suitable surrogate for a crawler tractor per SCAQMD staff.

As shown in **Table 3.3**, the maximum number of acres that would be disturbed in a day during project construction would be 2.5 acres during grading. The local air quality emissions from construction were analyzed using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate Localized Significant Threshold Look-up Tables and the methodology described in the LST Methodology prepared by SCAQMD (revised July 2008). The Look-up Tables were developed by the SCAQMD in order to readily determine if the daily emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxide (NOx), particulate matter (PM)10, and PM2.5 from the proposed project could result in a significant impact to the local air quality. The emission thresholds were calculated based on the Corona-Norco Source Receptor Area (SRA) 22 and a disturbance value of two acres per day, to be conservative. According to LST Methodology, any receptor located closer than 25 meters (82 feet) shall be based on the 25-meter thresholds. As mentioned above, the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the existing residential dwelling units located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north (across the Riverside County Flood Channel), and approximately 115 feet south (across Chandler Street) of the project site; therefore, the SCAQMD Look-up Tables for 25 meters was used. **Table 3.4, Local Construction Emissions at the Nearest Receptors** shows the on-site emissions from the CalEEMod model for the different construction phases and the LST emissions thresholds.

The data provided below shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, a less than significant local air quality impact would occur from construction of the proposed project.

Table 3.4: Local Construction Emissions at the Nearest Receptors

Activity	On-Site Pollutant Emissions			
	NO_x	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Demolition	31.44	21.57	1.65	1.46
Site Preparation	1.90	2.26	0.14	0.11
Grading	20.86	15.27	3.51	2.18
Building Construction	21.07	23.13	1.10	1.03
Paving	9.52	12.19	0.49	0.45
Architectural Coating	1.41	1.81	0.08	0.08
SCAQMD Thresholds[1]	170	1,007	6	5
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis. January 27, 2020. Table 8, p. 33.

Notes:

(1) The nearest sensitive receptors are the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located adjacent to the east and west of the project site; therefore, the 25-meter threshold was used.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are another group of pollutants of concern. Sources of TACs include industrial processes such as petroleum refining and chrome plating operations, commercial operations such as gasoline stations and dry cleaners, and motor vehicle exhaust. Cars and trucks release at least forty different TACs. The most important of these TACs, in terms of health risk, are diesel particulates, benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde. Public exposure to TACs can result from emissions from normal operations as well as from accidental releases. Health effects of TACs include cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, and death.

The greatest potential for TAC emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during construction of the proposed project. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)[2] and the SCAQMD *Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis* (August 2003),[3] health effects from TACs are described in terms of individual cancer risk based on a lifetime (i.e., 30-year) resident exposure duration. Given the temporary and short-term construction schedule (approximately 9 months), the project would

[2] Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Air Toxic Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment, February 2015, https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf

[3] South Coast Air Quality Management District, Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis, August 2003, http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/mobilesource-toxics-analysis.doc?sfvrsn=2.

not result in a long-term (i.e., lifetime or 30-year) exposure as a result of project construction.

The project would comply with the CARB Air Toxics Control Measure that limits diesel powered equipment and vehicle idling to no more than 5 minutes at a location, and the CARB In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation; compliance with these would minimize emissions of TACs during construction. The project would also comply with the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 1403 if asbestos is found during the renovation and construction activities. Furthermore, construction-based particulate matter emissions (including diesel exhaust emissions) do not exceed any local or regional thresholds. Therefore, no significant short-term TAC impacts would occur during construction of the proposed project and impacts from TACs during construction would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

Project-related air emissions may have the potential to exceed the state and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the SCAB. The proposed project has been analyzed for the potential local CO emission impacts from the project-generated vehicular trips and from the potential local air quality impacts from on-site operations. The following analysis analyzes the vehicular CO emissions and local impacts from on-site operations per SCAQMD LST methodology.

Local CO Emission Impacts from Project-Generated Vehicular Trips

CO is the pollutant of major concern along roadways because the most notable source of CO is motor vehicles. For this reason, CO concentrations are usually indicative of the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator of potential local air quality impacts. Local air quality impacts can be assessed by comparing future without and with project CO levels to the state and federal CO standards.

To determine if the proposed project could cause emission levels in excess of CO standards, a sensitivity analysis is typically conducted to determine the potential for CO “hot spots” at a number of intersections in the general project vicinity. Because of reduced speeds and vehicle queuing, “hot spots” potentially can occur at high traffic volume intersections with a Level of Service E or worse.

The analysis prepared for CO attainment in the SCAB by the SCAQMD can be used to assist in evaluating the potential for CO exceedances in the SCAB. CO attainment was thoroughly analyzed as part of the SCAQMD's *2003 Air Quality Management Plan* (2003 AQMP) and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan). As discussed in the 1992 CO Plan, peak CO concentrations in the SCAB are due to unusual meteorological and topographical conditions and not due to the impact of particular intersections. Considering the region’s unique meteorological conditions and the increasingly stringent CO emissions standards, CO modeling was performed as part of 1992 CO Plan and subsequent plan updates and air quality management plans. In the 1992 CO Plan, a CO hot spot analysis was conducted for four busy intersections in Los Angeles at the peak morning and afternoon time periods. The intersections evaluated included: South Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway (Lynwood); Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue (Westwood); Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue (Hollywood); and La Cienega Boulevard and

Century Boulevard (Inglewood). These analyses did not predict a violation of CO standards. The busiest intersection evaluated was that at Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority evaluated the Level of Service in the vicinity of the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection and found it to be Level of Service E during the morning peak hour and Level of Service F during the afternoon peak hour.

The Trip Generation Analysis prepared for the project showed that the project would generate a maximum of approximately 157 daily vehicle trips. The 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide (1992 CO Plan) showed that an intersection which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day would not violate the CO standard. Therefore, as the project is anticipated to only generate a maximum of 157 daily vehicle trips, no CO "hot spot" modeling was performed and no significant long-term air quality impact is anticipated to local air quality with the ongoing use of the proposed project.

Local Air Quality Impacts from On-Site Operations

Project-related air emissions from on-site sources such as architectural coatings, landscaping equipment, on-site usage of natural gas appliances as well as the operation of vehicles on-site may have the potential to exceed the state and federal air quality standards in the project vicinity, even though these pollutant emissions may not be significant enough to create a regional impact to the SCAB. The nearest sensitive receptors that may be impacted by the proposed project are the existing residences located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north (across a drainage channel), and approximately 115 feet south (across Chandler Street) of the project site.

According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources (such as heavy-duty trucks) that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site; such as industrial warehouse/transfer facilities. The proposed project consists of a self-storage facility and does not include such uses. Therefore, due the lack of stationary source emissions, no long-term LST analysis is warranted.

3(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding.[4] The project does not include any such uses identified by SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Potential sources that may emit odors during the ongoing operations of the proposed project would include odor emissions from the intermittent diesel delivery truck emissions and trash storage areas. Due to the distance of the nearest receptors from the project

[4] South Coast Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, 1993.

site and through compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 402 regarding public nuisances, no significant impact related to odors would occur during the ongoing operations of the proposed project.

Construction activities associated with the project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. However, construction-related odors would be short term in nature and cease upon project completion. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, which minimizes the idling time of construction equipment either by shutting it off when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes. This would further reduce the detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. The project would also comply with the SCAQMD Rule 1113, which would minimize odor impacts from ROG emissions during architectural coating. Any impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short term and would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The following measure shall be incorporated into project plans as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 402:

    - A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.

2. The following measures shall be incorporated into project plans as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403:

    - All clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.

    - The contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the project site are watered at least three times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.

    - The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and in project site areas are reduced to 15 mph or less.

2. The following measure shall be incorporated into project plans as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 1113:

    - In order to limit the volatile organic compound (VOC) content of architectural coatings used in the SCAB, architectural coatings shall be no more than a low VOC default level of 50 grams per liter (g/L) unless otherwise specified in the SCAQMD Table of Standards.

3. All applicable measures shall be incorporated into project plans as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 1403 if asbestos is found during the renovation and construction activities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation is required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
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?		X		
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
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?		X		

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following analysis is based upon *the Burrowing Owl - Narrow Endemic Plant - Riverine Riparian and Vernal Pools Area Habitat Assessments and Jurisdictional Delineation Eastvale Self-Storage Facility – APNs 144-120-002, 144-120-003 and 144-120-020, City of Corona, Riverside County, CA* (Biological Resources Assessment), prepared by Jericho Systems Incorporated, dated November 4, 2019 (**Appendix 6**), and the *Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis for the Eastvale Self-Storage Development* (WRC-MSHCP Consistency Analysis), prepared by Jericho Systems Incorporated, dated October 21, 2019 (**Appendix 7**).

DISCUSSION

4(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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

A Biological Resources Assessment and WRC-MSHCP Consistency Analysis was prepared for the project and included a field investigation to survey existing biological conditions on and surrounding the project site. In addition, the following reference materials and databases were reviewed for the Corona North and Prado Dam 7.5-minute USGS quadrangles to determine which species and/or habitats would be expected to occur on-site:

- California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) Rarefind 5;
- CNDDB Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS);
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey;
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetland Inventory;
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Water Program "My Waters" data layers;
- California Native Plant Society Electronic Inventory database;
- Calflora database;
- Google Earth Pro historic aerial imagery (1994-2018);
- County/City habitat conservation plans and other sensitive resource policies; and
- RCA MSHCP Information Map.

<u>Sensitive Plant Species</u>

Due to the historical use of the project site for residential and agricultural activities, the habitat quality is considered poor, highly degraded, and disturbed. According to the Riverside Conservation Authority Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (RCA MSHCP), the vegetation type for the project site is designated as "Developed/Disturbed." Vegetation on-site primarily consists of bare ground cover/cow manure and with a small amount (less than 10%) of ruderal weedy species along the northern border of the site. Ground cover species observed during the field survey include the following: gallant soldier (*Galinsoga parviflora*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), and oak leaved goosefoot (*Chenopodium glaucum var. salinum*). Native trees are not located on-site, although nonnative trees are located near the property lines. Nonnative species observed include tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*), Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), and red gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*).

While the species observed on-site are not identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, the project site falls within a Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) for San Miguel savory (*Clinopodium chandleri*), Brand's phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris*) and San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*). Due to unsuitable conditions on-site for each plant species, the Biological Resources Assessment determined that these species have a low potential to occur on site; refer to **Appendix 6**. No impact would occur in this regard.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

Burrowing Owl

According to the RCA MSHCP, the project site is located within a mapped survey area for western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*). The burrowing owl is designated as a species of special concern by the CDFW. The species is typically found in grassland, shrub steppe, and desert habitat types; however, the species can also be found in agricultural areas, ruderal fields, and pastures, as well as in urban environments such as vacant lots, flood control facilities, and open spaces. Burrowing owls require underground burrows or other cavities for nesting, roosting and shelter. Burrows used by the owls are usually dug by other species such as California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*) and round-tailed ground squirrel (*Citellus tereticaudus*). As such, the presence of colonial mammal burrows is often an indication that burrowing owl may be present. If colonial mammal burrows are not present, burrowing owls have been found occupying man-made cavities, such as buried and non-functioning drainpipes, stand-pipes, and dry culverts.

Based on the Biological Resources Assessment, the closest burrowing owl occurrence is approximately 800 feet west of the project site. The disturbed habitats on the project site provide line-of-sight opportunities favored by burrowing owl, but no burrows and no ground squirrels where found on-site. No burrowing owls, surrogate burrows, or recent or historic signs of occupation (pellets, feathers, castings, or whitewash) were observed during the habitat assessment. Due to the lack of observations, distance to nearest occurrence, and disturbed condition of the site, it is unlikely the burrowing occurs on-site. However, to ensure that burrowing owls are not adversely affected, Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** would be implemented to require a pre-construction survey to ensure that burrowing owl is not present on-site. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Migratory Birds and Raptors

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) implements international treaties between the United States and other nations devised to protect migratory birds, their parts, eggs, and nests from activities such as hunting, pursuing, capturing, killing, selling, and shipping, unless expressly authorized in the regulations or by permit. The State of California has incorporated the protection of birds of prey in FGC Sections 3800, 3513, and 3503.5. All raptors and their nests are protected from take or disturbance under the MBTA (16 United States Code [USC] Section 703 et seq.) and California statute (FGC Section 3503.5).

Although no migratory birds or raptors were observed on-site during the field investigation, it is possible that these species have since migrated to the site and/or use the project site for foraging and hunting. Direct impacts to native vegetation communities and removal of trees during project

construction could result in direct impacts to the bird nests, which would be considered significant absent mitigation. Impacts could result from project activities if nesting birds are present on the project site at the time of construction and if activities cause nest abandonment or mortality of young. Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** would reduce potential impacts to nesting and migratory birds to less than significant by limiting the removal of trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat to outside the avian nesting season which generally extends from February 1 through August 31. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Conclusion

Due to the historical use of the project site for residential and agricultural activities, sensitive vegetation species do not occur on-site. Although it is unlikely to occur on-site, the proposed project would implement a Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** to ensure potential impacts to burrowing owls are avoided and mitigated by requiring a preconstruction survey prior to ground disturbing activities. To reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires a pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey to determine the presence/ absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site. If the nesting bird clearance survey indicates the presence of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires buffers to ensure that any nesting birds are protected pursuant to the MBTA. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

4(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Determination: No Impact

According to the Biological Resources Assessment, no jurisdictional waters, riparian, riverine, or vernal pool areas exist on the project site. No impact would occur in this regard.

4(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Determination: No Impact

Based on the project's Biological Resources Assessment, no state or federally protected wetlands are located within the project site. No impact would occur in this regard.

4(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Historical agricultural practices and residential uses have removed the natural vegetation communities, limiting the quality and availability of habitat for wildlife. The urbanized land uses adjacent to the project site further limits the potential for migratory wildlife to occur in the project

vicinity. While some native wildlife species, especially those particularly tolerant of human disturbances, may occasionally breed on the site, no native wildlife have established nursery or breeding colonies on the site. The project area does not support any bodies of water or wetlands that attract large migration stopovers or attractants for avian species. Furthermore, the project is proposed on lands that are low quality, disturbed habitats surrounded by disturbed residential uses. Project construction would result in the removal of existing on-site trees which have the potential to provide suitable nesting opportunities for nesting birds. The MBTA governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests. To reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires a pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site. If the nesting bird clearance survey indicates the presence of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires buffers to ensure that any nesting birds are protected pursuant to the MBTA. With implementation of Mitigation Measure **BIO-2**, the project's potential construction-related impacts to migratory birds would be reduced to a less than significant level.

4(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

According to the MSHCP Consistency Analysis, the City of Eastvale is a signatory to the MSHCP and according to the Riverside Conservation Authority (RCA) MSHCP Information Map, the project site is not in a cell group, criteria cell, in the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Plan Fee area or an area that requires surveys for amphibians, criteria area species, or mammals. However, the project is located in an area requiring burrowing owl, San Diego ambrosia, Brand's phacelia, and San Miguel savory habitat assessments and surveys if suitable habitat is present.

The project site primarily consists of disturbed, barren habitat with patches of ruderal vegetation. As discussed in Response 4(a), the habitat on-site is not suitable for the three narrow endemic plant species (San Diego ambrosia, Brand's phacelia, or San Miguel savory) due to the lack of soil and/or hydrological conditions required by these species. However, the site provides marginally suitable habitat for burrowing in that the soils are friable, and the vegetation is sparse. However, no BUOW individuals, surrogate burrows, or burrowing owls sign were found during the field investigation. In addition, no riverine riparian or vernal pool areas occur on-site and no special status species were observed or are expected to occur on site; refer to Response 4(a). Nonetheless, to ensure that burrowing owls are not adversely affected by project implementation, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure **BIO-1.** Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** would requires a pre-construction survey to be conducted to ensure that burrowing owl is not present on-site. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

4(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Refer to Response 4(e), above. Although the project area is located within MSHCP, there would be no take of critical habitat. Furthermore, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure **BIO-1** to ensure that western burrowing owls are not present on-site. To reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires a pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey to determine the presence/ absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site. If the nesting bird clearance survey indicates the presence of nesting birds, Mitigation Measure **BIO-2** requires buffers to ensure that any nesting birds are protected pursuant to the MBTA. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. Municipal Code Section 4.62.100 – Payment of fees. The fee shall be paid at the time a certificate of occupancy is issued for a residential unit or development project or upon final inspection, whichever occurs first. No final inspection shall be made, and no certificate of occupancy shall be issued, prior to full payment of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan fee. However, this section shall not be construed to prevent payment of the fee prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit or final inspection.

MITIGATION MEASURES

BIO-1 **Burrowing Owl Preconstruction Clearance Survey.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a preconstruction burrowing owl clearance survey shall be completed by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to ground disturbance to avoid direct take of burrowing owls. Once complete, a written report summarizing the results of the clearance survey shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Eastvale for review and concurrence.

