INITIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Chandler/Archibald Retail Development

Northwest Corner of Chandler Street and
Archibald Avenue
(PROJECT 19-20000)

Project Proponent:

Schneider REA / Eastvale LP

Lead Agency:

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

April 2021

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 several land use entitlements including a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Major Development Review, multiple Conditional Use Permits (CUP), and Tentative Parcel Map, collectively referred to as PLN19-20000, for the development of a gas station/convenience store, a drive-through restaurant, and a fast casual restaurant on 2.71 acres on the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. The project will also include CUP applications for alcohol sales at the proposed convenience store and casual dining restaurant. PLN19-20000 is further described in Section I.C, below.

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 on the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. The project site consists of four parcels, identified as Assessor Parcel Numbers 144-13-04, -11, -12, -13. The project site is currently vacant with no existing structures. 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 bounded by LDR to the west and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to the north and south, and Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) to the east. Refer to ***Exhibit 3, Land Use Map***. Land uses to the north, south, and east have been fully developed with single-family residential neighborhoods consistent with their respective permitted densities and complete with right of way improvements such as sidewalks, lighting, and landscaping. Parcels to the west of the project site are developed with single-family residential dwellings, consistent with the General Plan land use designation of LDR. Properties along Chandler Street have been partially improved with an asphalt sidewalk and limited lighting; there is no parkway landscaping.

The project site and parcels to the west along Chandler Street are zoned Light Agriculture (A-1). The neighborhood to the north is zoned One-Family Dwellings (R-1), the neighborhood to the east is classified as a Specific Plan (SP), and the neighborhood to the south is classified as a Planned Residential Development (PRD). Refer to ***Exhibit 4, Zoning Map*** and ***Section III.9, Surrounding Land Use Designations and Zoning***, below.

C.PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project, identified as PLN19-20000, consists of six discretionary permits to allow the proposed development of a gas station with convenience store, a drive-through restaurant, and a fast-casual restaurant. The entitlements are discussed individually in the bulleted list below and illustrated in ***Exhibit 5, Conceptual Site Plan*****.**

- **General Plan Amendment** on 2.71 acres to change the land use designation from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Commercial Retail (CR) to facilitate a proposed change of zone.
- **Change of Zone** on 2.71 acres from Light Agricultural (A-1) to General Commercial (C-1/C-P).
- **Conditional Use Permit** for the operation of a drive-through fast food restaurant.
- **Conditional Use Permit** for development and operation of a gas station and convenience store with the off-sale of beer and wine (ABC License Type 20).
- **Conditional Use Permit** for the on-sale of general alcohol in conjunction with a restaurant. (ABC License Type 47).
- **Major Development Review** for the development of:
  - A 3,700-square-foot convenience store with a 3,144-square-foot 10-fueling position gas station
  - A 4,456-square-foot drive-through restaurant
  - A 3,500-square-foot fast casual restaurant
- **Tentative Parcel Map** to subdivide the 2.71 net acres into three parcels: one parcel for each proposed land use: the gas station, drive-through, and fast casual restaurant.

Additionally, the project involves grading of the project site, and the installation of right-of-way improvements, including sidewalk, street lighting, and parkway landscaping.

Development Concept

Between the three proposed buildings and fuel canopy, the total building area for the project would be 14,800 square feet with a building coverage (floor area ratio) of 12.5 percent. The maximum building height would be 50 feet. The project would be constructed to conform with Chapter 5, *Development Standards*, of the City's Zoning Code and the City's adopted *Design Standards and Guidelines*, which include design standards related to building size, height, setback, and materials, as well as landscaping, signage, and other considerations. Refer to ***Appendix 1, Architectural Plan Set***.

Utilities

The following utilities/infrastructure systems and services are available to the project. Refer to ***Appendix 2, Preliminary Water and Sewer Plan*** and ***Appendix 3, Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan***.

- *Water and Sewer*. Water and sewer services would be provided to the project by the Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD).
- *Drainage*. The drainage system that would serve the project site is under the jurisdiction of Riverside County in accordance with the County's Master Drainage Plan (MDP).
- *Dry Utilities*. Electricity and natural gas services would be provided by Southern California

Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), respectively.

Access and Circulation

All project access and circulation improvements would be designed and constructed consistent with City design and engineering standards. Roadways adjacent to the project, site access points, and site-adjacent intersections would be constructed consistent with the identified roadway classifications and respective cross-sections in the City of Eastvale General Plan Circulation Plan. Specifically, the project would provide three restricted access driveways. Two right-turn in/out only driveways are proposed at Archibald Avenue and one right-turn in/out only driveway is proposed at Chandler Street. Refer to ***Appendix 4, Preliminary Street Improvement Plan***.

Parking

The project would include a total of 104 parking stalls, which would exceed the City's minimum parking requirement of 78 parking stalls, in accordance with Chapter 5, *Development Standards*, of the City's Zoning Code. Of the 104 parking stalls, 5 parking stalls would be designated for accessible parking and 11 parking stalls would be designated for clean air vehicle parking. All clean air vehicle parking stalls would be provided with infrastructure for the addition of future electric vehicle charging stations. A total of 8 parking stalls would be designated as future electric vehicle charging station stalls and would be constructed to meet current accessibility standards along accessible routes or have the ability to be modified without affecting required parking space quantities. Refer to ***Exhibit 5, Conceptual Site Plan*****.**

Landscaping

Ornamental water-efficient landscaping, including a variety of trees, shrubs, and vines, would be installed throughout the project site. Planting materials would be selected in accordance with Chapter 5, *Development Standards*, of the City's Zoning Code and the City's adopted *Design Standards and Guidelines.* Of the total 117,986-square-foot project site area, the total landscape coverage would be 25,654 square feet, equating to 21.7 percent of the project site. Refer to ***Appendix 5, Conceptual Landscape Plan*****.**

Project Construction and Phasing

The project would be constructed in a single phase. Construction is estimated to occur in mid 2021 with operation planned for early 2022.

This page is intentionally left blank.

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: Conceptual Site Plan

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/home/showdocument?id=2360.

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 Zoning Code is located under Part B of the Municipal Code.

The Chandler Area Community Vision Plan (CAVP), adopted in May 2015, is a summary of the outcome of the community's visioning process and identifies priorities and programs that the City, landowners, and residents can spearhead to preserve or improve the community. The CAVP is a guide for decision-making in the Chandler Area and does not change the General Plan land use designation or zoning for any properties. The CAVP is not codified and is used solely for guidance when considering land use/zoning changes, and other discretionary actions related to development within the Chandler Area. A copy of the CAVP is available at https://www.eastvaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=4205.

B.Physical Setting

The project site consists of 2.71 acres on the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. Archibald Avenue is identified as an Urban Arterial and Chandler Street is identified as an Arterial in the General Plan and this intersection is the southernmost intersection of two arterials in the City. The project site presently consists of four parcels, all of which are vacant. All parcels have street frontage on either Chandler Street or Archibald Avenue though limited improvements exist within the right-of-way. An asphalt sidewalk exists across all parcels and two streetlights are installed on the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street.

The topography of the project site is relatively flat and slopes gently to the west. There are no water courses or bodies of water on the project site. Immediately north of the project is an open storm drain channel that runs parallel to Chandler Street until it discharges into Cucamonga Creek.