- If no burrowing owls are detected, construction may proceed. If construction is delayed or suspended for more than 30 days during the breeding season (March 1 to August 31), the project site or work area shall be resurveyed.

- If burrowing owls are detected on the project site during the breeding season (March 1 to August 31), a 300-foot “no work” buffer shall be established around the active burrow and all work within the buffer shall be halted until the qualified biologist has determined through non-intrusive methods that the nesting effort is complete (i.e., all young have fledged). Once the nesting effort is complete or if a burrowing owl burrow is detected on-site during the non-breeding season (September 1 to February 28), passive and/or active relocation of burrowing owls may be implemented by a qualified biologist following consultation and approval from the City of Eastvale, the RCA, and the CDFW.

BIO-2 Pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code, removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat shall be conducted outside the avian nesting season. The nesting season generally extends

from February 1 through August 31, but can vary slightly from year to year based on seasonal weather conditions. If ground disturbance and vegetation removal cannot occur outside of the nesting season, a preconstruction clearance survey for burrowing owls and nesting birds shall be conducted within 30 days of the start of any ground-disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the preconstruction clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptors and special-status species, this buffer will be expanded to 500 feet. A biological monitor shall be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, normal construction activities can occur.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

With implementation of Mitigation Measures **BIO-1** and **BIO-2** and adherence to the standard conditions and requirements, which includes payment of MSHCP mitigation fees, the project will comply with the requirement of the MSHCP and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Compliance will reduce any impacts to less than significant.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			X	

DISCUSSION

A Cultural Resources Assessment and a Historical Resources Evaluation were prepared by BCR Consulting and dated February 25, 2020 to assess potential cultural and paleontological resources–related impacts for the proposed project and a Paleontological Assessment was prepared by Brian F. Smith and dated November 4, 2019. The following discussion is based on these reports and incorporated herein by reference, which are included as **Appendices 8**, **9,** and **11**, respectively, to this Initial Study.

5(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The Cultural Resources Assessment included the review and incorporation of an archaeological records search that was previously prepared for the project site in 2019.[5] This included a review of all recorded historic and prehistoric cultural resources, as well as a review of known cultural resources, and survey and excavation reports generated from projects located within one mile of the project site. In addition, a review was conducted of the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and documents and inventories from the California Office of Historic Preservation including the lists of California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, Listing of National Register Properties, and the Inventory of Historic Structures.

Data from the EIC revealed that 57 cultural resource studies have taken place within the project

[5] See page 3 of Appendix 8, Research Design for reference to prior records search.

vicinity resulting in the recording of 24 cultural resources within one mile of the project site. Of the 57 previous studies, no previously recorded resources were within the project boundary. A field survey found no prehistoric cultural resources of any kind, or evidence for subsurface activity were identified during the field survey. Historic period resources (i.e., over 45 years old) were identified as the residences located at 14555, 14557, and 14565 Chandler Street.

During the field survey, five historic-period residences were identified. CEQA (PRC Chapter 2.6, Section 21083.2 and CCR Title 145, Chapter 3, Article 5, Section 15064.5) calls for the evaluation and recordation of historic and archaeological resources. The criteria for determining the significance of impacts to cultural resources are based on Section 15064.5 of the *CEQA Guidelines* and Guidelines for the Nomination of Properties to the California Register. Properties eligible for listing in the California Register and subject to review under CEQA are those meeting the criteria for listing in the California Register, National Register, or designation under a local ordinance.

The historic period resources were evaluated in **Appendix 8** against the significance criteria discussed in the above paragraph. The evaluation determined the dwellings did not meet the criteria for listing on the California Register and as such are not recommended historical resources under CEQA meaning the removal of the buildings with the proposed project would not result in an impact to historic resources.

Based on the findings of the Cultural Resources Assessment, BCR Consulting recommends a finding of no impacts to historical resources under CEQA. Furthermore, BCR Consulting recommends that no additional cultural resources work, or monitoring is necessary during proposed activities associated with development of the project site. However, if previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, Mitigation Measure **CUL-1** shall be implemented to ensure that less than significant impacts occur.

5(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Refer to Response 5(a) above. Less than significant impacts would occur with implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-1**.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Brian F. Smith and Associates (2019) completed a Paleontological Assessment (**Appendix 11**) of the project site. The Paleontological Assessment states that older Quaternary deposits may well contain significant vertebrate fossil remains. As such, the Paleontological Overview concludes that excavations in the project site may well encounter significant vertebrate fossils. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-2** is required to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources. With implementation of this measure, impacts would be less than significant.

5(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Construction activities, particularly grading, could potentially disturb human remains interred outside of a formal cemetery. Thus, the potential exists that human remains may be unearthed during grading and excavation activities associated with project construction. In the event that human remains are discovered during grading or other ground disturbing activities associated with the proposed project, all work in that area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds as detailed under Mitigation Measure **CUL-3**. Less than significant impacts are anticipated with implementation of Mitigation Measure **CUL-3**.

STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made.

   Following discovery and during assessment of the remains, work will be diverted at least 50-feet from the burial. The discovery shall be kept confidential, and secure to prevent disturbance. If left overnight, remains will be covered with a muslin cloth and steel plate over the excavation to protect the remains. If this method of protection is not feasible, a guard will be posted.

   If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted by the Coroner within 24 hours of the Coroner's determination. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately identify the "most likely descendants(s)" for purposes of receiving notification of discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours from the time that site access is granted and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 507.98.

MITIGATION MEASURES

CUL-1 **Archaeological Monitoring.** If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area shall cease and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service) [NPS] 1983 shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find(s). If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted and will be reported to the City.

CUL-2 **Paleontological Monitoring.** Monitoring of mass grading and excavation activities in the areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources by a qualified paleontologist. Full time monitoring shall be conducted in areas of grading or excavation in undisturbed, very old alluvial channel sediments as identified by the project Paleontological Assessment. Paleontological monitors shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossils. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow for

the removal of abundant or large specimens in a timely manner. Monitoring may be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units are not present in the subsurface, or if present, are determined upon exposure and examination by a qualified paleontologist to have low potential to contain or yield fossil resources.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **CUL-1** and **CUL-2** would provide that any cultural, archaeological, and/or paleontological resources inadvertently discovered during project grading or construction activities would be protected consistent with the recommendations of a qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist, thereby reducing impacts to less than significant.

6. ENERGY. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

This section incorporates by reference the *Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* (AQ/GHG Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group and dated January 27, 2020, and included in this report as **Appendix 5**.

BACKGROUND

SENATE BILL 100

Senate Bill (SB) 100 (Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) requires that retail sellers and local publicly owned electric utilities procure a minimum quantity of electricity products from eligible renewable energy resources so that the total kilowatt-hours (kWh) of those products sold to their retail end-use customers achieve 44 percent of retail sales by December 31, 2024, 52 percent by December 31, 2027, 60 percent by December 31, 2030, and 100 percent by December 31, 2045. The bill requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Energy Commission (CEC), State board, and all other State agencies to incorporate that policy into all relevant planning. In addition, SB 100 requires the CPUC, CEC, and State board to utilize programs authorized under existing statutes to achieve that policy and, as part of a public process, issue a joint report to the Legislature by January 1, 2021, and every four years thereafter, that includes specified information relating to the implementation of the policy.

CALIFORNIA BUILDING ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARDS (TITLE 24)

The 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6), commonly referred to as "Title 24," became effective on January 1, 2020. In general, Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Under 2019 Title 24 standards, nonresidential buildings will use about 30 percent less energy, mainly due to lighting

upgrades, when compared to 2016 Title 24 standards.[6] The standards offer developers better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features that reduce energy consumption in homes and businesses.

CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING STANDARDS (CALGREEN)

CALGreen is the first-in-the-nation mandatory green buildings standards code. The California Building Standards Commission developed the green building standards in an effort to meet the goals of California's landmark initiative Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which established a comprehensive program of cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) to 1990 levels by 2020. CALGreen was developed to (1) reduce GHGs from buildings; (2) promote environmentally responsible, cost-effective, healthier places to live and work; (3) reduce energy and water consumption; and (4) respond to the environmental directives of the administration. The 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as CALGreen, went into effect on January 1, 2020. CALGreen requires that new buildings employ water efficiency and conservation, increase building system efficiencies (e.g. lighting, heating/ventilation and air conditioning [HVAC], and plumbing fixtures), divert construction waste from landfills, and incorporate electric vehicles charging infrastructure. There is growing recognition among developers and retailers that sustainable construction is not prohibitively expensive, and that there is a significant cost-savings potential in green building practices and materials.[7]

DISCUSSION

6(a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The construction schedule is anticipated to occur between the beginning of December 2021 and the end of August 2022 and be completed in one phase. Staging of construction vehicles and equipment will occur on the 4.1-acre project site. Based on the 2017 National Construction Estimator,[8] the typical power cost per 1,000 square feet of building construction per month is estimated to be $2.32. The project plans to develop the site with a 142,839 square feet of self-storage facility use. Therefore, the total power cost of the on-site electricity usage during project construction is estimated to be approximately $2,982.48. According to **Appendix 5**, project construction activities would consume an estimated 28,375 gallons of diesel fuel, and construction worker trips would generate an estimated 208,505 VMT. An aggregate fuel efficiency of 28.57

[6] California Energy Commission, 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ_ada.pdf, accessed June 25, 2020.

[7] U.S. Green Building Council, *Green Building Costs and Savings*, https://www.usgbc.org/articles/green-building-costs-and-savings, accessed June 25, 2020.

[8] Pray, Richard. 2017 National Construction Estimator. Carlsbad, CA: Craftsman Book Company, 2017.

miles per gallon (mpg) was used to calculate vehicle miles traveled for construction worker trips, meaning 7,298 gallons of fuel would be consumed for construction worker trips. For the delivery of construction materials, an average fuel efficiency of 8.5 mpg was used, for an estimated 9,912 gallons of fuel would be consumed for such hauling trips.

Construction equipment used over the approximately nine-month construction phase would conform toCARB regulations and California emissions standards and is evidence of related fuel efficiencies. There are no unusual project characteristics or construction processes that would require the use of equipment that would be more energy intensive than is used for comparable activities; or equipment that would not conform to current emissions standards (and related fuel efficiencies). Equipment employed in construction of the project would therefore not result in inefficient wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of fuel.

The project would utilize construction contractors which practice compliance with applicable CARB regulation regarding retrofitting, repowering, or replacement of diesel off-road construction equipment. Additionally, CARB has adopted the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to limit heavy-duty diesel motor vehicle idling in order to reduce public exposure to diesel particulate matter and other Toxic Air Contaminants. Compliance with these measures would result in a more efficient use of construction-related energy and would minimize or eliminate wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. Idling restrictions and the use of newer engines and equipment would result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption.

Additionally, as required by California Code of Regulations Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than five minutes, thereby minimizing or eliminating unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. Enforcement of idling limitations is realized through periodic site inspections conducted by City building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints.

Energy consumption in support of or related to project operations would include transportation energy demands (energy consumed by employee and patron vehicles accessing the project site) and facilities energy demands (energy consumed by building operations and site maintenance activities).

The proposed project would generate 157 trips per day, and **Appendix 5** estimates that 45,549 gallons of fuel would be consumed per year for the operation of the proposed project. Building operation and site maintenance (including landscape maintenance) would result in the consumption of electricity (provided by Southern California Edison) and natural gas (provided by Southern California Gas Company).

Project construction and operations would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. Further, the energy demands of the project can be accommodated within the context of available resources and energy delivery systems. The project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

6(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is located in an area that is substantially developed with an established transportation network. Access to/from the project site would occur from existing roads and as a result, the project would not interfere with, nor otherwise obstruct intermodal transportation plans or projects that may be proposed pursuant to the ISTEA because SCAG is not planning for intermodal facilities in the project area.

Regarding the State's Energy Plan and compliance with Title 24 CCR energy efficiency standards, the applicant is required to comply with the California Green Building Standard Code requirements for energy efficient buildings and appliances as well as utility energy efficiency programs implemented by Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company.

Regarding AB 1493 regulations, an individual project does not have the ability to comply or conflict with these regulations because they are intended for agencies and their adoption of procedures and protocols for reporting and certifying GHG emission reductions from mobile sources.

Regarding the State's Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards, the project would be required to meet or exceed the energy standards established in the CALGreen Code). CalGreen Standards require that new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials.

The project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservations goals within the State of California. Notwithstanding, the project proposes self-storage facility uses and will not have any long-term effects on an energy provider's future energy development or future energy conservation strategies. Impacts would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposed project:						
Issues			**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**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?			X	
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
	iv)	Landslides?			X	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X	
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?				X	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X	
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?					X
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X	

DISCUSSION

7(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. This state law was a direct result of the 1971 San Fernando earthquake, which was associated with extensive surface fault ruptures that damaged numerous homes, commercial buildings, and other structures. The act requires the California State Geologist to establish regulatory zones (now known as Earthquake Fault Zones; prior to January 1, 1994, these zones were known as Special Studies Zones) around the surface traces of active faults that pose a risk of surface ground rupture and to issue appropriate maps in order to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. An "active" fault is one that shows displacement within the last 11,000 years and therefore is considered more likely to generate a future earthquake.

The project site is not located in an Earthquake Fault Zone as mapped by the California Geological Survey. The closest mapped active fault that could affect the project site is the Chino-Elsinore fault which is located approximately four miles to the southwest. Therefore, the potential for fault rupture at the site is considered very low. Although no active faults traverse the project site, all new development and redevelopment is required to comply with the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act as well as with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC), which includes specific design measures intended to maximize structural stability in the event of an earthquake. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is located in seismically active southern California with numerous fault systems in the region. As such, it should be anticipated that the project site will experience moderate to strong ground shaking in the near future. However, the proposed development would be subject to the CBSC seismic design force standards for the Eastvale area. Compliance with these standards, would require that the structures and associated improvements are designed and constructed to withstand expected seismic activity and associated potential hazards, thereby minimizing risk to the public and property. The project would be designed and developed consistent with the CBSC, and standard engineering practices, and reviewed in conjunction with the City Engineer. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

As stated by the Eastvale General Plan, all of Eastvale has been identified as having a moderate to high susceptibility to liquefaction. Furthermore, seismic hazard maps prepared by the County of Riverside show the project site is in an area with a high potential for liquefaction. As such, in accordance with Action S-2.1 of the Eastvale General Plan, a site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be prepared for the proposed project as a

condition of project approval. With adherence to Action S-2.1 of the General Plan, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

iv) Landslides?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from landslides. Although the project site is in an area of high seismic activity, because of the relatively flat terrain on the site and the surrounding properties, the site is at little risk for landslide. Impacts would be less than significant.

7(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Proposed construction activities would include clearing the site of debris and/or vegetation, soil excavation, grading, asphalt paving, building construction, and landscaping. Such activities would disturb site soils, exposing them to the erosive effects of wind and water. However, all construction activities related to the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the CBSC. Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water General Construction Permit for construction activities (discussed in detail in Section 10, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Initial Study). Compliance with the CBSC and the NPDES would minimize the effects of erosion consistent with the Water Quality Control Plan of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (1995), which establishes water quality standards for the groundwater and surface water of the region. Additionally, the project applicant would be required to comply with Chapter 14.12, Stormwater Drainage System Protection Regulations, of the Eastvale Municipal Code, which requires new development or redevelopment projects to control stormwater runoff by implementing appropriate best management practices (BMPs) to prevent deterioration of water quality. Furthermore, the displacement of soil through cut and fill would be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2016 CBSC related to grading and excavation, other applicable building regulations, and standard construction techniques.

A stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would be required as part of the grading permit submittal package. The SWPPP will include a schedule for the implementation and maintenance of erosion control measures and a description of erosion control practices, including appropriate design details and a time schedule. The SWPPP will consider the full range of erosion control BMPs, including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. Erosion control BMPs include, but are not limited to, the application of straw mulch, hydroseeding, the use of geotextiles, plastic covers, silt fences, and erosion control blankets, as well as construction site entrance/outlet tire washing. The State General Permit also requires that those implementing SWPPPs meet prerequisite qualifications that would demonstrate the skills, knowledge, and experience necessary to implement the plans. NPDES requirements would significantly reduce the potential for substantial erosion or topsoil loss to occur in association with the project. Water quality features intended to reduce construction-related erosion impacts would be clearly noted

on the grading plans for implementation by the construction contractor.

The City routinely requires the submittal of detailed erosion control plans with any grading plans. The implementation of this standard requirement is expected to address any erosional issues associated with grading and over excavation of the site. Additionally, fugitive dust would be controlled in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403. Further, in accordance with Clean Water Act and NPDES requirements, water erosion during construction would be minimized by limiting certain construction activities to dry weather, covering exposed excavated dirt during periods of rain, and protecting excavated areas from flooding with temporary berms. As a result, impacts associated with soil erosion are considered less than significant with the implementation of the necessary erosion and runoff control measures required as part of the approval of a grading plan. Compliance with these existing regulations that are intended to minimize soil erosion and sedimentation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

As discussed in Response a(iv), above, the proposed project is not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from landslides. Although the project site is in an area of high seismic activity, because of the relatively flat terrain on the site and the surrounding properties, the site is at little risk for landslide.

Further, as stated by the *Soil Infiltration Test Results and Stormwater BMP Recommendations Report,* which was prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc. in conjunction with the proposed project's *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan* (WQMP), the site soils are representative of distinctive, fine-grained distal alluvial-fan and axial valley deposits originated from the San Gabriel Mountains. The nodular concretions observed at the project site appear to be consistent with the historical data which suggests that fairly strongly developed illuvial clay and calcic horizons which lay atop older parent materials are anticipated in the region. Additionally, the National Resources Conservation Service classifies shallow BMP basin soils as Chino silt loam (Cb) which is a Hydrologic soil group C soil series. However, the Soil Infiltration Test Results and Stormwater BMP Recommendations Report does not provide a determination regarding the stability or expansive properties of the soil located on the project site. Therefore, at this time, it is unknown if proposed project is located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or an expansive soil.

As discussed in Response a(iii), above, a site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be prepared for the proposed project as a condition of project approval in accordance with Action S-2.1 of the General Plan. The site-specific geotechnical investigation is anticipated to provide a determination regarding the stability and expansive properties of the soil located on-site as well as any potentially required mitigation and design features. Furthermore, the proposed project would be designed and developed consistent with the California Building Code, and standard engineering practices, and reviewed in conjunction with the City Engineer. With adherence to Action S-2.1 of

the General Plan, California Building Code, standard engineering practices, and review in conjunction with the City Engineer, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

7(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?

Determination: No Impact

The proposed project would be served by the municipal sewer system of the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and would therefore have no need for a septic system or other alternative wastewater disposal system. There would be no impact.

STANDARD CONDITIONS and REQUIREMENTS

1. General Plan Action S-2.1: Require geological and geotechnical investigations in areas with potential for seismically induced liquefaction or settlement as part of the environmental and development review process, for any structure proposed for human occupancy, and for any structure whose damage would cause harm.
2. The project shall comply with the California Building Standards Code and the City of Eastvale's grading requirements in Municipal Code Section 130.08.040, Street Grades, and subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the proposed project:					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

DISCUSSION

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis* (Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. dated January 27, 2020, provided as **Appendix 5** of this IS/MND.

Background

Global Climate Change

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 420 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent ($MTCO_2e$) per year.[9] Methane (CH_4) is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which increases the Earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission. Every nation emits GHGs and as a result makes an incremental cumulative contribution to global climate change; therefore, global cooperation is required to reduce the rate of GHG emissions enough to slow or stop the human-caused increase in average global temperatures and associated changes in climatic conditions.

The impact of human activities on global climate change is apparent in the observational record. Air trapped by ice has been extracted from core samples taken from polar ice sheets to determine the global atmospheric variation of carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) from before the start of industrialization (approximately 1750), to over 650,000 years ago. For that period, it was found that CO_2 concentrations ranged from 180 to 300 parts per million (ppm). For the period from approximately 1750 to the present, global CO_2 concentrations increased from a pre-industrialization period concentration of 280 to 379 ppm in 2005, with the 2005 value far

[9] California Air Resources Board, California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017, 2019 Edition.

exceeding the upper end of the pre-industrial period range. As of May 2020, the highest monthly average concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere was recorded at 417 ppm.[10]

Regulations and Significance Criteria

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

In 1988, the United Nations established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to evaluate the impacts of global climate change and to develop strategies that nations could implement to curtail global climate change. In 1992, the United States joined other countries around the world in signing the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreement with the goal of controlling GHG emissions. As a result, the Climate Change Action Plan was developed to address the reduction of GHGs in the United States. The plan consists of more than 50 voluntary programs.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) constructed several emission trajectories of GHGs needed to stabilize global temperatures and climate change impacts. It concluded that a stabilization of GHGs at 400 to 450 ppm carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e)[11] concentration is required to keep global mean warming below two degrees Celsius (°C), which in turn is assumed to be necessary to avoid dangerous climate change.

Executive Order S-3-05

Executive Order S-3-05 was issued in June 2005, which established the following GHG emission reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Executive Order B-30-15

Additionally, issued in April 2015, Executive Order B-30-15 requires statewide GHG emissions to be reduced 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) requires that the CARB determines what the statewide GHG emissions level was in 1990, and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to that level, to be achieved by 2020. CARB has approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 million metric tons (MT) of CO_2e ($MTCO_2e$).

Assembly Bill 32 (California Health and Safety Code, Division 25.5 – California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (codified in the California Health and Safety Code [HSC], Division 25.5 – California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006),

[10] Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Carbon Dioxide Concentration at Mauna Loa Observatory, https://scripps.ucsd.edu/programs/keelingcurve/, accessed June 25, 2020.

[11] Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO_2e) – A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.

which focuses on reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020. HSC Division 25.5 defines GHGs as CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, HFCs, PFCs, and SF_6 and represents the first enforceable statewide program to limit emissions of these GHGs from all major industries with penalties for noncompliance. The law further requires that reduction measures be technologically feasible and cost effective. Under HSC Division 25.5, CARB has the primary responsibility for reducing GHG emissions. CARB is required to adopt rules and regulations directing state actions that would achieve GHG emissions reductions equivalent to 1990 statewide levels by 2020.

Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 197

In 2016, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill (SB) 32 and its companion bill AB 197, and both were signed by Governor Brown. SB 32 and AB 197 amends HSC Division 25.5 and establishes a new climate pollution reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and includes provisions to ensure the benefits of state climate policies reach into disadvantaged communities.

California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2017 Scoping Plan

The goal to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, established in Executive Order S-3-05, was codified by the Legislature as the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32).[12] In 2008, CARB approved a Scoping Plan as required by AB 32. The Scoping Plan has a range of GHG reduction actions which include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an AB 32 implementation fee to fund the program. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan) identifies additional GHG reduction measures necessary to achieve the 2030 target. These measures build upon those identified in the First Update to the Scoping Plan (2013). Although a number of these measures are currently established as policies and measures, some measures have not yet been formally proposed or adopted. It is expected that these measures or similar actions to reduce GHG emissions will be adopted as required to achieve statewide GHG emissions targets.

City of Eastvale

The City of Eastvale is part of the Western Riverside Council of Government (WRCOG). The WRCOG adopted the WRCOG Subregional Climate Action Plan (CAP) in September 2014. The Subregional CAP, which sets forth a subregional emissions reduction target, emissions reduction measures, and action steps to assist each community to demonstrate consistency with California's Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] 32).

The CAP consists of a community-wide emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2010 levels by 2020, and 49 percent below 2010 levels by 2035. As indicated in the CAP, the emission reduction target of 15 percent from 2010 levels equates to a GHG emissions reduction of nearly 2,330,647 metric tons below business-as-usual (BAU) conditions by 2020. In order to reach these

[12] California Health and Safety Code, Sections 38500 et seq.

goals, the CAP provides feasible strategies, while affording its communities other economic and environmental benefits.

Emissions reductions are achieved through the efforts of federal, state, and regional programs, in addition to local measures that jurisdictions will implement in their community. State and federal emissions reductions are primarily achieved through regulations, such as efficiency standards for passenger vehicles (e.g., the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards), reduction in carbon content of transportation fuels (e.g., the Low Carbon Fuel Standard), and minimum renewable energy supply requirements for utilities (e.g., the Renewables Portfolio Standard). While federal, state, and regional measures are critical to meet emission reduction goals, choices made by each local government, resident, and business owner will determine the subregion's ability to achieve the overall emissions reduction target. Through outreach campaigns, incentives, zoning changes, and ordinances, local communities can achieve additional reductions identified in the CAP.

In addition, the City of Eastvale General Plan Air Quality and Conservation Element includes the following policies related to greenhouse gases:

AQ-18 Support local, regional, and statewide efforts to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases linked to climate change.

AQ-19 Analyze and mitigate, to the extent feasible, potentially significant increases in greenhouse gas emissions during project review, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

AQ-20 Continue to support the planting and maintenance of trees in the community to increase carbon sequestration.

Conclusion

Due to the nature of global climate change, it is not anticipated that any single development project would have a substantial effect on global climate change. In actuality, GHG emissions from the proposed project would combine with emissions emitted across California, the United States, and the world to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.

8(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact.

Construction and operational activities associated with the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from area sources, energy usage, mobile sources, waste, water, and construction equipment; CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 was used to calculate the GHG emissions from the proposed project. A summary of the results is shown below in **Table 8.1, Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. As shown in **Table 8.1**, project-related GHG emissions would total 686.04 $MTCO_2e$ per year. According to the thresholds of significance established above, a cumulative global climate change impact would occur if the GHG emissions created from the ongoing operations of the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year for all land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the draft screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year for operation of the proposed project would not create a significant cumulative impact to global climate change. Impacts would be less than

significant in this regard.

Table 8.1: Project-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Category	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons/Year)					
	Bio-CO2	**NonBio-CO_2**	**CO_2**	**CH_4**	**N_2O**	**CO_2e**
Area Sources[1]	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Energy Usage[2]	0.00	122.88	122.88	0.00	0.00	123.36
Mobile Sources[3]	0.00	299.19	299.19	0.01	0.00	299.53
Waste[4]	27.26	0.00	27.26	1.61	0.00	67.52
Water[5]	10.48	137.04	147.52	1.08	0.03	182.49
Construction[6]	0.00	13.07	13.07	0.00	0.00	13.13
Total Emissions	37.74	572.19	609.92	2.71	0.03	686.04
SCAQMD Draft Screening Threshold						**3,000**
Exceeds Threshold?						**No**

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis. January 27, 2020. Table 11, p. 60.

Notes:

(1) Area sources consist of GHG emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape equipment.

(2) Energy usage consist of GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas usage.

(3) Mobile sources consist of GHG emissions from vehicles.

(4) Solid waste includes the CO_2 and CH_4 emissions created from the solid waste placed in landfills.

(5) Water includes GHG emissions from electricity used for transport of water and processing of wastewater.

(6) Construction GHG emissions CO2e based on a 30 year amortization rate.

8(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project could have the potential to conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. As noted above, the applicable plan for the proposed project is the WRCOG CAP.

As stated previously, the SCAQMD's tier 3 thresholds used Executive Order S-3-05 goal as the basis for deriving the screening level. Executive Order S-3-05 establishes the following reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels
- 2020: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels
- 2050: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires CARB, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 through an enforceable statewide emission cap which was phased in starting in 2012.

Therefore, as the project's emissions would meet the threshold for compliance with Executive Order S-3-05, the project's emissions would also comply with the goals of AB 32 and the WRCOG CAP. Additionally, as the project meets the current interim emissions targets/thresholds established by SCAQMD, the project would also be on track to meet the reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 mandated by SB 32. Furthermore, the majority of the post 2020 reductions in GHG emissions are addressed via regulatory requirements at the state level, and the project would be required to comply with these regulations as they come into effect.

At a level of 686.04 $MTCO_2e$ per year, the project's GHG emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year and is in compliance with overall community-wide reduction goals of the WRCOG CAP, AB 32, and SB 32. Furthermore, the project would comply with applicable CalGreen Building Standards and City of Eastvale's policies regarding sustainability (as dictated by the City's General Plan). Impacts would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project would be required to comply with all mandates imposed by the State of California and the South Coast Air Quality Management District intended to reduce GHG emissions. The following are applicable to the project and would assist in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions:

    - Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)
    - Regional GHG Emissions Reduction Targets/Sustainable Communities Strategies (Senate Bill [SB] 375)
    - Pavley Fuel Efficiency Standards (AB 1493) – establishes fuel efficiency ratings for new vehicles
    - California Code of Regulations, Title 24 (California Building Standards Code) – establishes energy efficiency requirements for new construction
    - California Code of Regulations, Title 20 (Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards) – establishes energy efficiency requirements for appliances
    - California Code of Regulations, Title 17 (Low Carbon Fuel Standard) – requires carbon content of fuel sold in California to be 10 percent less by 2020
    - California Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB 1881) – requires local agencies to adopt the Department of Water Resources' updated Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or equivalent by January 1, 2010, to ensure efficient landscapes in new development and reduced water waste in existing landscapes
    - Statewide Retail Provider Emissions Performance Standards (SB 1368) – requires energy generators to achieve performance standards for GHG emissions.
    - Renewables Portfolio Standard (SB 1078) – requires electric corporations to increase the amount of energy obtained from eligible renewable energy resources to 20 percent by 2010 and 33 percent by 2020.

MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation is required.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**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?			X	
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?		X		
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles or a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		
g)	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?				X

DISCUSSION

The following analysis is based upon the *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Residential Property, 14555-14587 Chandler Street, Eastvale, Riverside County, California 92880* (Phase 1

Environmental Site Assessment) prepared by The Phase One Group, dated October 3, 2019; refer to **Appendix 12: Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment**.

9(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials can occur through improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes particularly by untrained personnel, a transportation accident, environmentally unsound disposal methods, or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

Construction

Project construction could expose construction workers and the public to temporary hazards related to the transport, use, and maintenance of construction equipment and/or materials (i.e., oil, diesel fuel, and transmission fluids). These activities would be short-term in nature, and the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. All project construction activities would demonstrate compliance with the applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, ensuring that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner. Therefore, impacts concerning the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant.

Operations

Hazardous materials are not typically associated with storage or office uses. Anticipated hazardous materials use may include minor cleaning products and the occasional use of pesticides and herbicides for landscape maintenance. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner, and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. As such, impacts concerning the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during project operations would be less than significant.

9(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

One of the means through which human exposure to hazardous substance could occur is through accidental release. Incidents that result in an accidental release of hazardous substance into the environment can cause contamination of soil, surface water, and groundwater, in addition to any toxic fumes that might be generated. Human exposure of contaminated soil, soil vapor, or water

can have potential health effects on a variety of factors, including the nature of the contaminant and the degree of exposure.

Construction

During project construction, there is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluids used for construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials utilized during construction. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, State, and Federal law.

Construction activities could also result in accidental conditions involving existing on-site contamination. It should be no evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs), historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs), or controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs) in connection with the subject property. Nonetheless, the following environmental issue areas were identified as part of the Phase 1 ESA:

- During the site visit completed for the Phase 1 ESA, a total of six, unlabeled 55-gallon drums containing an unknown substance were observed stored along the eastern perimeter of the project site. No evidence of spills or staining was observed on the ground surrounding the drums. To reduce the potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, the Phase 1 ESA recommends that the drums are collected and disposed of by a certified hazardous waste hauler (Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1**). With implementation of the recommendations identified by the Phase 1 ESA, impacts would be less than significant.
- Drinking water for the subject property is provided by one private groundwater well located on the central portion of the subject property. To reduce the potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, the Phase 1 ESA recommends that the on-site groundwater well is properly closed and abandoned following current regulatory procedures and guidelines (Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1**). With implementation of the recommendations identified by the Phase 1 ESA, impacts would be less than significant.
- Sanitary discharges for the five on-site dwellings are directed to on-site septic systems. The presence of the on-site septic systems is not anticipated to adversely impact the subject property due to its presumed use for domestic purposes only. To reduce the potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, the Phase 1 ESA recommends that the on-site septic systems associated with the five on-site dwellings should be properly closed and removed following current regulatory procedures and guidelines prior to any planned redevelopment of the subject property and connection to the City of Eastvale sewer system (Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1**).

With implementation of the recommendations identified by the Phase 1 ESA, impacts would be less than significant.

- The on-site dwellings and former dairy farm building were built from the 1930s to 1960s. Due to the age of these buildings, there is the potential for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paints (LBPs), as well as other potential hazardous materials to be present in association with the building materials. In the last 25 years, LBPs has been phased out of use due to concerns over the health effects associated with lead. Additionally, prior to the 1940s and up until the early 1970s, ACMs were used in many building materials and can result in serious health problems if inhaled. Demolition of the structures could expose construction personnel and the public to ACMs or LBPs. To reduce the potential for accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, the Phase 1 ESA recommends that a comprehensive ACM and LBP survey is conducted of the project site prior to any demolition activities (Mitigation Measure **HAZ-1**). With implementation of the recommendations identified by the Phase 1 ESA, impacts would be less than significant.

Operations

Refer to Response 9(a) for a description of impacts related to proposed operations at the project site. Upon adherence to existing regulations related to hazards and hazardous materials safety, impacts pertaining to the potential for accidental conditions during project operations would be less than significant.