This page is intentionally left blank.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A.Project Information

1.	**Project Title:**	PLN19-20000
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**	Gustavo Gonzalez, Planning Manager (951) 703-4499
4.	**Project Location**	Northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. Assessor Parcel Numbers 144-130-004, -011, -012, -013
5.	**Project Sponsor Name and Address**	Schneider REA Al Steward 1257 W. Colton Avenue Redlands, CA 92374
6.	**General Plan Designation Existing**	LDR, Low Density Residential
	General Plan Designation Proposed	CR, Commercial Retail
7.	**Zoning Existing**	A-1, Light Agriculture
	Zoning Proposed	C-1/C-P General Commercial
8.	**Description of Project**	The project would change the General Plan from LDR to CR; change the zone from A-1 to C-1/C-P; and construct a gas station with convenience store, a drive-through fast food restaurant, and a fast casual dine-in restaurant on 2.71 acres.

9.	**Surrounding Land Use Designations and Zoning**		
	North	Land Use Designation	MDR, Medium Density Residential
		Zoning	R-1, One-Family Dwellings
	East	Land Use Designation	MDHR, Medium High Density Residential
		Zoning	SP, Specific Plan
	South	Land Use Designation	MDR, Medium Density Residential
		Zoning	PRD, Planned Residential Development
	West	Land Use Designation	LDR, Low Density Residential
		Zoning	A-1, Light Agriculture
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 IV.18, 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: Less Than Significant 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 0.6 miles northwest 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 and impacts would be less than significant.

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. The nearest scenic highway is State Route 91 (SR-91) (designated as eligible for listing), which is located 4.4 miles south of the project site.[1] Views of the project site are not afforded from SR-91 due to intervening

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

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 topography of the project site is relatively flat and slopes gently to the west. The project site consists of four parcels, all of which are currently vacant and contain no structures. All parcels have street frontage on either Chandler Street or Archibald Avenue. An asphalt sidewalk exists across all parcels and two streetlights are installed on the northwest corner of Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. 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 Responses IV.1(a) and (b)).

The proposed project includes the development of a gas station with convenience store, a drive-through restaurant, and a fast casual restaurant, and involve the grading of the project site and the installation of right-of-way improvements, including sidewalk, street lighting, and parkway landscaping. 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, 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 also adhere to General Plan Policy DE-46, which states that security fencing shall be incorporated into the visual/architectural design of the project and 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 proposed project is consistent with the surrounding development. With adherence to the City's design policies and goals, impacts would be less than significant.

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 is located in an urbanized area, existing sources of light and glare typically come from vehicles traveling on Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street, streetlights, exterior lighting on surrounding buildings, and reflection from windows and roofs on the surrounding residential

Highways. Updated July 2019.

and commercial buildings.

Construction

Construction of the project would be restricted to the City's permitted construction hours in accordance with Eastvale Municipal Code Chapter 8.52, *Noise Regulation*, Section 8.52.020, *Exemptions*. Construction would be prohibited between 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. 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 Archibald Avenue and 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. 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 percent and 80 percent to meet the efficiency requirements of California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Parts 6 and 11).

Although the project would increase light and glare in the surrounding area, light and glare produced on-site would be similar to that 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.

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

Determination: 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 58 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.[2] 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***. The project site is vacant with no agricultural operations occurring. 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 forestland or timberland. Further, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning or result in the rezoning of forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur.

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

Determination: No Impact.

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

[2] California Department of Conservation. n.d. Important Farmland Finder website. Accessed June 25, 2020. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp.

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 IV.2(a) through IV.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 *Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis* (Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis), prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. and dated November 18, 2020, provided as **Appendix 6** 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 Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC 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, TAC 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 IV.3(b) and IV.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 site is currently designated as Low Density Residential (LDR) on the General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Commercial Retail (CR) and a Change of Zone from Light Agriculture (A-1) to General Commercial (C-1/C-P). Therefore, the proposed project is not currently consistent with the existing land use and zoning. However, upon approval of the General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone, the project would be consistent with the General Plan land use and zoning designations. Although the project may initially result in an inconsistency with the AQMP, the inconsistency would not necessarily constitute a conflict with the AQMP. Because the land use and zoning would be changed from residential to commercial, the project would not be expected to result in population growth beyond that assumed in the AQMP assumptions.

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 Title 24 (specifically CalGreen) 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

Short-term project-related construction activities would have the potential to generate air emissions. 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)[4]					
		ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM10	PM2.5
Grading	On-site[1]	1.83	20.21	9.76	0.02	3.47	2.16
	Off-site[2]	0.09	1.85	0.61	0.01	0.26	0.08
	Subtotal	1.92	22.07	10.37	0.03	3.74	2.23
Building Construction	On-site[1]	2.19	17.45	16.26	0.03	0.90	0.86
	Off-site[2]	0.28	1.89	2.13	0.01	0.68	0.19
	Subtotal	2.46	19.34	18.38	0.04	1.58	1.05
Paving	On-site[1]	1.38	9.33	11.70	0.02	0.49	0.45
	Off-site[2]	0.07	0.04	0.51	0.00	0.17	0.05
	Subtotal	1.45	9.37	12.21	0.02	0.66	0.50
Architectural Coating	On-site[1]	8.54	1.41	1.81	0.00	0.08	0.08
	Off-site[2]	0.04	0.03	0.34	0.00	0.11	0.03
	Subtotal	8.59	1.43	2.15	0.00	0.19	0.11
Total for Overlapping Phases[3]		12.50	30.14	32.75	0.06	2.43	1.65
SCAQMD Thresholds		75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Thresholds?		No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 6 (CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2)
(1) On-site emissions from equipment operated on-site that is not operated on public roads. On-site grading and site preparation PM10 and PM2.5 emissions show mitigated values for fugitive dust for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403.
(2) Off-site emissions from equipment operated on public roads.
(3) Construction, painting and paving phases may overlap.
(4) ROG = reactive organic gases; NOx = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_2 = sulfur dioxide; PM10 = particles that are less than 10 micrometers in diameter; PM2.5 = particles that are less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter.

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 from the Traffic Impact Analysis into the CalEEMod model. The Traffic Impact Analysis found that the proposed project will generate approximately 4,871 total trips per day. Trip generation rates for the proposed project include 189.8 trips per fuel pump per day for the service station with convenience market (takes into consideration the 62 percent AM and 56 percent PM pass-by trip reduction), 315.14 trips per thousand square foot per day for the restaurant, and 434.8 trips per thousand square foot per day for the fast-food restaurant (takes into consideration the 49 percent AM and 50 percent PM pass-by trip

reduction). The Traffic Impact Analysis also found a trip generation rate of 9.44 trips per dwelling unit for the three single-family detached residential dwelling units that have been removed from the site. 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 were calculated and are shown below in ***Table 3.2: Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions***. The results show that even before the emissions from the residential uses were removed, none of the SCAQMD regional thresholds would be exceeded. Therefore, a less than significant regional air quality impact would occur from operation of the proposed project.