9(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Determination: No Impact

There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the proposed project site. The nearest school, Rondo Elementary School, is located approximately 0.47 miles to the northwest of the proposed project site at 7620 Hellman Ave, Corona, CA 92880. Additionally, operation and maintenance of the proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to 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 would occur in this regard.

9(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?

Determination: No Impact

According to the Phase 1 ESA, the proposed project site is not located on a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would occur in this regard.

9(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles or a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Determination: No Impact

The proposed project area is not located within an airport land use plan and it is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is the privately-owned Chino Airport, which is located approximately 2.1 miles to the northwest of the proposed project area. According to the Chino Airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the proposed project is not located within the runway protection zone or safety zone (San Bernardino County 1991). Therefore, the proposed project would not be located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a working airport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact would occur in this regard.

9(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Activities associated with the proposed project would not impede existing emergency response plans for the project site and/or other land uses in the project vicinity. As indicated in **Section 17, Transportation**, the project does not propose changes to the City's circulation system, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, and would not introduce incompatible uses to area roadways. Further, should partial lane closures be required as part of project construction activities, implementation of a traffic management plan (TMP) would minimize congestion and ensure safe travel, including emergency access in the project vicinity; refer to Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**. As such, project implementation would not interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. With implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**, impacts would be less than significant.

9(g) 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?

Determination: No Impact

According to the General Plan Safety Element, the portion of Eastvale near the Santa Ana River has been identified as having a moderate susceptibility to wildfire. The project site is located approximately 0.4 miles east of the Santa Ana River and is not identified as a Very High Fire Hazard severity zone by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.[13] No impact would occur in this regard.

[13] CalFire, Western Riverside County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, December 24, 2009.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Eastvale Building Engineer, that the following recommendations identified in the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Residential Property, 14555-14587 Chandler Street, Eastvale, Riverside County, California 92880, prepared by The Phase One Group, dated October 3, 2019 have been completed:

- The six, unlabeled 55-gallon drums stored at the subject property shall be collected and properly disposed of by a certified hazardous waste hauler.
- The on-site septic systems associated with the five on-site dwellings shall be properly closed and removed following current regulatory procedures and guidelines prior to any planned redevelopment of the subject property and connection to the City of Eastvale sewer system.
- Prior to redevelopment of the subject property, the on-site groundwater well shall be properly closed and abandoned following current regulatory procedures and guidelines.
- A comprehensive asbestos survey of suspect asbestos-containing material (ACM) of construction materials at the subject property shall be conducted prior to any renovation or demolition activities to confirm the presence or absence of asbestos to prevent potential exposure to workers and/or building occupants.
- A comprehensive lead-based paint survey (LBP) survey of construction materials at the subject property shall be conducted prior to any renovation or demolition activities to confirm the presence or absence of LBP to prevent potential exposure to workers and/or building occupants.

Once complete, a written report summarizing the results of the actions shall be prepared and submitted to the City of Eastvale for review and concurrence.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the potential project impacts to a less than significant level.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X	
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			X	
	1) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
	2) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	3) 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?			X	
	4) Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

DISCUSSION

This section is based upon the following technical studies:

- Preliminary Hydrology Study for Eastvale Mini Storage (Preliminary Hydrology Study), prepared by MTH2 Engineering, Inc., dated October 23, 2019; refer to **Appendix 13: Preliminary Hydrology Study.**

- Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Eastvale Self Storage (Project-Specific WQMP), prepared by MTH2 Engineering, Inc., dated October 23, 2019; refer to **Appendix 14: Project-Specific Water Quality Management Plan.**

- Preliminary WQMP Site Plan, prepared by MTH2 Engineering, Inc., dated October 23, 2019; refer to **Appendix 15: Preliminary WQMP Site Plan**.

10a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Apart of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct stormwater discharges. In California, the State Water Regional Control Board (SWRCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, which include construction activities. The SWRCB works in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality. The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB.

Impacts related to water quality typically range over three different periods: 1) during the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest; 2) following construction, prior to the establishment of ground cover, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high; and 3) following completion of the project, when impacts related to sedimentation would decrease markedly, but those associated with urban runoff would increase.

Construction

Project construction could result in short-term impacts to water quality due to the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials, maintenance and operation of construction equipment, and earthmoving activities. These potential pollutants could damage downstream waterbodies. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the SWRCB's General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ (General Construction Permit). The General Construction Permit requires the project applicant to prepare and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would specify best management practices (BMPs) to be used during construction of the project to minimize or avoid water pollution, thereby reducing potential short-term impacts to water quality. Upon completion of the project, the project applicant would be required to submit a Notice of Termination to the SWRCB to indicate that construction has been completed.

To further minimize the potential for accidental release of pollutant during project construction, the routine transport, use, and disposal of construction materials would be required to adhere to applicable State and local standards and regulations for handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances; refer to Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Compliance with such measures would prevent such substances from entering downstream water bodies via stormwater runoff and adversely affect existing water quality. Following conformance with the Construction General Permit, SWPPP, and implementation of BMPs, the project's short-term impacts to water quality and waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

Operations

The project would be required to implement BMPs to minimize operational impacts to water quality. As detailed in the Project-Specific WQMP, potential sources of runoff pollutants include landscaping/outdoor pesticide use and runoff from impervious surfaces. As a result, the Project-Specific WQMP includes the following permanent and operational source control BMPs:

- *Landscaping/Outdoor Pesticide Use*. Where landscaped areas are used to retain or detain stormwater, specify plants that are tolerant of saturated soil conditions. Consider using pest-resistant plants, especially adjacent to hardscape. Select plants appropriate to sit, soils, sloped, climate, sun, wind, rain, land use, air movement, ecological consistency, and plant interactions. Maintain landscaping using minimum or no pesticides. Provide IPM information to new owners, lessees, and operators. Sweep Plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots regularly to prevent accumulation of litter and debris.

- *Impervious Surfaces*. Collect debris from pressure washing to prevent entry into the storm drain system. Collect washwater containing any cleaning agent or degreaser and discharge to the sanitary sewer not to a storm drain.

The project would also install bio-retention trenches along the northern and western project boundaries to retain and treat stormwater; refer to **Appendix 13**. The bio-retention trenches would increase the time of concentration of the developed project, reduce pollutant generation through filtration and absorption, and reduce runoff volume through minor infiltration, absorption, and evapotranspiration. The bio-retention trenches would be designed to capture and treat the 85th-percentile storm event. The draw down time for the ponded surface water is approximately 3-hours which is less than the required 48-hour maximum. Therefore, implementation of the aforementioned BMPs would reduce the project's operational water quality impacts to less than significant levels.

10b) Would the project 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)?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The project site is mostly partially developed with residential uses and ancillary structures. As detailed in the Hydrology Study, development of the project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces by approximately 80 percent. However, development of the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management. The project site is not currently used for groundwater recharge purposes. However, drinking water for the subject property is provided by one private groundwater well that is located on the central portion of the subject property. The proposed project would not use the existing groundwater well. Instead, water for the project would be provided by Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the project would connect to the existing water main. Thus, project implementation would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies nor interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

10ci) Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or project area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river. As discussed in Response 10(a), the project would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit under the NPDES program, which would result in preparation of a SWPPP that outlines necessary BMPs to minimize erosion and water quality impacts during construction.

Although the project would result in an 80 percent increase in impervious surfaces, drainage conditions at the project site would not be substantially altered as compared to the project's existing condition. The project would bio-retention trenches along the northern and western project boundaries to retain and treat stormwater, which would provide erosion control at project completion; refer to **Appendix 13**.

Following conformance with the Construction General Permit and implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs, project development would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes in drainage patterns.

10cii) Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Response 10(c)(i), above. **Table 10.1, Undeveloped and Developed Peak Flows**, compares the project's stormwater runoff between existing and proposed conditions.

Table 10.1: Undeveloped and Developed Peak Flows (Cubic Feet per Second)

Development Phase	Q100 (CFS)
Undeveloped	6.35
Developed	8.90

While the proposed project would increase peak flows and impervious coverage of the site, installation of the bio-retention trenches and other drainage features on-site, as illustrated in **Appendix 15**, would ensure that erosion or siltation is not carried off-site by stormwater runoff. The proposed project would comply with NPDES requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

10ciii) Would the Project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Responses 10(c)(i) and 10(c)(i), above.

10civ) Would the Project impede or redirect flood flows?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Responses 10(c)(II) and 4.10(c)(III).

10d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project result in a risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Determination: No Impact

Flood Hazard

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Hazard Layer Viewer, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.[14] As a result, no impact would occur in this regard.

Tsunami

A tsunami is a series of ocean waves generated in the ocean by an impulsive disturbance. Due to the inland location of the proposed project, tsunamis are not considered a threat. No impact would occur in this regard.

[14] Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Hazard Layer Viewer, https://www.fema.gov/national-flood-hazard-layer-nfhl, accessed June 25, 2020.

Seiche

A seiche is an oscillating surface wave in a restricted or enclosed body of water generated by ground motion, usually during an earthquake. Inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall or the banks of a water body. However, because the proposed project is not adjacent to any marine or inland water bodies, impacts from seiche are not expected to occur. No impact would occur in this regard.

10e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan

The project site is located in the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit in the South Coast Hydrologic Region. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) oversees basin planning and water quality in the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit. The SARWQCB prepares the Water Quality Control Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin (Basin Plan) to protect local surface waters and groundwater basins. The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses of waters in the region and provides objectives to maintain or improve water quality in the region (SARWQCB 2019).

The northern boundary of the project site is adjacent to an 85-foot-wide Riverside County flood channel that feeds into Cucamonga Creek. The flood channel is approximately 50 feet north of the project boundary. According to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), the flood channel is considered a jurisdictional drainage. Although there are no berms or barriers preventing surface sheet flow from the project site to the flood channel, no visible on-site drainages that feed into the flood channel were observed during the field surveys and therefore, no direct connectivity to Cucamonga Creek is expected; refer to **Appendix 6: Biological Resources Assessment**. As described in Responses 10(a) and 10(c) above, the project would install bio-retention trenches along the northern and western project boundaries to satisfy the requirements of the NPDES permit. The bio-retention trenches would increase the time of concentration of the developed project, reduce pollutant generation through filtration and absorption, and reduce runoff volume through minor infiltration, absorption, and evapotranspiration.

Since the NPDES permit is intended to protect water quality, compliance with the permit would ensure that the project would not impair existing or potential beneficial uses of nearby or downstream water bodies and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Basin Plan. As mentioned in Response 10(b), the proposed project would not use the existing groundwater well on-site and instead would use the existing water main to receive water from the JCSD. Since the project would not use groundwater, the project would not conflict with a groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant impacts and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The proposed project would be required to obtain coverage under the Santa Ana regional water quality control board's statewide General Construction Permit (CGP), which requires the preparation, approval, and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would include Best Management Practices (BMPS) to be implemented during and after project construction to minimize erosion and sedimentation of downstream watercourses.
2. The project is subject to the Riverside County Storm Water Permit, also issued by the Santa Ana RWQCB (Order No. R8-2010-003, NPDES No. CAS 618033, as amended by R8-2013-0024, NPDES No. CAS618033) for discharges into the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4S) draining the county.
3. The project applicant will be required to prepare a final WQMP for the project, with Best Management Practices incorporated in the plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Physically divide an established community?			X	
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

DISCUSSION

The existing property contains five single-family dwellings, four detached garages, a storage shed, and an open storage structure. The remainder of the subject property contains yards associated with the on-site dwellings and undeveloped pastureland equipped with livestock fencing. The project proposes to demolish all existing structures and accessory improvements on the property. The project site is located in the southwestern portion of the City that has historically been considered rural residential. However, properties directly to the south of the project site as well as further to the north, east, and southeast have been developed with residential and commercial uses to accommodate the City's recent growth.

The project site is a part of the Chandler Area within the City (General Plan, Figure LU-3). The General Plan identifies future land uses of the Chandler Area to include commercial uses. (General Plan, Policy LU-17). The area surrounding the proposed project site is predominately low- and medium-density residential and commercial in addition to light agriculture uses further to the west. Older residential properties and commercial development generally occur on the north side of Chandler Street, which are part of the Chandler Area. New, master-planned residential properties occur to the south, which is beyond the boundaries of the Chandler Area. Chandler Street is an east-west minor arterial that provides access to the City and intersects to the north-south major arterial Archibald Avenue approximately 0.5 miles east of the project site. Access to the project site would be provided via two 25-foot driveways on Chandler Street.

Proposed on-site improvements include paved parking, landscaping, and drainage facilities. Proposed off-site improvements include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements along project site frontage on Chandler Street. The curb and gutter improvements would align with the existing curb and gutter in front of the fire station on the northeast corner of the intersection of Selby Avenue and Chandler Street. The project includes a minimum 10-foot-high perimeter wall that would encompass the entire project site. None of these site improvements would constitute a barrier that would physically divide an established community. Access to and movement throughout the Chandler Area and the City would not be physically impaired due to the project.

Additionally, development of the project is consistent with the uses proposed in the General Plan (in Policy LU-17, mentioned above) as well as in the Chandler Area Community Vision Plan (Vision Plan). The Vision Plan, which is a general guidance document rather than an adopted policy,

identifies the area of the proposed project for future uses that include both low density residential and commercial. The proposed project, with concurrent approval of the zone change and the general plan amendment, would be consistent with the Vision Plan and the General Plan's proposed future land use in the Chandler Area. The proposed commercial use for the project, a storage facility, is not a typical commercial use. The project would generate low trip numbers and would keep reasonable hours of operation, both of which would be consistent within a residential setting. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Less than significant impacts would result from the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

11(b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

General Plan

The City's General Plan serves as a policy document that provides long-range guidance to City officials responsible for decision-making with regard to the City's future growth and long-term protection of its resources. The City's General Plan is intended to ensure decisions made by the City conform to long-range goals established to protect and further the public interest as the City continues to grow and to minimize adverse effects potentially occurring with ultimate buildout. The City of Eastvale General Plan also provides guidance to ensure that future development conforms to the City's established plans, objectives, and/or policies, as appropriate.

The project site is currently designated by the Eastvale General Plan as Low Density Residential (LDR) and is proposed to be changed to Commercial Retail (CR). As shown in **Exhibit 3, Land Use Map**, the land use designations in the surrounding areas are LDR to the west; LDR to the north; LDR and CR to the east; and MDR to the south. As such, the proposed project would have the same zoning designation as one of the properties to the east. Additionally, it would incorporate a land use identified in the General Plan (Policy LU-17) that should be considered for the Chandler Area. The proposed general plan amendment would apply only to the project site and would not include adjacent parcels. The proposed project is an allowed use in the CR zone and would be designed to meet all regulations of the CR zone. The project would comply with the minimum lot standards for area, width, and depth. The proposed buildings would comply with height, floor-area ratio, and setback regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any goals or policies of the General Plan with concurrent approval of the general plan amendment.

Zoning Code Amendment

The project site is currently zoned Light Agriculture (A-1) and is proposed to be rezoned to General Commercial (C-1/C-P). As shown in **Exhibit 4, Zoning Map**, the zoning designations in the surrounding areas are C-1/C-P to the east; A-1 to the north; A-1 and A-2 to the west; and R-1 and R-4 to the south. As such, the proposed project would have the same zoning designation as the properties immediately to the east. The proposed self-storage facility is a conditionally permitted use in the General Commercial zone. The proposed zoning code amendment would apply only to the project site and would not include adjacent parcels. The proposed project has been designed to meet the regulations of the C-1/C-P zone. The project would comply with the minimum lot

standards for area, width, and depth. The proposed buildings would comply with height, floor-area ratio, and setback regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable zoning ordinance with concurrent approval of the zoning code amendment.

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility - Chino Airport

The proposed project area is located within Compatibility Zone D of the Chino Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Chino Airport is located approximately 2.1 miles to the northwest of the proposed project area. According to Chino Airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the proposed project is located within the Chino Airport Influence Area (Riverside County 2008). Therefore, the proposed project would be subject to the Airport Land Use Commission review. This topic will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

Conclusion

The proposed project would not 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, with concurrent approval of the zoning code change and general plan amendment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:					
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

DISCUSSION

12(a, b) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state? Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

Determination: No Impact

The project site has no history of use as a mineral resource recovery operation and is located in a predominantly developed area of the City. Areas identified as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) are areas that contain identified mineral resources. No areas within the project vicinity are mapped MRZ-2 by the California Department of Conservation's Temescal Valley Production Area. As such, no mineral resources are anticipated within the project area.[15] Thus, project implementation would not 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. No impact would occur.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

[15] California Department of Conservation, Special Report 231, *Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Temescal Valley Production Area, Riverside County, California, 2014,* ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/sr_231/

13. NOISE. Would the proposed project result in:					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Noise Impact Analysis* (Noise Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. dated February 25, 2020, provided as **Appendix 16** of this IS/MND.