Table 3.2:Regional Operational Pollutant Emissions

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM10	PM2.5
Area Sources[1]	0.31	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage[2]	0.06	0.58	0.49	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Sources[3]	7.30	48.84	51.87	0.21	13.48	3.70
Subtotal Emissions	7.67	49.42	52.37	0.22	13.53	3.74
Single-family dwelling units that have been removed	-0.97	-0.53	-2.53	-0.01	-0.44	-0.29
Total Emissions	**6.70**	**48.88**	**49.83**	**0.21**	**13.08**	**3.45**
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 9 (CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2; the higher of either summer or winter emissions)
(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.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Local Air Quality Impacts from Construction

The SCAQMD has published the "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) (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 6** 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. As shown in ***Table 3.3***, the maximum number of acres disturbed in a day would be 2 acres during grading. ***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. As shown in ***Table 3.4***, 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 3.3:Maximum Number of Acres Disturbed Per Day

Activity	Equipment Type	Equipment Quantity	Acres Disturbed per 8-Hour Day	Total Acres Disturbed per Day
Grading	Rubber Tire Dozers	1	0.5	0.5
	Graders	1	0.5	0.5
	Crawler Tractors	2	0.5	1
Total for Phase		-	-	2

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 7.
(1) Tractor/loader/backhoe is a suitable surrogate for a crawler tractor per SCAQMD staff.

Table 3.4:Local Construction Emissions at the Nearest Receptors

Activity	On-Site Pollutant Emissions			
	NO_x	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Grading	20.21	9.76	3.47	2.16
Building Construction	17.45	16.26	0.90	0.86
Paving	9.33	11.70	0.49	0.45
Architectural Coating	1.41	1.81	0.08	0.08
Total Emissions				
SCAQMD Thresholds[1]	170	1,007	6	5
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 8 (calculated from CalEEMod and SCAQMD's Mass Rate Look-up Tables for 2 acres at a distance of 25 in SRA 22 Corona-Norco)
(1) The nearest sensitive receptors to the project include the single-family detached residential dwelling units located to the west, approximately 85 feet (~26 meters) to the north, and approximately 120 feet (~37 meters) to the east and south; 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 40 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) 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

[3] Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. Air Toxic Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessment.

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 29 months), the project would 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 five 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 carbon monoxide (CO) emission impacts from the project-generated vehicular trips and from the potential local air quality impacts from on-site operations. The following analysis addresses 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

https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/crnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf. South Coast Air Quality Management District. 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.

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: 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 Traffic Impact Analysis showed that the project would generate a maximum of approximately 4,871 net new vehicle trips per day. The intersection with the highest traffic volume is located at the intersection of Archibald Avenue and Smith River Road/Eastvale Parkway and has a Horizon Year (2040) With Project morning peak hour volume of 1,527 vehicles. The 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 highest traffic volumes fall far short of 100,000 vehicles, 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, and 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 receptor that may be impacted by the proposed project are the existing single-family detached residential dwelling units located to the west, approximately 85 feet (~26 meters) to the north, and approximately 120 feet (~37 meters) to the east and south of the proposed project site.

The proposed project was analyzed based on the Corona-Norco source receptor area (SRA 22) and, to be conservative, used the thresholds for a 2-acre project site (as the site is approximately 2.71 acres). ***Table 3.4*** shows the on-site emissions from the CalEEMod model that includes natural gas usage, landscape maintenance equipment, and vehicles operating on-site and the calculated emissions thresholds. Per LST methodology, mobile emissions include on-site vehicles which equate to approximately 10 percent of the project-related new mobile sources. The data provided in ***Table 3.4*** shows that the ongoing operations of the proposed project would not exceed the local NOx, CO, PM10 and PM2.5 thresholds of significance. Therefore, the proposed

project would create a less than significant operations-related impact to local air quality due to on-site emissions and no mitigation would be required.

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 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:

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

- 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.

3. 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.

4. 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		

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl and Narrow Endemic Plant Species; MSHCP Consistency Analysis; (Assessor's Parcel Nos. 144-130-013, -012, -011, -004) Riverside County, California* (Habitat Assessment), prepared by Osborne Biological Consulting, dated July 2, 2018, and provided as **Appendix 7** of this IS/MND.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site currently supports exotic annual grass/forbland dominated by species such as wall barley (*Hordeum murinum),* milk thistle *(Lactuca serriola),* cheeseweed *(Malva parviflora),* goosefoot *(Chenopodium album),* and prickly Russian thistle *(Salsola tragus)*, all of which are weedy species typical of highly disturbed conditions. On-site soils consist of Waukena saline-alkali fine sandy loam. Historical agricultural practices and residential uses have removed the natural vegetation communities, limiting the quality and availability of habitat for wildlife. No narrow endemic plant species were found on the project site, and such plant species are not expected to have the potential to occur on-site. No riparian habitat or vernal pools occur on the project site. In addition, there are no potential jurisdictional waters or wetlands on the project site.

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) administered by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). The City of Eastvale is a signatory to the MSHCP.

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.

Sensitive Plant Species

The MSHCP calls for focused studies of habitat evaluations for narrow endemic plant species. According to the Habitat Assessment conducted for the proposed project, no species of narrow endemic plant were encountered on the project site and habitat conditions indicate that these plant species—including San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila)*, Brand's Phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris)*, and San Miguel savory (*Satureja chandleri)*—should not be expected on-site. In addition, due to the historical use of the project site for residential and agricultural activities, sensitive vegetation species do not occur on-site.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

According to the MSHCP, the project site is located within a mapped survey area for western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). The burrowing owl is designated as a species of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (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. Burrowing owls have also been found occupying

man-made cavities, such as buried and non-functioning drainpipes, standpipes, and dry culverts. Although burrowing owl is unlikely to occur on-site, the proposed project would implement **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.

Birds

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 California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) 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 (CFGC Section 3503.5).

Direct impacts to native vegetation communities and removal of trees during project construction could result in direct impacts to 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. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure BIO-2**, which requires a preconstruction nesting bird clearance survey to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site, 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. 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 for both sensitive wildlife species and migratory birds 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 Habitat Assessment conducted for the proposed project, 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 Habitat Assessment conducted for the proposed project, 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.

As mentioned previously, 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 limit the potential for migratory wildlife to occur in the project vicinity. 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 preconstruction 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: No Impact.

There are no local policies or ordinances with respect to biological resources that apply to the project site. Therefore, the project is not in conflict with local policies or ordinances. No impact would occur.

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.

According to the MSHCP Consistency Analysis, the RCA MSHCP Information Map shows the project site is not located within 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 land with patches of ruderal vegetation. As discussed in Response IV.4(a), the habitat on-site is not suitable for the three narrow endemic plant species discussed above. Additionally, no burrowing owl individuals, surrogate burrows, or

burrowing owls sign were found during the field investigation. Nonetheless, to ensure that burrowing owls are not adversely affected by project implementation, the proposed project would implement **Mitigation Measure BIO-1,** which requires a preconstruction survey to be conducted to ensure that burrowing owl is not present on-site. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. City of Eastvale Municipal Code Section 4.62.100, *Payment of fees*, states that the Western Riverside County MSHCP 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. Furthermore, 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 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 Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

BIO-2 Pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act 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 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 would comply with the requirement of the MSHCP and the MBTA. Compliance would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

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)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			X	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Phase I Cultural Resources Survey for Proposed Retail Development at the Corner of Archibald and Chandler* (Cultural Resources Survey) prepared by EnviroPro Consulting, LLC, dated October 17, 2018, and provided as **Appendix 8** of this IS/MND.

DISCUSSION

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 Survey conducted for the proposed project included a records search for surveys or sites within a 1-mile radius from the project site. A standard review of the National Register of Historic Places and the Office of Historic Preservation Historic Property Directory was also conducted. A second records search was conducted at the Soboba Band of Luiseño's Research Library.

Two historic sites were recorded just beyond 1 mile from the project site, both located to the northwest. These sites consist of built structures associated with a farm/dairy ranch (P#33-13347 and P#33-13348). A single prehistoric isolate (P# 33-26628) was also recorded at or beyond the 1-mile study area, southeast of the project site. A second prehistoric isolate consisting of a portable grinding stone was reported in one of the records search reports, although there was no site form or location plotted.

A Sacred Lands File search was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The search results did not indicate the presence of any Native American cultural resources within the project site or its 1-mile radius. In addition, a review of cultural resource records held by Soboba Cultural Resources Department did not reveal cultural resources within the project area. Correspondence is on file at the City of Eastvale.

The field survey conducted as part of the Cultural Resources Survey confirmed that the entire project site has been disturbed by many generations of historical dairy or cattle use, and no cultural resources were visible on the property. The survey did not result in the identification of any historic or prehistoric cultural resources.

Based on the records search results, with numerous negative surveys for housing developments in the immediate vicinity, it is considered a low risk (though still possible) that cultural resources are buried within the project site, as no indications were observed during the survey that would suggest historic or prehistoric features or artifacts were present. However, if previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, **Mitigation Measure CUL-1** would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to historical and archaeological resources to less than significant levels.

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 IV.5(a). Less than significant impacts to archaeological resources would occur with implementation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-1**.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

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 the Standard Conditions & Requirements below. Less than significant impacts would occur.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & 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 of Native American origin, the NAHC must be contacted by the coroner within 24 hours of the coroner's

determination. The NAHC 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 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 shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find(s). If the discovery proves to be significant under the California Environment Quality Act, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted and shall be reported to the City.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

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

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	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis* (Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. and dated November 18, 2020, provided as **Appendix 6** of this IS/MND.

BACKGROUND

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Electricity

Electricity would be provided to the project by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE provides electric power to more than 15 million persons, within a service area encompassing approximately 50,000 square miles. SCE derives electricity from varied energy resources including fossil fuels, hydroelectric generators, nuclear power plants, geothermal power plants, solar power generation, and wind farms. SCE also purchases from independent power producers and utilities, including out-of-state suppliers.

Natural Gas

Natural gas would be provided to the project by Southern California Gas (SoCalGas). SoCalGas is regulated by the CPUC, which regulates natural gas rates and natural gas services, including in-state transportation over the utilities' transmission and distribution pipeline systems, storage, procurement, metering and billing.

Transportation Energy Resources

The project would attract additional vehicle trips with resulting consumption of energy resources, predominantly gasoline and diesel fuel. Gasoline (and other vehicle fuels) are commercially provided commodities and would be available to the project patrons and employees via commercial outlets. The transportation sector emits 41 percent of the total GHGs in the state and about 84 percent of smog-forming oxides of nitrogen (NOx). Petroleum comprises about 92

percent of all transportation energy use, excluding fuel consumed for aviation and most marine vessels.

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.

Multiple energy-related regulations apply to the project including the following:

- Senate Bill (SB) 100 (Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Energy Commission (CEC), California Air Resources Board (CARB), and all other state agencies to incorporate that policy into all relevant planning.
- California Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 enacted on July 22, 2002, required the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop and adopt regulations that reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) emitted by passenger vehicles and light duty trucks.
- The 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy.
- The California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) were developed 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 GHGs to 1990 levels by 2020.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

The construction schedule is anticipated to occur between mid 2021 and the end of March 2022 and be completed in one phase. Staging of construction vehicles and equipment will occur on-site.

Construction Equipment Electricity Usage Estimates

The energy implications of the construction process involve the power cost from on-site electricity consumption during construction of the proposed project. Based on the 2017 National Construction Estimator, Richard Pray,[5] the typical power cost per 1,000 square feet of building construction per month is estimated to be $2.32. Based on the proposed project building areas, the total power cost of the on-site electricity usage during construction is estimated to be approximately $241.48.

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

Construction Equipment Fuel Estimates

Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of project construction. Using the CalEEMod data input for the air quality and GHG analyses, the project's construction phase would consume electricity and fossil fuels as a single energy demand, that is, once construction is completed their use would cease. Project construction activities would consume an estimated 25,512 gallons of diesel fuel.

Construction Worker Fuel Estimates

It is assumed that all construction worker trips are from light duty autos along area roadways. With respect to the project's estimated vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the construction worker trips would generate an estimated 148,617 VMT. Using an aggregate fuel efficiency of 30.13 miles per gallon (mpg) to calculate VMT for construction worker trips, an estimated 4,933 gallons of fuel would be consumed for construction worker trips.

Construction Vendor/Hauling Fuel Estimates

With respect to estimated VMT, the vendor and hauling trips would generate an estimated 27,220 VMT; data regarding project-related construction worker trips were based on CalEEMod 2016.3.2 model defaults. For the architectural coatings, it is assumed that the contractors would be responsible for bringing coatings and equipment with them in their light-duty vehicles. Therefore, vendors delivering construction material or hauling debris from the site during grading would use medium- to heavy-duty vehicles with an average fuel consumption of 8.93 mpg for medium heavy-duty trucks and 6.51 mpg for heavy-duty trucks. Based on these assumptions, an estimated 3,090 gallons of fuel would be consumed for vendor and hauling trips.

Construction Energy Efficiency/Conservation Measures

Construction equipment used over the approximately nine-month construction phase would conform to CARB 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 project construction would therefore not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of fuel. The project would use 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.

Furthermore, as required by *California Code of Regulations Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling*, idling times of construction vehicles are limited 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 County building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints.

Based on the above, a less than significant impact would occur relative to short-term construction energy usage.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

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 facility energy demands (energy consumed by building operations and site maintenance activities).

Transportation Fuel Consumption

Using the CalEEMod output from the air quality and GHG analyses, an average trip for autos and light trucks was assumed to be 16.6 miles and 3-4-axle trucks were assumed to travel an average of 6.9 miles. As the project includes the development of the site with restaurant and gas station uses (which are frequently utilized on weekends), and in order to present a worst case scenario, it was assumed that vehicles would operate 365 days per year. The proposed project would generate 4,871 trips per day. An estimated 1,139,964 gallons of fuel would be consumed per year for the operation of the proposed project. Trip generation and VMT generated by the proposed project are consistent with other similar commercial uses of similar scale and configuration as reflected respectively in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (20th Edition, 2017). As such, the project does not propose uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, nor associated excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption. Furthermore, the state of California consumed approximately 4.2 billion gallons of diesel and 15.1 billion gallons of gasoline in 2015. The increase in fuel consumption from the proposed project is negligible in comparison to the state's demand. Therefore, project transportation energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary.