DESCRIPTION OF NOISE METRICS

Sound is a pressure wave created by a moving or vibrating source that travels through an elastic medium such as air. Noise is defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. The effects of noise on people can include general annoyance, interference with speech communication, sleep disturbance, and in extreme circumstances, hearing impairment.

The unit of measurement used to describe a noise level is the decibel (dB). The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies within the sound spectrum. Therefore, the "A-weighted" noise scale, which weights the frequencies to which humans are sensitive, is used for measurements. Noise levels using A-weighted measurements are written dB(A) or dBA.

From the noise source to the receiver, noise changes both in level and frequency spectrum. The most obvious is the decrease in noise as the distance from the source increases. The manner in which noise reduces with distance depends on whether the source is a point or line source as well as ground absorption, atmospheric effects and refraction, and shielding by natural and manmade features. Sound from point sources, such as air conditioning condensers, radiates uniformly outward as it travels away from the source in a spherical pattern. The noise drop-off rate associated with this geometric spreading is 6 dBA per each doubling of the distance (dBA/DD). Transportation noise sources such as roadways are typically analyzed as line sources, since at any given moment the receiver may be impacted by noise from multiple vehicles at various locations

along the roadway. Because of the geometry of a line source, the noise drop-off rate associated with the geometric spreading of a line source is 3 dBA/DD.

Decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale, which quantifies sound intensity in a manner similar to the Richter scale used for earthquake magnitudes. Thus, a doubling of the energy of a noise source, such as a doubled traffic volume, would increase the noise levels by 3 dBA; halving of the energy would result in a 3 dBA decrease.

Average noise levels over a period of minutes or hours are usually expressed as dBA Leq, or the equivalent noise level for that period of time. For example, Leq(3) would represent a 3-hour average. When no period is specified, a one-hour average is assumed. Noise standards for land use compatibility are stated in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and the Day-Night Average Noise Level (DNL). CNEL is a 24-hour weighted average measure of community noise. CNEL is obtained by adding five decibels to sound levels in the evening (7:00 PM to 10:00 PM), and by adding ten decibels to sound levels at night (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM). This weighting accounts for the increased human sensitivity to noise during the evening and nighttime hours. DNL is a very similar 24- hour average measure that weights only the nighttime hours.

It is widely accepted that the average healthy ear can barely perceive changes of 3 dBA; that a change of 5 dBA is readily perceptible, and that an increase (decrease) of 10 dBA sounds twice (half) as loud. This definition is recommended by the California Department of Transportation's Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol.

VIBRATION FUNDAMENTALS

The way in which vibration is transmitted through the earth is called propagation. Propagation of earthborn vibrations is complicated and difficult to predict because of the endless variations in the soil through which waves travel. There are three main types of vibration propagation: surface, compression and shear waves. Surface waves, or Raleigh waves, travel along the ground's surface. These waves carry most of their energy along an expanding circular wave front, similar to ripples produced by throwing a rock into a pool of water.

Compression waves, or P-waves, are body waves that carry their energy along an expanding spherical wave front. The particle motion in these waves is longitudinal (i.e., in a "push-pull" fashion). P-waves are analogous to airborne sound waves. Shear waves, or S-waves, are also body waves that carry energy along an expanding spherical wave front. However, unlike P-waves, the particle motion is transverse or "side-to-side and perpendicular to the direction of propagation".

As vibration waves propagate from a source, the energy is spread over an ever-increasing area such that the energy level striking a given point is reduced with the distance from the energy source. This geometric spreading loss is inversely proportional to the square of the distance. Wave energy is also reduced with distance as a result of material damping in the form of internal friction, soil layering, and void spaces. The amount of attenuation provided by material damping varies with soil type and condition as well as the frequency of the wave.

Vibration amplitudes are usually expressed as either peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root mean square (RMS) velocity. The PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal in inches per second. The RMS of a signal is the average of the squared amplitude of the signal in vibration decibels (VdB), ref one micro-inch per second. The Federal Railroad Administration uses the abbreviation "VdB" for vibration decibels to reduce the potential for confusion with sound decibel.

PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential of building damage and VdB is commonly used to evaluate human response. Decibel notation acts to compress the range of numbers required in measuring vibration. Similar to the noise descriptors, Leq and Lmax can be used to describe the average vibration and the maximum vibration level observed during a single vibration measurement interval. Figure 4 illustrates common vibration sources and the human and structural responses to ground-borne vibration. As shown in the figure, the threshold of perception for human response is approximately 65 VdB; however, human response to vibration is not usually substantial unless the vibration exceeds 70 VdB. Vibration tolerance limits for sensitive instruments such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or electron microscopes could be much lower than the human vibration perception threshold.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

Federal Noise Control Act of 1972

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Noise Abatement and Control was originally established to coordinate federal noise control activities. After its inception, EPA's Office of Noise Abatement and Control issued the Federal Noise Control Act of 1972, establishing programs and guidelines to identify and address the effects of noise on public health, welfare, and the environment. In response, the EPA published Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety (Levels of Environmental Noise). The Levels of Environmental Noise recommended that the day-night average sound level (Ldn) should not exceed 55 dBA outdoors or 45 dBA indoors to prevent significant activity interference and annoyance in noise-sensitive areas.

In addition, the Levels of Environmental Noise identified five (5) dBA as an "adequate margin of safety" for a noise level increase relative to a baseline noise exposure level of 55 dBA Ldn (i.e., there would not be a noticeable increase in adverse community reaction with an increase of five dBA or less from this baseline level). The EPA did not promote these findings as universal standards or regulatory goals with mandatory applicability to all communities, but rather as advisory exposure levels below which there would be no risk to a community from any health or welfare effect of noise.

In 1981, EPA administrators determined that subjective issues such as noise would be better addressed at lower levels of government. Consequently, in 1982 responsibilities for regulating noise control policies were transferred to state and local governments. However, noise control guidelines and regulations contained in EPA rulings in prior years remain in place by designated Federal agencies, allowing more individualized control for specific issues by designated federal, state, and local government agencies.

State

The State Office of Planning and Research Noise Element Guidelines include recommended exterior and interior noise level standards for local jurisdictions to identify and prevent the creation of incompatible land uses due to noise. The Noise Element Guidelines contain a land use compatibility table that describes the compatibility of various land uses with a range of environmental noise levels in terms of CNEL.

Local

City of Eastvale General Plan

GOAL N-1: Prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure on the residents, employees, visitors, and noise-sensitive uses of Eastvale.

GOAL N-2: Locate noise-tolerant land uses within areas irrevocably committed to land uses that are noise producing, such as transportation corridors.

GOAL N-3: Ensure that noise sensitive uses do not encroach into areas needed by noise generating uses.

GOAL N-4: Locate noise sources away from existing noise sensitive land uses unless appropriate noise control measures are provided.

POLICY N-1: Protect noise-sensitive land uses from high levels of noise by restricting noise producing land uses from these areas.

POLICY N-3: Consider the following uses to be sensitive to noise and vibration, and discourage these uses in areas where existing or projected future noise levels would be in excess of 65 CNEL and/or vibration would be more than 0.0787 Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second):

- Schools;
- Hospitals;
- Rest Homes;
- Long Term Care Facilities;
- Mental Care Facilities;
- Residential Uses;
- Libraries;
- Passive Recreation Uses; and
- Places of worship

POLICY N-4: Require noise sensitive land uses proposed in areas where existing or projected future noise levels would be in excess of 65 CNEL to have an acoustical specialist prepare a study of the

noise problems and recommend structural and site design features that will adequately mitigate the noise problem.

POLICY N-5: Require that exterior noise forecasts use the appropriate Level of Service for the adjacent roadways, or a 20-year projection of traffic volumes (whichever is greater) for future noise forecasts.

POLICY N-6: Mitigate exterior noise to the levels shown in Table 3 to the extent feasible.

POLICY N-7: Table 4 provides the City's standards for maximum exterior non-transportation noise levels to which land designated for residential land uses may be exposed for any 30-minute period on any day. Where existing ambient noise levels exceed these standards, the ambient noise level shall be highest allowable noise level as measured in dBA Leq (30 minutes).

POLICY N-8: The noise levels specified in Policy N-7 shall be lowered by 5 dB for simple tonal noises (such as humming sounds), noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises (such as pile drivers, punch presses, and similar machinery). Example: the Single-Family/Duplex standard from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM for these types of noises is 45 dBA.

POLICY N-9: The City may impose exterior noise standards which are less restrictive than those specified in Table 4, provided that:

(1) The noise impact on the residential or other noise-sensitive use is addressed in an environmental analysis and at least one outdoor area meets the standard; and

(2) A finding is made by the approving body specifying why the exception would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and general welfare; and

(3) The exception would not adversely affect the character of the surrounding development.

(4) The exception would not be injurious to adjacent uses, property and improvements; and,

(5) Alternatives have been considered but none are technologically feasible for the proposal; and,

(6) Interior noise levels resulting from an external source will be no more than 45 dBA CNEL from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM; and,

(7) Residents of noise sensitive uses are informed of the proposal during the review stage and prior to approval.

POLICY N-10: Table 5: Maximum Acceptable Interior Noise Levels Created by Exterior Noise Sources provides the City's standards for acceptable indoor noise levels for various types of land uses. These standards should receive special attention when projects are considered in "Tentatively Compatible" or "Normally Incompatible" areas.

POLICY N-12: The City's preferences for providing noise mitigation are, in order of preference (#1 is most preferred; #5 is the least):

(1) Reduce noise at the source.

(2) If #1 is not practical, designate land uses which are compatible with projected noise levels.

(3) If #1 or #2 are not practical, use distance from the source to reduce noise to acceptable levels.

(4) If #1, #2, or #3 are not practical, use buildings, berms, or landscaping or a combination of these to reduce exterior noise to acceptable levels. Use construction techniques (sound-reducing windows, insulation, etc.) to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels.

(5) The last measure which should be considered is the use of a sound wall to reduce noise to acceptable levels.

POLICY N-14: Ensure compatibility between industrial and commercial development and adjacent land uses. To achieve compatibility, industrial and commercial development projects may be required to include noise mitigation measures to avoid or minimize project impacts on adjacent uses.

POLICY N-15: Encourage noise-tolerant land uses such as commercial or industrial development, to locate in areas already committed to land uses that are noise-producing.

POLICY N-16: Require that parking structures, terminals, and loading docks of commercial or industrial land uses be designed to minimize potential noise impacts on adjacent noise sensitive land uses.

POLICY N-17: If noise levels in Table 4 exceed, or are projected to be exceeded as a result of the proposed commercial or industrial loading dock or delivery area, require delivery hours be limited when adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses.

POLICY N-18: Natural buffers, setbacks or other noise attenuation shall be established between freeways and urban arterial roadways and adjoining noise-sensitive areas.

POLICY N-22: Ensure that construction activities are regulated to establish hours of operation in order to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts on surrounding areas.

POLICY N-23: Condition subdivision and other land development approval adjacent to developed/occupied noise-sensitive land uses to require the developer to submit a construction-related noise mitigation plan to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and specify how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project, through the use of such methods as:

- Temporary noise attenuation fences;
- Preferential location of equipment;

- Length of equipment use and idling time; and,
- Use of current noise suppression technology and equipment.

POLICY N-24: Require that all construction equipment be kept properly tuned and use noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

POLICY N-25: Development should use natural barriers such as berms, setbacks and/or dense vegetation to assist in noise reduction.

POLICY N-27: Noise reduction measures shall be included in the design of new development through measures which may include:

- Separation of noise-sensitive buildings from noise-generating sources;
- Use of natural topography and intervening structures to shield noise-sensitive land uses; and
- Adequate sound proofing of noise sources or receptor structures to maintain desired interior noise levels.

City of Eastvale Municipal Code

In addition to any measures to reduce noise levels recommended in this report, project operations will be subject to the following City ordinances.

Section 8.52.020 - Exemptions

Sound emanating from the following sources is exempt from the provisions of this chapter:

- Private construction projects located one-quarter of a mile or more from an inhabited dwelling;
- Private construction projects located within one-quarter of a mile from an inhabited dwelling, provided that construction does not occur between the hours of: 6:00 PM and 6:00 AM during the months of June through September and 6:00 PM and 7:00 AM during the months of October through May;
- Property maintenance, including, but not limited to, the operation of lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc., provided such maintenance occurs between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM;
- Heating and air conditioning equipment.
- Safety, warning and alarm devices, including, but not limited to, house and car alarms, and other warning devices that are designed to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

Section 8.52.040 – General sound level standards

No person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards set

forth in Table 6.

Table 13.1, City of Eastvale Noise Compatibility and Land Use Designation, shows the City's noise compatibility associated with each specific land use designation, as presented in the General Plan. **Table 13.2, City of Eastvale Exterior Noise Level Standards for Non-Transportation Noise**, shows the City's exterior noise level standards for non-transportation noise, measured as dBA Leq (30 minutes), as presented in the General Plan. **Table 13.3, City of Eastvale Maximum Acceptable Noise Levels Created by Exterior Noise Sources,** shows the City's maximum acceptable noise levels created by exterior noise sources, as presented in the General Plan. **Table 13.4, City of Eastvale Sound Level Standards (dB Lmax),** shows the City's sound level standards (dB Lmax), as presented in the City's Municipal Code.

Table 13.1: City of Eastvale Noise Compatibility and Land Use Designation

Land Use Designations	Completely Compatible	Tentatively Compatible	Normally Incompatible	Completely Incompatible
All Residential (Single- and Multi-Family)	Less than 60 dBA	60-70 dBA	70-75 dBA	Greater than 75 dBA
All Non-Residential (Commercial, Industrial, & Institutional)	Less than 70 dBA	70-75 dBA	Greater than 75 dBA	To be determined as part of the project review process
Public Parks (Lands on which public parks are located or planned)	Less than 65 dBA	65-70 dBA	70-75 dBA	Greater than 75 dBA

Notes:

Source: City of Eastvale General Plan, Table N-3.

All noise levels shown in this table are designated CNEL.

Table 13.2: City of Eastvale Exterior Noise Level Standards for Non-Transportation Noise, Measured as dBA Leq (30 Minutes)

Land Use Type	Time Period	Maximum Noise Level (dBA)
Single-Family Homes and Duplexes	10 PM to 7 AM	50
	7 AM to 10 PM	60
Multiple Residential 3 or More Units Per Building (Triplex +)	10 PM to 7 AM	55
	7 AM to 10 PM	60

Notes:

Source: City of Eastvale General Plan, Table N-4.

Table 13.3: City of Eastvale Maximum Acceptable Noise Levels Created by Exterior Noise Sources

Land Use Type	Acceptable Noise Level (dBA CNEL)
Residential Living and Sleeping Areas	45 dBA
Residential Living and Sleeping Areas where the dwelling unit is subject to noise from railroad tracks, aircraft overflights, or similar sources which produce clearly identifiable, discrete noise events (such as the passing of a train as opposed to relatively steady or constant noise sources such as roadways)	40 dBA
Private and Semi Private School Classrooms1	55 dBA
All Places of Work Other than School Classrooms	Conform with applicable state and federal workplace safety standards

Notes:

Source: City of Eastvale General Plan, Table N-5.

Standards for public schools are set and enforced by the State of California and are not regulated by the City of Eastvale.

Table 13.4: City of Eastvale Sound Level Standards (dB Lmax)

General Plan Foundation Component			Maximum Decibel Level	
Land Use Designation General Plan	**Land Use Designation Name**	**Density**	**7:00 AM to 10:00 PM**	**10:00 PM to 7:00 AM**
Community Development				
EDR	Estate density residential	2 acres	55	45
VLDR	Very low-density residential	1 acre	55	45
LDR	Low-density residential	1/2 acre	55	45
MDR	Medium-density residential	2--5	55	45
MHDR	Medium high-density residential	5--8	55	45
HDR	High-density residential	8--14	55	45
VHDR	Very high-density residential	14--20	55	45
H'TDR	Highest density residential	20 +	55	45
CR	Retail commercial		65	55
CO	Office commercial		65	55
CT	Tourist commercial		65	55
CC	Community center		65	55
LI	Light industrial		75	55
HI	Heavy industrial		75	75
BP	Business park		65	45
PF	Public facility		65	45
SP	Specific plan-residential		55	45
	Specific plan-commercial		65	55
	Specific plan-light industrial		75	55
	Specific plan-heavy industrial		75	75

General Plan Foundation Component			Maximum Decibel Level	
Land Use Designation General Plan	**Land Use Designation Name**	**Density**	**7:00 AM to 10:00 PM**	**10:00 PM to 7:00 AM**
Rural Community				
EDR	Estate density residential	2 acres	55	45
VLDR	Very low-density residential	1 acre	55	45
LDR	Low-density residential	1/2 acre	55	45
Rural				
RR	Rural residential	5 acres	45	45
RM	Rural mountainous	10 acres	45	45
RD	Rural desert	10 acres	45	45
Agriculture				
AG	Agriculture	10 acres	45	45
Open Space				
C	Conservation		45	45
CH	Conservation habitat		45	45
REC	Recreation		45	45
RUR	Rural	20 acres	45	45
W	Watershed		45	45
MR	Mineral resources		75	45

Notes:

Source: City of Eastvale Municipal Code, Section 8.52.040 Table 1.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Noise Sensitive Receptors

Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to include those uses where noise exposure could result in health-related risks to individuals, as well as places where quiet is an essential element of their intended purpose. Residential dwellings are of primary concern because of the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to both interior and exterior noise levels. Additional land uses such as parks, historic sites, cemeteries, and recreation areas are considered sensitive to increases in exterior noise levels. Schools, churches, hotels, libraries, and other places where low interior noise levels are essential are also considered noise-sensitive land uses. The nearest sensitive receptors include the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north (across the Riverside County Flood Channel), and approximately 115 feet south (across Chandler Street) of the project site.