Facility Energy Demands (Electricity and Natural Gas)

Building operation and site maintenance (including landscape maintenance) would result in the consumption of electricity and natural gas. The annual natural gas and electricity demands were provided per the CalEEMod output from the air quality and GHG analyses. The estimated electricity demand for the proposed project is approximately 401,547 kilowatt-hours (kWh) per year. In 2019, the nonresidential sector of the County of Riverside consumed approximately 8,183 million kWh of electricity. In addition, the estimated natural gas consumption for the proposed project is approximately 1,973,430 kilo British thermal units (kBTU) per year. In 2019, the nonresidential sector of the County of Riverside consumed approximately 148.2 million kBTU of gas. Therefore, the increase in both electricity and natural gas demand from the proposed project is negligible compared to the County's 2019 nonresidential sector demand.

Energy use in buildings is divided into energy consumed by the built environment and energy consumed by uses that are independent of building construction, such as in plug-in appliances.

In California, Title 24 governs energy consumed by the built environment, mechanical systems, and some types of fixed lighting. Non-building energy use, or "plug-in" energy use, can be further subdivided by specific end-use (refrigeration, cooking, appliances, etc.). The proposed project would be required to comply with Title 24 standards.

Furthermore, the proposed project energy demands in total would be comparable to other commercial projects of similar scale and configuration. Therefore, the project facilities' energy demands and energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary. Based on the above, a less than significant impact would occur relative to long-term operational energy usage.

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 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) because SCAG is not planning for intermodal facilities in the project area.

Regarding the state's Energy Plan and Title 24 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 SCE and SoCalGas.

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 Renewables 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 commercial/retail 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	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Proposed Circle K Gas Station & Restaurants NWC Archibald Avenue & Chandler Street, Eastvale, California* (Geotechnical Report) prepared by Salem Engineering Group, Inc., dated January 7, 2021, and provided as **Appendix 9** of this IS/MND.

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.

According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, 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 4 miles to the southwest. Therefore, the potential for fault rupture at the site is considered 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 2019 California Building Code (CBC), 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 CBC 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 CBC 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.

According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, the soils encountered within the depth of 50.5 feet on the project site during the field exploration consisted predominantly of sandy silt with various amounts of clay; sandy clay with silt; silty sand with various amounts of gravel; silty, clayey sand; and poorly graded sand. Free groundwater was encountered at a depth of 38.5 feet below the ground surface. As such, the project site was determined to have a moderate-to-high potential for liquefaction under seismic conditions.

The historically highest groundwater is estimated to be at a depth of 20 feet below ground surface according to the County of Riverside Geologic Hazards Map and regional groundwater well data. Low to very low cohesion strength is commonly associated with the sandy soil profile at the project site. A seismic hazard, which could cause damage to the proposed development

during seismic shaking, is the post-liquefaction settlement of liquefied sands. Regardless, implementation of standard grading and soil engineering practices and site-specific recommendations in the project's Geotechnical Report would serve to ensure that project structures are adequately supported and render the likelihood of liquefaction to very low levels. In addition, compliance with site-specific design recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report, including using geogrid, a structural slab system, stone columns, or supporting the building on a deep foundation system, would be required as a condition of issuance of building and grading permits. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

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 implementation of best management practices (BMPs) for erosion control, as required under National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act. NPDES requirements for construction projects 1 acre or more in area are set forth in the Construction General Permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ). Furthermore, the project's land clearing, grading, and construction activities would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 403.2 regulating fugitive dust emissions, thus minimizing wind erosion from such ground-disturbing activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate substantial erosion. Soil erosion impacts would be less than significant.

7(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Responses IV.7a(iii) and IV.7a(iv), above, while the proposed project site is at little risk for landslides, it was determined to have a moderate-to-high potential for liquefaction under seismic conditions. Due to the relatively flat site topography, the likelihood of lateral spreading was determined to be low. However, implementation of standard grading and soil engineering

practices and site-specific recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report would reduce potential impacts relative to unstable soils to less than significant levels.

7(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?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, expansive soil is considered to be a geotechnical constraint at the project site. To minimize the potential soil movement due to expansive soil conditions, the Geotechnical Report recommends that the upper 18 inches of soil beneath the required subbase within slab and exterior flatwork areas be removed and replaced with non-expansive engineered fill that meets the requirements provided in the Geotechnical Report. As an alternative to the use of non-expansive soils, the upper 18 inches of soil supporting the slab areas may consist of lime or cement-treated clayey soils. Compliance with these recommendations would ensure that impacts relative to expansive soil remain less than significant.

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 and would therefore have no need for a septic system or other alternative wastewater disposal system. There would be no impact.

7(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is located within the Inland Valley, within the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province of California. The Inland Valley is situated between the San Bernardino Mountains to the northeast, the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, the Chino Hills to the southwest, and to the southeast by the hilly uplands that separate it from the San Jacinto Basin. These mountain ranges are part of the Transverse Ranges Geomorphic Province of California.

The Inland Valley is dominated by northwest-trending faults and adjacent anticlinal uplifts. The intervening deep synclinal troughs are filled with poorly consolidated Upper Pleistocene and unconsolidated Holocene sediments. Tectonism of the region is dominated by the interaction of the East Pacific Plate and the North American Plate along a transform boundary. The Inland Valley has been filled with a variable thickness of relatively young, heterogeneous alluvial deposits. These deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils, at least within the uppermost layers.

According to the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project, the subsurface conditions encountered appear typical of those found in the geologic region of the site. In general, the soils within the depth of exploration consisted of alluvium deposits of soft to hard

sandy silt with various amounts of clay; sandy clay with silt; medium dense to very dense silty sand with various amounts of gravel; silty, clayey sand; and poorly graded sand. The project site is not anticipated to contain significant paleontological or geologic features. No prehistoric resources were identified during background research or field survey for the project site. As such, a less than significant impact would occur.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. The project shall comply with the California Building 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 *Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis* (Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc., dated November 18, 2020, and provided as **Appendix 6** 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.[6] 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.

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.

[6] California Air Resources Board. 2019. California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017. Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e) is a metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.

Regulations and Significance Criteria

Multiple regulations pertaining to GHG emissions apply to the project including the following, which are described in detail in the Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis:

- Climate Change Action Plan: developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to address the reduction of GHGs in the United States, consisting of more than 50 voluntary programs. The IPCC concluded that a stabilization of GHGs at 400 to 450 ppm CO_2e 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: 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
  - 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels
- Executive Order B-30-15: Issued in April 2015, requires statewide GHG emissions to be reduced 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.
- Assembly Bill 32 (California Health and Safety Code, Division 25.5 – California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006): Adopted in 2006, focuses on reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 and defines GHGs as CO_2, CH_4, N_2O, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride and represents the first enforceable statewide program to limit emissions of these GHGs from all major industries with penalties for noncompliance. Under HSC Division 25.5, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has the primary responsibility for reducing GHG emissions.
- Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 197: Adopted in 2016, 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 2017 Scoping Plan: establishes 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 Scoping Plan Update 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).
- 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 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 (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.

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

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Per City of Eastvale guidance, to determine whether the project's GHG emissions are significant, this analysis uses the SCAQMD screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year for all land uses.

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 in ***Table 8.1, Project-Related GHG Emissions***. As shown in ***Table 8.1***, project related GHG emissions would total 3,672.91 $MTCO_2e$ per year (including subtraction of emissions from residential uses that have been demolished, but without credit for any reductions from sustainable design and/or regulatory requirements). As stated above, according to the thresholds of significance, a cumulative global climate change impact would occur if GHG emissions created from the ongoing operations of the proposed project exceeded the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ per year for all land uses. Therefore, emissions reductions are required for the project. The reductions would come from incorporation of California Air Pollution Control Officers Association-based reduction measures and regulatory compliance, described in **Mitigation Measure GHG-1**, below. In addition, project-specific design features are required to be implemented as described in **Mitigation Measure GHG-2**, below.

Table 8.1:Project-Related GHG 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	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage[2]	0.00	254.07	254.07	0.01	0.00	255.25
Mobile Sources[3]	0.00	3,422.38	3,422.38	0.26	0.00	3,428.96
Waste[4]	10.87	0.00	10.87	0.64	0.00	26.92
Water[5]	0.79	11.11	11.90	0.08	0.00	14.54
Construction[6]	0.00	11.17	11.17	0.00	0.00	11.22
Subtotal Emissions	11.66	3,698.73	3,710.39	1.00	0.01	3,736.89
Existing single-family dwelling units that have been removed	-1.13	-61.39	-62.52	-0.05	0.00	-63.99
Total Emissions	10.53	3,637.35	3,647.87	0.94	0.00	**3,672.91**
SCAQMD Draft Screening Threshold						**3,000**
Exceeds Threshold?						**Yes**

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 12. (CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 for Opening Year 2022)
(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.

Table 8.2:Project-Related GHG Emissions with Mitigation summarizes the project's GHG emissions after implementation of **Mitigation Measures GHG-1** and **GHG-2**. As shown in ***Table 8.2***, with compliance with regulation and incorporation of sustainable design (compliance with regulation is shown as "mitigation" in the CalEEMod output), the proposed project's total emissions would be reduced to 2,609.74 $MTCO_2e$ per year.

Table 8.2:Project-Related GHG Emissions with Mitigation

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	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Usage[2]	0.00	233.25	233.25	0.01	0.00	234.33
Mobile Sources[3]	0.00	2,407.29	2,407.29	0.24	0.00	2,413.19
Waste[4]	2.72	0.00	2.72	0.16	0.00	6.73
Water[5]	0.63	9.04	9.68	0.07	0.00	11.79
Construction[6]	0.00	11.17	11.17	0.00	0.00	11.22
Sequestration[7]						-3.54
Subtotal Emissions	3.35	2,660.76	2,664.11	0.47	0.00	2,673.72
Existing single-family dwelling units that have been removed	-1.13	-61.39	-62.52	-0.05	0.00	-63.99
Total Emissions	2.22	2,599.37	2,601.59	0.42	0.00	**2,609.74**
SCAQMD Draft Screening Threshold						**3,000**
Exceeds Threshold?						**No**

Notes:
Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Air Quality, Global Climate Change, TAC and Energy Impact Analysis, November 18, 2020, Table 13. (CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 for Opening Year 2022)
(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.
(7) Approximately 100 new trees to be planted as part of sequestration.

With implementation of these measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

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 with Mitigation Incorporated.

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 GHGs. 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.

As discussed above, the proposed project's total emissions would be reduced to 2,609.74 $MTCO_2e$ per year with implementation of mitigation, and as such, 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 (Assembly Bill [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, Division 2, Chapter 4 (Appliance Efficiency Regulations) – establishes energy efficiency requirements for appliances
- California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Division 3, Chapter 1, Subchapter 10, Article 4, Subarticle 7 (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

GHG-1 The project shall incorporate the following California Air Pollution Control Officers Association-based reduction measures and regulatory compliance:

- Utilize low-flow fixtures that would reduce indoor water demand by 20 percent per CALGreen Standards.
- Implement recycling programs that reduce waste to landfills by a minimum of 75 percent (per AB 341).
- Incorporate the following land use and site enhancement reduction measures: LUT-1 Increase Density, LUT-4 Improve Destination Accessibility, LUT-5 Increase Transit Accessibility, and SDT-1 Improve Pedestrian Network.

GHG-2 The project shall incorporate the following design features:

- The project applicant shall require that all faucets, toilets, and showers installed in the proposed structures utilize low-flow fixtures that would reduce indoor water demand by 20 percent per CALGreen standards.
- The project applicant shall require recycling programs that reduce waste to landfills by a minimum 75 percent per AB 341.

- The project applicant shall provide sidewalks on-site and connecting off-site.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures GHG-1** and **GHG-2**, impacts relative to GHGs would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, NWC Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street Eastvale, CA 92880* (Phase 1 ESA) prepared by S & S Commercial Environmental Services, Inc., dated July 30, 2018, and provided as **Appendix 10** of this IS/MND.

DISCUSSION

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 and operation of the proposed project would require the routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of limited quantities of common hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel fuel, oils, solvents, paint, fertilizers, pesticides, and other similar materials. However, the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are strictly regulated by state and federal agencies to minimize adverse hazards from accidental release. In addition to state and federal regulations, future project tenants are subject to the provisions of the Eastvale Municipal Code (Title 16, Health and Sanitation), which outline the handling and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes and will comply with the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP), which is a written set of procedures and information created to help minimize the effects and extent of a release or threatened release of a hazardous material. The intent of the HMBEP is to satisfy federal and state Community Right-To-Know laws and to provide detailed information for use by emergency responders.

Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment related to hazardous materials. This impact 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.

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.

Based on the Phase I ESA prepared for the proposed project, the project site appears to have been part of a larger parcel of agricultural land until it was subdivided into smaller parcels in the 1940s. However, former pesticides would be expected to have broken down into constituent components with a half-life of seven years or less on average. No operations are currently performed on the project site and the three residences and fruit stand that existed on-site at the time the Phase I ESA was conducted have since been demolished. No potential environmental concerns were identified in association with the current or former uses of the project site.

Based on the Phase I ESA, no evidence of recognized environmental conditions, controlled recognized environmental conditions, or historical recognized environmental conditions were observed. Solid waste is not currently generated at the project site. No evidence of illegal dumping of solid waste was observed.

No wetlands, sumps, pits, ponds, or lagoons were observed on the project site. No evidence of current or former aboveground storage tanks or underground storage tanks (USTs) was found on-site. No potential polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing equipment (transformers, oil-filled switches, hoists, lifts, dock levelers, hydraulic elevators, etc.) was observed on the project site. No additional environmental hazards, including landfill activities or radiological hazards, were observed.

During project construction, there is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid 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 impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Project operations could involve the temporary storage and handling of potentially hazardous materials such as detergents, pesticides, fertilizers, or paint products that are pre-packaged for distribution and use. These materials are typical of those used in commercial/retail uses and would be employed for routine cleaning, maintenance, and landscaping activities. This type of storage, transfer, use and disposal of potentially hazardous materials is extensively regulated at the local, state, and federal levels. Amounts of these materials that are stored and used on-site would be subject to guidelines and restrictions established under the HMBEP, which would be implemented by the project, as described in Response IV.9(a), above.