Existing Ambient Noise Measurements

Short-term noise measurement ambient noise levels were taken in the project vicinity as part of the Noise Impact Analysis. These noise levels ranged from 49.2 to 66.6 dBA Leq. Long-term hourly noise measurement ambient noise levels ranged from 45.4 to 55.2 dBA Leq. The dominant noise sources were from vehicles traveling along Chandler Street and Selby Avenue as well as livestock/birds, residential noise, and aircrafts.

13(a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

CONSTRUCTION

Sensitive land uses that may be affected by short-term noise impacts associated the transport of workers, the movement of construction materials to and from the project site, ground clearing, excavation, grading, and building activities project construction include the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north (across the Riverside County Flood Channel), and approximately 115 feet south (across Chandler Street) of the project site. Construction and demolition noise would vary depending on the construction process, type of equipment involved, location of the construction site with respect to sensitive receptors, the schedule proposed to carry out each task (e.g., hours and days of the week) and the duration of the construction work.

The construction phases for the proposed project are anticipated to include demolition, site preparation, building construction, paving and architectural coating. A summary of noise level data for a variety of construction equipment compiled by the U.S. Department of Transportation is presented in **Table 13.5**. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings.

Table 13.5: Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Typical Construction Equipment

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor[1]	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
All Other Equipment > 5 HP	**50**	**85**
Auger Drill Rig	**20**	**85**
Backhoe	**40**	**80**
Bar Bender	**20**	**80**
Blasting	**N/A**	**94**
Boring Jack Power Unit	**50**	**80**
Chain Saw	**20**	**85**
Clam Shovel (dropping)	**20**	**93**
Compactor (ground)	**20**	**80**

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor[1]	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
Compressor (air)	**40**	**80**
Concrete Batch Plant	**15**	**83**
Concrete Mixer Truck	**40**	**85**
Concrete Pump Truck	**20**	**82**
Concrete Saw	**20**	**90**
Crane	**16**	**85**
Dozer	**40**	**85**
Drill Rig Truck	**20**	**84**
Drum Mixer	**50**	**80**
Dump Truck	**40**	**84**
Excavator	**40**	**85**
Flat Bed Truck	**40**	**84**
Forklift[2, 3]	**50**	**N/A**
Front End Loader	**40**	**80**
Generator	**50**	**82**
Generator (<25KVA, VMS signs)	**50**	**70**
Gradall	**40**	**85**
Grader	**40**	**85**
Grapple (on backhoe)	**40**	**85**
Horizontal Boring Hydraulic Jack	**25**	**80**
Hydra Break Ram	**10**	**90**
Impact Pile Driver	**20**	**95**
Jackhammer	**20**	**85**
Man Lift	**20**	**85**
Mounted Impact hammer (hoe ram)	**20**	**90**
Pavement Scarafier	**20**	**85**
Paver	**50**	**85**
Pickup Truck	**50**	**85**
Paving Equipment	**50**	**85**
Pneumatic Tools	**50**	**85**
Pumps	**50**	**77**
Refrigerator Unit	**100**	**82**
Rivit Buster/chipping gun	**20**	**85**
Rock Drill	**20**	**85**
Roller	**20**	**85**
Sand Blasting (Single Nozzle)	**20**	**85**
Scraper	**40**	**85**
Shears (on backhoe)	**40**	**85**
Slurry Plant	**100**	**78**
Slurry Trenching Machine	**50**	**82**

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor[1]	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
Soil Mix Drill Rig	**50**	**80**
Tractor	**40**	**84**
Vacuum Excavator (Vac-truck)	**40**	**85**
Vacuum Street Sweeper	**10**	**80**
Ventilation Fan	**100**	**85**
Vibrating Hopper	**50**	**85**
Vibratory Concrete Mixer	**20**	**80**
Vibratory Pile Driver	**20**	**95**
Warning Horn	**5**	**85**
Welder/Torch	**40**	**73**

Notes: L_{max} = maximum noise levels; dBA = A-weighted decibel

Acoustical Use Factor (percent): Estimates the fraction of time each piece of construction equipment is operating at full power (i.e., its loudest condition) during a construction operation.

(2) Warehouse & Forklift Noise Exposure - NoiseTesting.info Carl Stautins, November 4, 2014 http://www.noisetesting.info/blog/carlstrautins/ page-3/

(3) Data provided Leq as measured at the operator. Sound Level at 50 feet is calculated using Inverse Square Law.

Source: Federal Highway Administration, Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054), January 2006.

Construction noise sources are regulated within the City of Eastvale Municipal Code Section 8.52.020(9) which prohibits construction activities within one-quarter of a mile from an inhabited dwelling between the hours of: 6:00 PM and 6:00 AM during the months of June through September and 6:00 PM and 7:00 AM during the months of October through May. Further, Policy N-24 of the City of Eastvale General Plan requires construction equipment to be kept properly tuned and use noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

Noise impacts in compliance with the City's Municipal Code, it is assumed that construction would not occur during the noise-sensitive nighttime hours, and noise impacts shall be considered significant if project-related construction activities:

- Occur at any time other than the permitted hours of 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM Section 8.52.040 of the City of Eastvale Municipal Code); or
- Generate noise levels which exceed the 85 dBA Leq acceptable noise level threshold at the nearby sensitive receiver locations (NIOSH, Criteria for Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure); or
- Generate temporary project construction related noise level increases which exceed the 12 dBA Leq substantial noise level increase threshold at noise-sensitive receiver locations (California Department of Transportation, Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol).

Construction noise associated with the proposed project was calculated utilizing methodology presented in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) together with several key construction parameters including: distance

to each sensitive receiver, equipment usage, percent usage factor, and baseline parameters for the project site. Distances to receptors were based on the acoustical center of the proposed construction activity. Construction noise levels were calculated for each phase. Anticipated noise levels during each construction phase are presented in **Table 13.6**, as well as a comparison of existing noise levels and existing plus project construction noise levels.

Noise measurement 4 (STNM4) was chosen to represent noise levels at the property line of the residential uses to the east of the project site, noise measurement 1 (STNM1) was chosen to represent noise levels at the property line of the residential uses adjacent to the west of the project site, noise measurement 5 (STNM5) was chosen to represent noise levels at the property line of the residential uses to the north of the project site, and noise measurement 2 (STNM2) was chosen to represent noise levels at the property line of the residential uses to the south of the project site.

Per the construction noise modeling, unmitigated construction noise levels when combined with existing measured noise levels are expected to reach 78.1 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the east of the project site, up to 78.3 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line adjacent to the west of the project site, up to 71.3 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the north of the project site, and up to 72.1 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the south of the project site. Noise level increases are expected to range between 0.6 to 23.7 dB at the modeled receptors.

Although unmitigated project construction noise levels are not expected to exceed the 85 dBA Leq acceptable noise level threshold, they are expected to exceed the 12 dBA Leq substantial noise level increase threshold. Impacts would be considered significant without mitigation. As shown in **Table 13.6**, with incorporation of mufflers or enclosures or acoustical tents (as appropriate) that provide at least 13 dBA of reduction, construction noise levels will no longer exceed the 12 dBA Leq substantial noise level increase threshold. Therefore, mitigation would be required. With implementation of City construction standards, as described in Mitigation Measure **NOI-1** described below, construction-related noise impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table 13.6: Construction Noise Levels (L_{eq})

Receptor Location	Phase	Existing Ambient Noise Levels (Leq)1	Unmitigated Construction Noise Levels (Leq)2	Combined Noise Levels	Increase (dB)	Reduction with Mitigation3 (dB)	Mitigated Construction Noise Levels (Leq)	Mitigated Existing Plus Construction Noise Levels (Leq)	Mitigated Increase in Ambient Noise Levels (Leq)
East	Demolition	53.9	77.6	77.6	23.7	13	64.6	65.0	11.1
West		64.1	77.6	77.8	13.7	13	64.6	67.4	.3
North		49.2	70.9	70.9	21.7	13	57.9	58.4	9.2
South		66.6	70.2	71.8	5.2	13	57.2	67.1	0.5
East	Site Preparation	53.9	65.6	65.9	12.0	13	52.6	56.3	2.4
West		64.1	65.6	67.9	3.8	13	52.6	64.4	0.3
North		49.2	58.9	59.3	10.1	13	45.9	50.9	1.7
South		66.6	58.2	67.2	0.6	13	45.2	66.6	0.0
East	Grading	53.9	76.6	76.6	22.7	13	63.6	64.0	10.1
West		64.1	76.6	76.8	12.7	13	63.6	66.9	2.8
North		49.2	69.8	69.8	20.6	13	56.8	57.5	8.3
South		66.6	69.1	71.0	4.4	13	56.1	67.0	0.4
East	Building Construction	53.9	74.4	74.4	20.5	13	61.4	62.1	8.2
West		64.1	74.4	74.8	10.7	13	61.4	66.0	1.9
North		49.2	67.7	67.8	18.6	13	54.7	55.8	6.6
South		66.6	67.0	69.8	3.2	13	54.0	66.8	0.2
East	Paving	53.9	78.1	78.1	24.2	13	65.1	65.4	11.5
West		64.1	78.1	78.3	14.2	13	65.1	67.6	3.5
North		49.2	71.3	71.3	22.1	13	58.3	58.8	9.6
South		66.6	70.6	72.1	5.5	13	57.6	67.1	0.5
East	Architectural Coating	53.9	65.6	65.9	12.0	13	52.6	56.3	2.4
West		64.1	65.6	67.9	3.8	13	52.6	64.4	0.3
North		49.2	58.9	59.3	10.1	13	45.9	50.9	1.7
South		66.6	58.2	67.2	0.6	13	45.2	66.6	0.0

Notes:

(1) Per measured existing ambient noise levels. STNM4 was used for receptors to the east, STNM1 was used for receptors to the west, STNM5 was used for receptors to the north, and STNM2 was used for receptors to the south.

(2) Construction noise worksheets are provided in Appendix D of the Noise Impact Analysis.

(3) This reduction can be verified by measuring on-site equipment or by special ordering mufflers to meet reduction requirement, or by providing shielding/acoustic tent that provides a 20 dB reduction. See Appendix D of the Noise Impact Analysis.

OPERATIONS

NOISE IMPACTS TO OFF-SITE RECEPTORS DUE TO PROJECT GENERATED TRIPS

Existing and existing plus project traffic noise was modeled utilizing project trip generation information obtained from the Trip Generation Analysis prepared for the proposed project; refer

to **Appendix 17** of this IS/MND. As this project only has a Trip Generation Analysis, existing daily vehicle trips were obtained from a study conducted for a project nearby, Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street Project Traffic Impact Analysis, Ganddini Group, Inc. (December 20, 2018).

A worst-case scenario that assumes that all project generated vehicle trips will pass the single-family detached residential neighborhoods along Chandler Street was modeled. The proposed project is expected to generate approximately 157 average daily vehicle trips with 14 evening peak hour vehicle trips and 14 morning peak hour vehicle trips.

As stated previously, increases in ambient noise along affected roadways due to project generated vehicle traffic is considered substantial if the noise levels at existing and future noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, etc.):

- are less than 60 dBA CNEL and the project creates a readily perceptible 5 dBA CNEL or greater project-related noise level increase; or
- range from 60 to 65 dBA CNEL and the project creates a barely perceptible 3 dBA CNEL or greater project-related noise level increase; or
- already exceed 65 dBA CNEL, and the project creates a community noise level impact of greater than 1.5 dBA CNEL

As shown in **Table 13.7**, project-generated vehicle trips are projected to result in increases in the existing ambient noise by less than 1 dB and would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels. Impacts related to project generated trip impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Table 13.7: Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CNEL)

Roadway	Segment	Distance from roadway centerline to right-of-way (feet)1	Modeled Noise Levels (dBA CNEL)2				
			Existing Without Project at right-of-way	Existing Plus Project at right-of-way	Change in Noise Level	Exceeds Standards3	Greater than 3 dB Increase
Chandler Street	West of Archibald Avenue	64	70.16	70.26	0.10	YES	NO

Notes:

Right of way per the City of Eastvale General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element (June 13, 2012).

Exterior noise levels calculated 5-feet above pad elevation, perpendicular to subject roadway

Per the City of Eastvale completely compatible standard for residential dwelling units

TRANSPORATION NOISE IMPACTS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Per the City of Eastvale, commercial land uses are considered to be “completely compatible” in environments where the exterior noise level reach up to 70 CNEL and “tentatively compatible” in environments where the exterior noise level reaches up to 75 CNEL.

Chandler Street is the only roadway anticipated to carry enough vehicle traffic under buildout conditions to affect the proposed self-storage facility. The City of Eastvale General Plan Circulation

and Infrastructure Element identifies Chandler Street as an Arterial (128-foot right-of-way) roadway. Per the County of Riverside Industrial Hygiene Guidelines for Determining and Mitigating Traffic Noise Impacts to Residential Structures and County of Riverside General Plan, Chapter 4, Figure C-3 "Link Volume Capacities/Level of Service for Riverside County Roadways" revised March 2001, future buildout noise levels associated with these roadways were modeled using average daily traffic volume Level of Service (LOS) "C" design capacities (also known as future build-out daily traffic volumes). Chandler Street is expected to accommodate up to 28,700 vehicles per day at LOS C.

FHWA modeling was conducted to calculate noise levels associated with buildout vehicle traffic noise from Chandler Street. Future buildout traffic noise levels could reach up to 75.0 dBA CNEL at the proposed self-storage building that lies closest to Chandler Street, approximately 82 feet north of the roadway.

The exterior noise levels at the proposed project site are anticipated to fall within the City's compatible standards for commercial land uses. Impacts related to future traffic noise impacts to the proposed project would be less than significant.

NOISE IMPACTS TO OFF-SITE RECEPTORS DUE TO ON-SITE OPERATIONAL NOISE

Sensitive receptors that may be affected by project operational noise include the existing residences located adjacent to the east and west, approximately 80 feet north, and approximately 115 feet south of the proposed project.

Peak hour operational noise levels were modeled utilizing the SoundPLAN model. Peak Hour noise levels were modeled assuming peak hour traffic and loading/unloading activity. Vehicle traffic assumptions were based on the peak hour trip generation provided in the Trip Generation Analysis prepared for the proposed project. An area source equivalent to 65 dBA L_{eq} was utilized to model loading and unloading activities. The area source assumes this noise level spread throughout the loading and unloading activities for the entire peak hour. A total of five receptors were modeled to accurately evaluate the proposed project's operational noise impact.

Table 13.8 shows that operational noise levels associated with the proposed project are expected to range between 40.5 to 49.1 dBA L_{eq} at the nearby sensitive receptors. Project operational noise levels are expected to result in an increase in daytime ambient noise levels of up to 1.2 dBA (L_{eq}) and will not be readily noticeable over the existing measured daytime noise levels that range between 49.2 to 66.6 dBA L_{eq}.

Compliance with General Plan Stationary Noise Standards

Although **Table 13.8** shows that existing noise levels at Receptors R1, R2 and R3 currently exceed daytime noise standards, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to these noise levels. Existing measured nighttime noise levels range between 45.4 and 54.3 dBA L_{eq}. However, peak hour operations are not expected to occur during nighttime hours; only an occasional visitor is expected during nighttime hours. Nighttime project operational noise levels (L_{eq}) are not expected to result in violations of the City's nighttime non-transportation noise standard.

Project operation is not expected to violate City Non-Transportation daytime or nighttime noise

standards. Operational noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

CEQA - Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Project operational noise levels are expected to result in an increase in daytime ambient noise levels of up to 1.2 dBA (L_{eq}) and would not be readily noticeable over the existing measured daytime noise levels that range between 49.2 to 66.6 dBA L_{eq}.

Existing measured nighttime noise levels range between 45.4 and 54.3 dBA L_{eq} and modeled peak hour operational noise levels are expected to range between 40.5 to 49.1 dBA. Further, peak hour operations are also not expected to occur during nighttime hours; only an occasional visitor is expected during nighttime hours. Nighttime project operational noise levels (L_{eq}) would not be readily noticeable and would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels.