Additionally, the project would utilize USTs to store gas and diesel fuel on the project site associated with the proposed gas station. The USTs would consist of double-walled, fiberglass fuel storage tanks with leak detection sensors. All project USTs would be designed, installed, inspected, maintained, and monitored consistent with federal, state, and local regulatory

requirements. The containment system design is subject to design review by the Jurupa Community Services District related to protection of its water facilities such as nearby municipal wells. Additionally, gasoline fueling stations are required by the SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Storage and Dispensing, to include an enhanced vapor recovery and diagnostic system.

The project would also be required to comply with the provisions established by Section 2540.7, Gasoline Dispensing and Service Stations, of the California Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) Regulations; Chapter 38, Liquefied Petroleum Gases, of the California Fire Code; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act requirements; and the Riverside County Fire Department requirements. Collectively, the routine inspection of the gas station, the USTs, and all associated fuel delivery infrastructure, along with the continued mandated compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations, provides the framework that would reduce operational impacts relative to hazardous material releases to a less than significant level.

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 approximately one mile northwest of the proposed project site at 14977 Walters Street in the City of Eastvale. 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 prepared for the proposed project, 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: Less Than Significant Impact.

According to Exhibit CH-6, *Compatibility Factors Map*, of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document (ALUCP), the project site is located within the Chino Airport

Influence Area, Compatibility Zone D.[7] The ALUCP establishes various policies and compatibility maps for individual ALUCP airports, including Chino Airport. The applicant has prepared a consistency review, which determined that the entire 2.71-acre project site would accommodate 338 persons, or 125 people per acre. These numbers are significantly less that the average of 150 people per acre allowed on a site and 450 people allowed to occupy any single acre of the site, pursuant to ALUCP Policy CH 2.6.1. As such, the project meets the ALUCP single and average acre intensity requirements.

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) acts in an advisory capacity when reviewing development projects for compatibility with the ALUCP and local jurisdictions are not required to adhere to the overruling process if they elect to approve a project without incorporating design changes or conditions suggested by the ALUC. Nonetheless, as discussed further in Section IV.11, *Land Use and Planning,* the project applicant would be required to document review and approval of the project by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. Any project revisions or limitations required by the commission would be incorporated in the project prior to building permit issuance by the City. Compliance with this requirement would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. Refer to Section IV.11 for further discussion.

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 IV.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 would minimize congestion and ensure safe travel, including emergency access in the project vicinity; refer to **Mitigation Measure TRA-1**. 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: Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Section IV.20, *Wildfire,* the project site is located in a developed urban area surrounded by residential and commercial uses and is not located in a zone designated as Very High Fire Hazard by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Urban levels of fire protection would be provided to the project area. In addition, the project would adhere to

[7] Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. 2008. West County Airports Background Data. Exhibit CH-6, *Compatibility Factors Map.* September 2008.

building codes and any conditions included through review by the Riverside County Fire Department. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Refer to **Mitigation Measure TRA-1** in Section IV.17, *Transportation.*

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:				
	i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
	ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	iii) 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	
	iv) 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	

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Preliminary Hydrology Study* (Hydrology Study), dated December 31, 2020, provided as **Appendix 11** of this IS/MND, and the *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan* (WQMP), prepared by LN Civil Engineers, Inc. dated January 11, 2021, provided as **Appendix 12** of this IS/MND.

DISCUSSION

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

As part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the US 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 Resources 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.

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 1 or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than 1 acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs 1 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 (Construction General Permit). The Construction General 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 project construction 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 pollutants 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 IV.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.

The project would be required to implement BMPs to minimize operational impacts to water quality. As detailed in the project's WQMP, potential sources of runoff pollutants include landscaping/outdoor pesticide use and runoff from impervious surfaces. As a result, the WQMP includes permanent and operational source control BMPs pursuant to the on-site storm drain inlets, landscaping/outdoor pesticide use, food service issues, refuse areas, fuel dispensing areas, loading docks/loading areas, and plazas/sidewalks/parking lots. With implementation of these BMPs, the project's impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

10(b) 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 currently vacant with no existing structures. Project development 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. Water for the project would be provided by Jurupa Community Services District (JCSD) and the project would connect to the existing water system. Thus, project implementation would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies nor interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

10(c)i) 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.

According to the project's WQMP, the total new area of impervious surfaces within the project limits would be 92,145 square feet. The project site currently has no impervious surfaces. Although the project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces, 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 because post-development drainage infrastructure would retain the project site's existing drainage pattern. Runoff would be directed into a vegetated swale along westerly property line and two bioretention basins located at the northwest corner of the project site. Treated water and excess runoff would be drained into underdrain pipes then collected by a 12-inch line that drains into Chandler Street Channel at the northwest corner of the project site. As discussed in Response IV.10(a) above, the project would comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit under the NPDES program, which would result in preparation of an SWPPP that outlines necessary BMPs to minimize erosion and water quality impacts during construction. Therefore, project development would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes in drainage patterns and impacts would be less than significant.

10(c)ii) 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.

The project site does not include any streams or rivers which could be altered by the proposed project. In addition, the project includes vegetated swale areas and two bioretention basins with underdrain pipes to treat stormwater runoff prior to releasing to the existing channel. The vegetated swale areas would be located throughout the project site including 6,845 square feet on roofing and 4,455 square feet of ornamental landscaping, as well as 28,320 square feet of asphalt/concrete pavement swale areas. Bioretention basin 1 would be 26-foot by 60-foot in size and would be located near the northeastern corner of the project site. Bioretention basin 2 would be 7-foot by 104-foot and would be located along the project site's eastern border. These drainage features would limit the release of stormwater from the site, thereby minimizing the potential for flooding to occur on-site or off-site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

10(c)iii) 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 IV.10(c)(i) and IV.10(c)(ii), above. On-site stormwater runoff associated with the project would be engineered to be conveyed through public street improvements and on-site infiltration to dispose of stormwater. Additionally, with required adherence to an SWPPP and WQMP as discussed above, the proposed project would not be a substantial source of polluted runoff. The project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. A less than significant impact would occur.

10(c)iv)Would the project impede or redirect flood flows?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site is relatively flat. The proposed project would include the development of a storm drainage system consistent with City requirements to convey stormwater runoff to the mainline storm drain system. Stormwater management practices as required under Eastvale Municipal Code Title 14, *Water and Sewers,* would further reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the proposed on-site vegetated swale and bioretention basins would limit the release of stormwater from the site, thereby minimizing the potential for impediment or redirect flood flows. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Determination: No Impact.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) National Flood Hazard Layer Viewer, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.[8] As a result, no impact would occur in this regard.

A tsunami is a series of ocean waves generated in the ocean by an impulsive disturbance. The proposed project site is located approximately 30 miles from the Pacific Ocean. Due to this location, tsunamis are not considered a threat. No impact would occur in this regard.

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.

10(e) 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 RWQCB oversees basin planning and water quality in the Santa Ana River Hydrologic Unit. The Santa Ana RWQCB 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.

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 US Geological Survey National Hydrography Dataset, 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 7: Habitat Assessment**.

As described in Responses IV.10(c)ii) and IV.10(c)iv) above, the project would install bioretention trenches along the northern project boundary to satisfy the requirements of the NPDES permit. The bioretention trenches would increase the time of concentration of the developed project, reduce pollutant generation through filtration and absorption, and reduce runoff volume through

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

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. 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.