The project would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels. This impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Table 13.8: Unmitigated Operational Noise Level Increases (Daytime at Backyards of Affected Residences)

Receiver Location[1]	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})[2]	Measurement Location[3]	Ambient Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})[4]	Combined Project and Ambient (dBA L_{eq})[5]	Project Contribution (dBA L_{eq})[6]	Significance Threshold[7] (daytime)	Daytime Threshold Exceeded?
R1	40.5	NM1	64.1	64.1	0.0	60.0	Yes
R2	40.6	NM2	66.6	66.6	0.0	60.0	Yes
R3	40.7	NM3	63.9	63.9	0.0	60.0	Yes
R4	49.1	NM4	53.9	55.1	1.2	60.0	No
R5	43.5	NM5	49.2	50.2	1.0	60.0	No

13(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Determination: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The nearest off-site structure to the project site is the residential building located approximately 12 feet west of the property line.

Annoyance

Due to the proximity of the adjacent residential buildings to the west, project construction activities could result in groundborne vibration that is annoying. Annoyance is expected to be short-term. In order to satisfy the City of Eastvale vibration standard of 0.0787 in/sec PPV, Mitigation Measure **NOI-2**, which would restrict the use of vibratory rollers and other similar vibratory equipment within 50 feet and large bulldozers within 30 feet of the residential structures located at the western project boundary, would be required.

Architectural Damage

The Noise Impact Analysis identifies a PPV level of 0.2 as the threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to normal dwelling units. The use of a vibratory roller would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.198 at 26 feet and a large bulldozer would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.191 at 15 feet. Therefore, in order to avoid the potential for structural damage at the residential dwelling units located as close as approximately 12 feet west of the project site's western property line, Mitigation Measure **NOI-2** would be implemented, which would prohibit the use of vibratory rollers within 14 feet and large bulldozers within 3 feet of the western property line. With incorporation of Mitigation Measure **NOI-2**, groundborne vibration impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant**.**

13(c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is located approximately 1.95 miles southeast of the Chino Airport. However, the project site would be situated well outside of the noise impact zones of this airport. According to the Chino Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1991), the airport's primary runway is situated in an east-west direction, and its secondary runway is situated in a northeast-southwest direction. In both cases, the project site is situated outside of the airport's CNEL noise contours. Therefore, the project would not expose people to aviation related noise. Impacts would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project will be subject to the general sound level standards of Eastvale Municipal Code Section 8.52.040.

MITIGATION MEASURES

NOI-1 Construction Noise Measures. Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Eastvale Planning Department that the project complies with the following:

- Construction contracts shall stipulate that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, are equipped with either properly operating and maintained mufflers or solid enclosures/acoustical tents (as appropriate) that achieve at least 13 decibel (dB) reduction from noise level specifications presented in **Table 13.6** above. Openings in the solid enclosures/acoustical tents for access will be necessary, but should be placed in a manner that does not interrupt the solid barrier between the noise source and the affected sensitive receptor(s).

- All stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

- Equipment shall be shut off and not left to idle when not in use.
- All equipment staging shall occur in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
- Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment, and all other portable stationary noise sources shall be shielded and noise shall be directed away from sensitive receptors.
- The construction contractor shall prohibit the use of music or sound amplification on the project site during construction.
- The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment.
- In order to limit annoyance due to vibration, the construction contractor shall restrict the use of vibratory rollers, and other similar equipment, within 50 feet of the residential structures located at the western project boundary and large bulldozers within 30 feet of the residential structure located at the western project boundary.

NOI-2 Paving Control Plan. Prior to the initiation of construction, the project applicant shall prepare a paving control plan to ensure that the paving process does not result in damage to western residential dwelling units. The paving control plan shall be subject to the Building Safety Division's approval prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. To reduce groundborne vibration levels, the paving control plan shall prohibit the use of vibratory rollers, or other similar vibratory equipment, within 14 feet of the western property limit and large bulldozers within 3 feet of the western property line.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Less than significant.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposed project:						
	Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**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)?			X	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

DISCUSSION

14(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)?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

A project could induce population growth in an area either directly, through the development of new residences or businesses, or indirectly, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure. The project would involve the construction of a self-storage facility, and would not include the construction of new homes or require the extension of infrastructure such as roads. The project includes a single residential unit for an on-site caretaker. Therefore, the project would not directly induce population growth in the area. The project would generate temporary construction and long-term operational employment. SCAG estimates that employment in the City of Eastvale will increase from 7,400 in 2016 to 21,600 in 2045.[16] Thus, it is expected that the project would absorb workers from the regional labor force and would not attract new workers into the region. Impacts would be less than significant.

14(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project would involve the demolition of five existing residences currently on the project site. All property owners are voluntarily selling their property and would be compensated for their property. At this time, no evictions are anticipated. It is expected that residents would have the ability to relocate based on the availability of existing housing stock in the area. According to the 2020 housing estimates provided by the California Department of Finance, there are 17,067

[16] Southern California Association of Governments, Connect SoCal, Demographics and Growth Forecast, 2020.

housing units in the City, with a vacancy rate of 3.9 percent.[17] The project's caretaker responsible for maintenance and security of the facility would live on-site, and thus would not require the use of Eastvale's existing housing stock. As a result, the construction of replacement housing would not be required as part of this project, and no people are expected to be displaced as a result of this project. There would be a less than significant impact.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

[17] California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit, Report E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 1, 2011-2020, with 2010 Benchmark, Sacramento, California, May 1, 2020. http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposed project:					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public series:				
	i) Fire protection?			X	
	ii) Police protection?			X	
	iii) Schools?			X	
	iv) Parks?			X	
	v) Other public facilities?			X	

DISCUSSION

15(a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public series:

i) Fire protection?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection and safety services to the City of Eastvale. The nearest fire station is Eastvale Fire Station #31, located 350 feet east at 144191 Chandler Street, Eastvale, CA 92880.

The proposed project would create an increased demand for fire protection services. However, as a self-storage facility, the project would not induce significant or unplanned population growth through employment generation, and would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities; refer to Section 14, Population and Housing. Further, the proposed project would be conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department for emergency access, fire flow, fire protection standards, fire lanes, and other site design/building standards. The project would also be subject to the project design requirements set forth in the 2019 California Fire Code and the 2019 California Building Standards Code. The City would collect a one-time development impact fees pursuant

to Municipal Code Chapter 110.28, which is imposed on all new development to help pay fair share of costs in upgrading the Riverside County Fire Department's fire facilities, as needed. Payment of these fees would offset the project's impacts to the acquisition, design, and construction of new fire facilities. Following collection of development impact fees and compliance with Riverside County Fire Department, California Fire Code, and California Building Code requirements, impacts to fire protection facilities would be less than significant.

ii) *Police protection?*

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Police protection services are provided by the Eastvale Police Department, under contract from the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The nearest sheriff's station is the Jurupa Valley Station, located at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Jurupa Valley, approximately 10 miles northeast of the project site.

The proposed project would create an increased demand for police protection services. However, as a self-storage facility, the project would not induce significant or unplanned population growth through employment generation, and would not result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities; refer to Section 14, Population and Housing. The proposed development would be conditioned for the payment of the City's development impact fees pursuant to Municipal Code Chapter 110.28. The police department would have the opportunity to review the project design plans and include conditions that would be required in order for the applicant to be issued development permits. As a self-storage facility, the proposed project is not expected to result in any unusual circumstances that may generate high demand for police protection services. Therefore, payment of the City's development impact fees would fully mitigate any potential impact on Sheriff's Department facilities.

iii) *Schools?*

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The proposed project site is located in the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD). As a self-storage facility, the project could generate additional students within the project area as a result of employee generation. However, the proposed project would not significantly increase the need for new school facilities, as the project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth; refer to Section 14, Population and Housing. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 50 requirements, which allow school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new projects, including commercial construction. According to Section 65997 of the California Government Code, payment of statutory fees is the exclusive method of mitigating environmental effects related to the adequacy of school facilities when considering the approval or the establishment of conditions for the approval of a development project. Thus, upon payment of required fees by the project applicant consistent with existing State requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) *Parks?*

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project does not propose new or physically altered parks or recreational facilities. As a self-storage facility, the project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth in the City. Thus, the project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts to any parks or recreational facilities in the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) or the Jurupa Area Recreation and Park District (JARPD). Upon payment of required fees to JCSD and JARPD, consistent with existing regulations, this impact would be less than significant.

v) *Other public facilities?*

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project does not propose new or physically altered parks or recreational facilities. As a self-storage facility, the project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth in the City. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the demand for other governmental services such as the economic development and other community support services commonly provided by the City. This impact would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project applicant is required to pay the established development impact fees in compliance with the Development Impact Fee Program in Chapter 110.28 of the Eastvale Municipal Code.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

16. RECREATION. Would the proposed project:					
Issues		**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a)	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?			X	
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

DISCUSSION

16(a) 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?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Refer to Response 15(a)(iv).

16(b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Refer to Response 15(a)(iv).

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project applicant is required to pay the established development impact fees in compliance with the Development Impact Fee Program in Chapter 110.28 of the Eastvale Municipal Code.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the proposed project:					
Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		X		
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		

A *Trip Generation Analysis* prepared for the project by Ganddini Group, Inc. dated January 15, 2020, is incorporated herein by reference and included in this document as **Appendix 17**.

17(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Regional access is provided primarily by Interstate 15 (I-15), approximately 2.65 miles east of the project site. Other facilities that provide regional access include State Route 71, approximately 4 miles west of the project site, and State Route 91, approximately 4.5 miles south of the project site.

Within the City's Bicycle Master Plan (adopted April 2016) Chandler Avenue is designated as a Class I Bike Route (Multi-Use Path), while another Class I Bike Route is proposed to follow the watercourse behind the project site. Hall Avenue and Selby Avenue are designated as Class III Bicycle Routes. No changes to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, project development would not conflict with any program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system in the project area. Impacts to roadway capacities are analyzed under Response 17(b). A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Additionally, based on the City's Bicycle Master Plan (adopted April 2016) Chandler Avenue is designated as a Class I Bike Route (Multi-Use Path), while another Class I Bike Route is proposed to follow the watercourse behind the project site. Hall Avenue and Selby Avenue are designated as Class III Bicycle Routes. No changes to transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, project development would not conflict with any program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system in the project area. Therefore, there would

not be conflicts with the Bicycle Master Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

17(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

On September 27, 2013, Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 into law, which initiated a process to change transportation impact analyses completed in support of CEQA documentation. SB 743 eliminates level of service (LOS) as a basis for determining significant transportation impacts under CEQA and provides a new performance metric, vehicle miles travelled (VMT). As a result, the State is shifting from measuring a project's impact to drivers (LOS) to measuring the impact of driving (VMT) as it relates to achieving State goals of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, encouraging infill development, and improving public health through active transportation. However, as this project is being circulated before July 1, 2020, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b), a VMT analysis is not required. On June 24, 2020 the City of Eastvale adopted thresholds of significance for determining significant impacts with respect to VMT. The adopted threshold takes effect on July 1, 2020 and is as follows:

> *A significant transportation impact would occur if the baseline or cumulative project generated VMT per capita equals or exceeds the Riverside County average VMT per capita for General Plan buildout conditions.*

Certain project types that are local serving in nature or generate a low number of vehicle trips may be presumed to have a less than significant impact as their uses are local serving in nature and may reduce regional VMT. The following are examples of these project types:

- Rehabilitation of existing transportation assets
- Local-serving retail establishment that is less than 50,000 sf., including individual establishments in a retail center
- Local-serving K-12 schools
- Local parks
- Day care centers
- Local-serving gas stations
- Local-serving banks
- Local-serving medical offices
- Local-serving community assembly uses (e.g., community centers and places of worship)
- Local-serving restaurants
- Local-serving hotels (e.g. non-destination hotels)
- Student housing projects
- Local serving community colleges that are consistent with the assumptions in the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy
- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips
- Other locally serving land uses as approved by the Community Development Director

Because the project is considered locally-serving and has a relatively low trip generation rate, the

project is presumed under the City's adopted VMT thresholds to have a less than significant impact.

17(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The project has the potential to result in safety hazards during the short-term construction process. Although roadways in the project vicinity, such as Chandler Street, would remain open to traffic at all times, partial road closures may be required during materials delivery and improvement of the public right of way. During periods when partial road closures are required, the project applicant would be required to implement a temporary Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to minimize congestion and safety impacts during the construction process; refer to Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**. The TMP would include measures such as construction signage, limitations on timing for lane closures to avoid peak hours, temporary striping plans, and use of construction flag-person(s) to direct traffic during heavy equipment use, among others. The TMP would provide congestion relief during short-term construction activities and ensure safe travel. Thus, with implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**, construction-related impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

The project does not involve any unusual conditions, or hazardous design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would result in safety hazards during operations. Further, the proposed project would be conditioned to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department for emergency access and other site design standards**.** Less than significant impacts would occur in terms of operation of the project

17(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The project is subject to the City's design review to ensure that the project as designed does not temporarily or permanently interfere with the provision of emergency access or with evacuation routes. All emergency access features are subject to and must satisfy the City of Eastvale design requirements and be approved by the Fire Department. During periods when partial road closures are required, the project applicant would be required to implement a temporary Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to minimize emergency access and evacuation routes during the construction process; refer to Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**. With implementation of Mitigation Measure **TRA-1**, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

TRA-1 Traffic Management Plan. Prior to the initiation of construction, the project applicant shall prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for approval by the City of Eastvale Traffic Engineer. The TMP shall include measures such as construction signage, limitations on timing for lane closures to avoid peak hours, temporary striping plans, and the need for a construction flag-person to direct traffic during heavy equipment use. The TMP shall specify that one direction of travel in each direction must always be maintained for Chandler Street throughout project construction. The TMP shall be incorporated into project specifications for verification prior to final plan approval.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of TRA-1 will reduce potential project impacts to a less than significant level.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposed project:				
Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) 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)?				X
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X		

DISCUSSION

18(a)(i) 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 size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: 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)? 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?

Determination: No Impact

As detailed in Response 5(a), no historic resources listed or eligible for listing in a State or local register of historical resources are located on the project site. Therefore, no impacts related to historic tribal cultural resources defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) would occur.

18(a)(ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Pursuant to AB-52 and SB-18 requirements, the City of Eastvale has commenced consultation with the appropriate and potentially affected Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO). The consultation window will remain open until July 22, 2020, due to a State Executive Order (EO N-54-20), and consultation will conclude prior to City Council consideration of this IS/MND for adoption. Because there is a possibility that THPOs may raise concerns or make requests for the consideration of tribal cultural, impacts are potentially significant, the City's standard measures have been provided to the project to address unanticipated discovery. Adherence to Mitigation Measures **TCR-1, -2,** and **-3** would ensure that any cultural and archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during project grading or construction activities would be protected consistent with the recommendations of a qualified archaeologist and the appropriate tribes, reducing impacts to less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

TCR-1 **Tribal Monitoring.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project applicant shall contact the consulting tribe(s) with notification of the proposed grading and shall make a good-faith effort, as determined by the City's Development Director, to enter into a Tribal Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement with each tribe that determines its tribal cultural resources may be present on the site. The agreements shall include, but not be limited to, outlining provisions and requirements for addressing the handling of tribal cultural resources; Project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the tribal monitors; treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to sacred sites, burial goods and human remains, discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring provisions and/or requirements for professional tribal monitors during all ground-disturbing activities. The terms of the agreements shall not conflict with any of these mitigation measures. A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the City of Eastvale Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.

TCR-2 **Archaeological Monitoring.** At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation and/or ground disturbing activities on the site take place, the project applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior Standards-qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. Ground-disturbing activities may

include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing or auguring, grubbing, weed abatement, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. The on-site monitoring would end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for archeological resources. The project archaeologist, in consultation with interested tribes identified in Mitigation Measure **TCR-1**, and the developer, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. Details in the plan shall include:

A. Project grading and development scheduling.

B. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the project applicant and the project archeologist for designated Native American tribal monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation and ground-disturbing activities on the site.

C. The safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American tribal monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all Project archaeologists.

D. The protocols and stipulations that the developer, tribes and project archaeologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.

TCR-3 **Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources**. If tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during ground disturbing actives for this project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

A. **Temporary Curation and Storage**. During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on-site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversite of the process.

B. **Treatment and Final Disposition.** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City Planning Department with documentation of same:

   i. **Reburial on-site.** Accommodate the process for on-site reburial of the discovered items with the consulting tribes. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts.

Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.

ii. **Curation.** A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists or researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.

iii. **Disposition Dispute**. If more than one tribe is involved with the project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center.

iv. **Final Report.** At the completion of grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and tribal monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall:
- Document the impacts to the known resources on the property;
- Describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled;
- Document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources;
- Provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting;
- In a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist.
- All reports produced will be submitted to the City, Eastern Information Center and consulting tribes.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures **TCR-1** through **TCR-3** would ensure that any tribal cultural and archaeological resources inadvertently discovered during project grading or construction activities would be protected consistent with the recommendations of a qualified archaeologist and the appropriate tribes, reducing impacts to less than significant.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposed project:				
Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) 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?			X	
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

DISCUSSION

19(a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is served by the following utilities:

- Electricity – SCE
- Water – Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD)
- Sewer – JCSD
- Storm Drain – City of Eastvale
- Cable – Spectrum

- Telephone – AT&T
- Natural Gas –SoCalGas Company

Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications

The project site is located in a developed area of the City and is situated within close proximity to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. Therefore, substantial new utility infrastructure would not be required with project implementation.

Water

The project would require water for the irrigation of landscaped areas. However, since the project is replacing several single-family homes, it is not expected that water demand would increase substantially with project implementation. Water for the project would be provided by JCSD and would connect to the existing water main. Therefore, the expansion of off-site water facilities would not be required to serve the project.

Storm Drain

The project's storm water needs are met by the City of Eastvale and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The nearest storm water facility to the project site is a drainage adjacent to the project boundary to the north. This drainage is designated as a Riverside County Flood Control and Water Control District Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) facility.[18] In the event of a storm, water would drain from the project site and would be collected by this facility. Therefore, the expansion of off-site storm drain facilities would not be required to serve the project.

Wastewater Treatment

The project is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which applies requirements to the wastewater treatment facilities owned and operated by treatment providers. Therefore, the expansion of off-site wastewater facilities would not be required to serve the project.

19(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Water service would be provided to the project site by JCSD. JCSD relies predominantly on groundwater and desalinated brackish groundwater from the Chino Groundwater Basin for its water supply[19], as described in the City's General Plan. Through a joint powers authority, the JCSD partners with the Chino Desalter Authority (CDA), the owner and operator of two water treatment plants (desalters), to treat potable water for the JCSD service area. Each of the desalters has the

[18] Riverside County Flood Control District, NPDES MUNICIPAL PERMIT SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED EXHIBIT SA-1, Accessed June 25, 2020. http://content.rcflood.org/downloads/NPDES/Documents/SA_Annual/SAR%202017%20AnnRpt%20-%20MS4%20Maps_Map1.pdf

[19] City of Eastvale General Plan, 2012. Page 7-6, Water Supply. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=2360

current capacity to treat 12 million gallons per day (mgd) of water. Based on a water demand rate of 3.7 acre-feet per year (AFY) per acre for commercial-retail uses the proposed development would have a total water demand of approximately 15.2 AFY or 13,569 gallons per day. However, as a self-storage facility, the project does not represent a water intensive use, and thus, the proposed projects total water demand would equal approximately 0.1 percent of current treatment capacity. In a dry year, water would be imported from Northern California, as described in the City's General Plan. Based on calculations, JCSD's supply exceeds the project's water needs. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

19(c) 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?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Wastewater disposal is regulated under the federal Clean Water Act and the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The RWQCB regulates wastewater discharges in Eastvale, including the project site, and implements the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Act by administering the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), issuing water discharge permits, and establishing best management practices (BMPs). Development of the project site would result in wastewater flows that would be collected and treated at the wastewater treatment plant that serves Eastvale, the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA) plant. The proposed project would receive wastewater conveyance services from the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD). The JCSD discharges Eastvale-generated wastewater flows to the River Road Lift Station, which pumps the wastewater to the WRCRWA treatment plant.[20] The JCSD estimates that wastewater treatment plant capacity is currently 6 million gallons per day (mgd) with the ability to expand to 14 mgd. According to the JCSD 2011 Standards Manual[21], commercial and industrial uses in the Eastvale area are estimated to generate an average of 2,000 gallons of wastewater daily per gross acre. Therefore, the project can be expected to contribute 8,200 gallons of wastewater flow to the WRCRWA treatment plant daily (4.1 acres x 2,000 daily gallons per acre = 8,200 gallons daily). Since the projects would only result in an increase of wastewater flows equal to 0.13 percent of current capacity (8,200 ÷ 6,000,000 = 0.0013), adequate capacity is available to serve the proposed project. However, as this proposed self-storage facility with a single caretaker's quarters is replacing five existing residences that currently produce wastewater, the actual net increase in wastewater flows is negligible. In addition, the WRCRWA treatment plant is in compliance with all applicable RWQCB wastewater treatment requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

19(d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact

Implementation of the project is anticipated to generate additional solid waste during the temporary, short-term construction phase, as well as the operational phase, but it would not be expected to result in inadequate landfill capacity. Solid waste services for the City is provided by

[20] Jurupa Community Services District 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, accessed June 25, 2020.

[21] Jurupa Community Services District 2011 Standards Manual, accessed June 25, 2020.

the El Sobrante Landfill located in the northern portion of the City. According to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the landfill has a maximum throughput of 16,054 tons per day. This landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of approximately 209.9 million cubic yards, and the landfill has a remaining capacity of approximately 143.9 million cubic yards. The landfill has an expected operational life through 2051.[22]

All construction activities would be subject to conformance with relevant Federal, State, and local requirements related to solid waste disposal. Specifically, the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939), which requires all California cities to "reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the State to the maximum extent feasible." The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires that at least 50 percent of waste produced is recycled, reduced, or composted. The project would also be required to demonstrate compliance with the Green Building Code, which includes design and construction measures that act to reduce construction-related waste though material conservation measures and other construction-related efficiency measures. Compliance with these programs would ensure the project's construction-related solid waste impacts are less than significant.

Based on the project's air quality and greenhouse gas modeling, project operations are expected to generate approximately 134.7 tons of waste per year, or approximately 0.37 tons per day; refer to **Appendix 5: Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis**. This represents .002 percent of the El Sobrante Landfill's maximum daily permitted throughput capacity. For these reasons, the project is not anticipated to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Impacts would be less than significant.

19(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Determination: No Impact

Refer to Response 19(d) above. The proposed project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act and City requirements for solid waste generated during the construction process. Less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project applicant will be required to comply with the recommendations of the Riverside County Waste Management Department and all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991.
2. The project applicant, developer, or successor in interest shall provide written verification that the Jurupa Community Services District can and will provide potable water service to the project.

[22] CalRecycle, SWIS Facility Detail, El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217), accessed June 23, 2020, https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

20. WILDFIRE. Would the proposed project:				
Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X	
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X	
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X	

DISCUSSION

20(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is located in a developed urban area surrounded by residential and commercial uses. According to the Cal Fire - Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer (Cal Fire 2019), the project site is not located in a zone designated as Very High Fire Hazard. Emergency response and evacuation is the responsibility of the City of Eastvale Fire Department. The City of Eastvale, Riverside County Fire Department, Cal Fire operate two Fire Stations, Station 27 and Station 31, in the City. Fire Station 31 is located immediately adjacent to the project site at 14491 Chandler Street. The Eastvale Fire Department provides full service, municipal and wildland fire protection, pre-hospital emergency medical response by paramedics and EMTs, technical rescue services and response to hazardous materials discharges (City of Eastvale 2020).

During construction, materials would be placed within the project boundaries adjacent to the current phase of construction to avoid any access conflicts in case of emergency evacuations. Primary and emergency access to the site for vehicles would be provided on Chandler Street. Activities associated with the proposed project would not impede the free movement of emergency response vehicles. Existing off-site roadways would be adequate to serve the development for purposes of emergency evacuation in the event of a wildfire. The proposed

project would not interfere with the City's ability to safely evacuate the area in the event of an emergency (see Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Section 15, Public Services; and Section 17, Transportation). Additionally, the proposed project has been designed in compliance with access and design requirements related to fire prevention and subject to approval by the City's Community Development department.

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

20(b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

The project site is generally flat and does not support areas of steep slopes. The proposed project is a commercial self-storage facility that would include living quarters for the on-site caretaker of the project. Comprehensive safety measures that comply with federal, state, and local worker safety and fire protection codes and regulations would be implemented for the proposed project. These measures would minimize the occurrence of fire during construction and for the life of the proposed project.

During operations, the proposed project may introduce potential ignition sources including vehicles, gas- or electric-powered small hand tools (i.e., for maintenance), and standard substances used for routine household cleaning and landscaping maintenance; however, such conditions are not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks or increase the risk of exposure of residents to pollutant concentrations.

The proposed project would be constructed in compliance with access and design requirements of the City of Eastvale Fire Department (conditions of approval) and would be subject to payment of public safety services impact fees (see Section 15, Public Services) to ensure risks from wildfire are minimized. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to exacerbate wildfire risks or otherwise expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

20(c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Refer to Responses 19(a) and 20(b), above. Primary access to the site would be provided via two 25-foot driveways on Chandler Street. Tenants would access the site via a key coded entrance and exit gate. Tenants would be able to access to the site from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. every day of the week. A manager would also live on-site for security and maintenance purposes. Emergency access would be provided by the two driveways on Chandler Street. No new off-site roadways are proposed with the project.

The project site is located in a developed area of the City and is situated within close proximity to existing electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications facilities. The project would require water for the irrigation of landscaped areas. However, since the project is replacing several single-family homes, it is not expected that water demand would increase substantially with project implementation. Water for the

project would be provided by FWC and would connect to the existing water main. The project is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), which applies requirements to the wastewater treatment facilities owned and operated by treatment providers. Therefore, the project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. This topic will not be analyzed further in the EIR.

20(d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

Because the project site and surrounding lands are relatively flat, the risk of landslide hazards is considered low (see Section 7, Geology and Soils). While the proposed project would increase peak flows and impervious coverage of the site, installation of the bioretention trenches and other drainage features on-site, as illustrated in **Appendix 14** would ensure that erosion or siltation is not carried off-site by stormwater runoff. The proposed project would comply with NPDES requirements (refer to Response 10(c)(i) above).

The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Would the proposed project:				
Issues	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) 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?		X		
b) 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.)			X	
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		

The following are mandatory findings of significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

DISCUSSION

21(a) 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?

Determination: Less than Significant with Mitigation

As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts. As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, after mitigation, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service. Similarly, as discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, and Section 18, Tribal Cultural Resources, after mitigation, the

proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to human remains, archaeological resources, and paleontological resources. No additional mitigation measures are required.

21(b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact

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

(a) Cumulative impacts shall be discussed when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.

(b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.

Given the passive nature of a self-storage facility, impacts associated with the proposed project would not be considered individually adverse or unfavorable. Additionally, as discussed in Section 11, Land Use/Planning, with City approval of the proposed GPA and ZC and adherence to the City of Eastvale Development Standards and Municipal Code, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. Furthermore, regarding potential impacts associated with biological and cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and project-related noise, project-specific mitigation measures have been identified and shall be implemented at the City's discretion to ensure that less than significant impacts occur. Therefore, no significant cumulative adverse impacts are anticipated with implementation of the proposed development.

21(c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Determination: Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The proposed project does not have the potential to significantly adversely affect humans, either directly or indirectly, once mitigation measures are implemented. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures and standard requirements, identified potential impacts are expected to be less than significant. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project would not be expected to cause significant adverse impacts to humans. No additional mitigation measures are required.

REFERENCES

BCR Consulting LLC. 2020. Cultural Resources Assessment: Eastvale Self Storage Project.

County of San Bernardino. 1991. Chino Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/Chino.pdf

———. 2019. Scenic Highway Mapping System. Accessed June 26, 2020. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways

DWR (California Department of Water Resources). 2006. Upper Santa Ana Valley Groundwater Basin, Chino Subbasin. California's Groundwater Bulletin 118. Sacramento, CA. https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/pubs/groundwater/bulletin_118/basindescriptions/8-2.01.pdf

California Air Resources Board. 2019. California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017.

———. 2017. 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan.

California Code of Regulations. 2019. Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, Title 24.

California Department of Conservation. 2019. D – EQ Zapp: California Hazards Zone Application. Accessed June 24, 2020. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp.

———, Division of Mines and Geology, A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos Report, 2000, https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/toxics/asbestos/ofr_2000-019.pdf.

———. California Geological Survey. 2019. Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program: Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Accessed June 24, 2020. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.

———. 2000. A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos Report. ww3.arb.ca.gov/toxics/asbestos/ofr_2000-019.pdf.

———. 2014. "Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Aggregate in the Temescal Valley Production Area, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties," Special Report 231.

———. n.d. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF.

California Department of Finance. 2020. Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2020 with 2010 Census Benchmark. Accessed June 23, 2020. http://dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2019. Fire and Resource Assessment Program. Accessed June 25, 2019. https://frap.fire.ca.gov/.

———. 2020. Fire and Resource Assessment Program, State Responsibility Area Viewer. Accessed January 30, 2020. https://bof.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/.

California Department of Transportation, List of Eligible and Officially Designated State Scenic Highways, updated July 2019.

California Energy Commission, 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/202003/Title_24_2019_Building_Standards_FAQ_ada.pdf

California Environmental Protection Agency. 2020. Cortese List Data Resources. Accessed January 29, 2020. http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/

California Health and Safety Code, Sections 38500 et seq.

CalFire, Western Riverside County Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, December 24, 2009.

California Public Utilities Commission. 2011. California Long-Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan. https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/General.aspx?id=4125

CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery). n.d. Solid Waste Information System. Accessed October 10, 2019. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/36-AA-0055/.

———. Green Building Materials. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/greenbuilding/materials#Material.

Chino Basin Watermaster. 2019. Optimum Basin Management Program, Staff Status Report 2019-1: January to June 2019, 2019.

———. 2017. Maximum Benefit Annual Report.

City of Eastvale. 2012. General Plan. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=2360

———. 2013. Housing Element. Accessed June 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=1807

———. 2012. Housing Needs Assessment. Accessed June 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=2359

———. 2020. Fire Services. Website. Accessed June 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/government/fire-services

———. 2020. Public Works. Website. Accessed June 2020. https://www.eastvaleca.gov/government/community-development/public-works

———. n.d. Eastvale Municipal Code.

———. n.d. Eastvale Zoning Code.

Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Hazard Layer Viewer, accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.fema.gov/national-flood-hazard-layer-nfhl

Federal Highway Administration. 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054).

Federal Transit Administration. 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

Historic Aerials. 2019. Project location. Accessed June 2020. https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer.

Ganddini Group, Inc. 2020. Eastvale Self-Storage Facility (14555 Chandler Street) Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Energy Impact Analysis.

Jurupa Community Services District. 2015. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed June 2020. https://www.jcsd.us/home/showdocument?id=2843

———. 2011 Standards Manual, accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.jcsd.us/Home/ShowDocument?id=2895

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. Air Toxic Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment. https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf

Pray, Richard. 2017 National Construction Estimator. Carlsbad, CA: Craftsman Book Company, 2017.

Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. 2008. Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document. http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/09-%20Vol.%201%20Chino.pdf

Riverside County Flood Control District, NPDES MUNICIPAL PERMIT SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED EXHIBIT SA-1, Accessed June 25, 2020. http://content.rcflood.org/downloads/NPDES/Documents/SA_Annual/SAR%202017%20AnnRpt%20-%20MS4%20Maps_Map1.pdf

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control. 2019. Santa Ana Region Basin Plan.

Scripps Institution of Oceanography. 2020. Carbon Dioxide Concentration at Mauna Loa Observatory. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://scripps.ucsd.edu/programs/keelingcurve/

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook.

———. 2003. Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/mobilesource-toxics-analysis.doc?sfvrsn=2

———. 2008. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.

———. 2015. Application of the South Coast Air Quality Management District for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae in Support of Neither Party and Brief of Amicus Curiae. In the Supreme Court of California. Sierra Club, Revive the San Joaquin, and League of Women Voters of Fresno v. County of Fresno.

———. 2016. Air Quality Management Plan. http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2016-aqmp.

Southern California Association of Governments, Connect SoCal, RTP/SCS 2020-2045, "https://www.connectsocal.org/Documents/Draft/dConnectSoCal_Demographics-And-Growth-Forecast.pdf,"

———. 2019. High Quality Transit Corridor (HQTC) mapping website. Accessed December 4, 2019. http://gisdata-scag.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/.

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2020. Carbon Monoxide Emissions, https://cfpub.epa.gov/roe/indicator_pdf.cfm?i=10.

US Fish and Wildlife Service. n.d. National Wetlands Inventory. Accessed November 25, 2019. https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html.

US Geological Survey. n.d. Interactive Fault Map website. Accessed January 28, 2020. https://www.usgs.gov/natural-hazards/earthquake-hazards/hazards.

U.S. Green Building Council, Green Building Costs and Savings, https://www.usgbc.org/articles/green-building-costs-and-savings, accessed June 25, 2020.