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

11(a)Physically divide an established community?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

The physical division of an established community is typically associated with construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and an outlying area.

None of the propose project components would constitute a barrier that would physically divide an established community. No new linear features are included in the project. Access to and movement throughout the Chandler area and the City would not be physically impaired due to the project.

Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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 project site is currently designated by the Eastvale General Plan as Low Density Residential (LDR) and is bounded by LDR to the west and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to the north and south, and Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) to the east. Refer to ***Exhibit 3, Land Use Map***. The project proposes to change the land use designation from LDR to Commercial Retail (CR) to facilitate a proposed Change of Zone. As such, approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment would make the project site land use consistent with the General Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

Zoning Code

The project site and parcels to the west along Chandler Avenue are zoned Light Agriculture (A-1).

The neighborhood to the north is zoned One Family Dwellings (R-1), the neighborhood to the east is classified as a Specific Plan (SP), and the neighborhood to the south is classified as a Planned Residential Development (PRD). Refer to ***Exhibit 4, Zoning Map*****.** However, the project proposes a Change of Zone from Light Agricultural (A-1) to General Commercial (C-1/C-P). With concurrent approval of the proposed Change of Zone, the project would be consistent with the General Plan's proposed future commercial land use in the Chandler Area as envisioned in the Chandler Area Community Vision Plan (CVAP). The CVAP, 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 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 Change of Zone. Impacts would be less than significant.

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility - Chino Airport

According to Exhibit CH-6, *Compatibility Factors Map*, of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Policy Document (ALUCP), the project site is located within the Chino Airport Influence Area, within any of the Compatibility Zones D.[9] The ALUCP establishes various policies and compatibility maps for individual ALUCP airports, including Chino Airport.

The ALUCP establishes various policies and compatibility maps for individual ALUCP airports, including Chino Airport. The applicant has prepared a consistency review, which determined that the entire 2.71-acre project site would accommodate 338 persons, or 125 people per acre. These numbers are significantly less that the average of 150 people per acre allowed on a site and 450 people allowed to occupy any single acre of the site, pursuant to ALUCP Policy CH 2.6.1. As such, the project meets the ALUCP single and average acre intensity requirements.

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) acts in an advisory capacity when reviewing development projects for compatibility with the ALUCP and local jurisdictions are not required to adhere to the overruling process if they elect to approve a project without incorporating design changes or conditions suggested by the ALUC. Nonetheless, the project applicant would be required to document review and approval of the project by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. Any project revisions or limitations required by the commission would be incorporated in the project prior to building permit issuance by the City. Compliance with this requirement would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. Refer to Section IV.11 for further discussion.

.

Conclusion

[9] Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. 2008. West County Airports Background Data. Exhibit CH-6, *Compatibility Factors Map.* September 2008.

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 General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone, and ALUC review and approval. Impacts would be less than significant.

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) 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?

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.[10] 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.

12(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?

Determination: No Impact.

Refer to **Impact 12(a),** above. No mineral resources are anticipated within the project area. No impact would occur.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

[10] California Department of Conservation. 2014. 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/.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

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 *Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Noise Impact Analysis* (Noise Impact Analysis) prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. and dated November 17, 2020, provided as **Appendix 13** of this IS/MND. Refer to the Noise Impact Analysis for a complete discussion regarding noise metrics and vibration fundamentals.

Multiple regulations pertaining to noise apply to the project including the following, which are described in detail in the Noise Impact Analysis:

- Federal Noise Control Act of 1972: Issued by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Noise Abatement and Control and establishes programs and guidelines to identify and address the effects of noise on public health, welfare, and the environment.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research Noise Element Guidelines: Includes recommended exterior and interior noise level standards for local jurisdictions to identify and prevent the creation of incompatible land uses due to noise.
- City of Eastvale General Plan Noise Element contains multiple policies relative to noise impacts that are applicable to the project.
- The City of Eastvale Municipal Code Section 8.52.020, *Exemptions,* and Section 8.52.040, *General sound level standards,* are applicable to the project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing Ambient Noise Measurements

Existing ambient noise levels in the project area are dominated by the transportation-related noise associated with Archibald Avenue, Chandler Street, and other surrounding roadways. Based on short- and long-term noise measurements that were taken in the project area as part of the Noise Impact Analysis, the existing ambient noise levels are as follows:

- Long-term Noise Measurement 1 (LT1) was taken toward the southern end of the project site near the western property boundary and represents noise levels at the single-family detached dwelling unit immediately west of the project site. Hourly noise levels at location LT1 ranged from 53.9 to 61.6 dBA Leq during the daytime hours and between 47.4 to 56.6 dBA Leq during the nighttime hours. The energy (logarithmic) average daytime noise level was calculated at 57 dBA Leq with an average nighttime noise level of 51.7 dBA Leq. The calculated CNEL is 56.4 dBA.

- Short-term Noise Measurement 1 (STNM1) was taken to the west of the project site and is representative of the single-family detached residential dwelling unit adjacent to the west of the project site. The short-term ambient noise level at this location was measured at 52.5 dBA Leq.

- Short-term Noise Measurement 2 (STNM2) was taken in the single-family residential neighborhood to the south of the project site and is representative of the single-family detached residential dwelling units located south of the project site across Chandler Street. The short-term ambient noise level at this location was measured at 47.3 dBA Leq.

- Short-term Noise Measurement 3 (STNM3) was taken in the single-family residential neighborhood to the east of the project site and is representative of the single-family detached residential dwelling units located east of the project site across Archibald Avenue. The short-term ambient noise level at this location was measured at 65.7 dBA Leq.

- Short-term Noise Measurement 4 (STNM4) was taken in the single-family residential neighborhood to the north of the project site and is representative of the single-family detached residential dwelling units located north of the project site. The short-term ambient noise level at this location was measured at 44.9 dBA Leq.

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, historical 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.

There are five sensitive receivers located near the project site including existing residential homes, described in the Noise Impact Analysis as receptor numbers R1, R2, R3, R4, and R5. The closest sensitive receiver location is represented by R4, which is located on a residential property adjacent to the project site. Other sensitive land uses in the project study area that are located at greater distances than those identified in this noise study would experience lower noise levels due to the additional attenuation from distance and the shielding of intervening structures. Refer to the Noise Impact Analysis for the specific locations of the sensitive receptors.

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.

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

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

Notes: 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

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

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

Notes: 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

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
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
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

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

SHORT-TERM CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Project-generated construction 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.

Construction activities for the proposed project are anticipated to occur in the following stages:

- Grading

- Building Construction
- Paving
- Architectural Coating

Roadway construction noise model noise reference levels and usage factors are shown in ***Table 13.5: Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Typical Construction Equipment***. The list shown in ***Table 13.5*** is extensive, and not all equipment listed is expected to be used on the project site.

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
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

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor[1]	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
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
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

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

Notes:

Lmax = maximum noise levels; dBA = A-weighted decibel

(1) 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.

Construction noise sources are regulated in the City of Eastvale Municipal Code Section 8.52.020 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.

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 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 pursuant to 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).

Table 13.6: Unmitigated Construction Equipment Noise Level Summary provides a summary of unmitigated noise levels from each stage of construction at each of the sensitive receiver locations. ***Table 13.6*** shows that unmitigated project construction noise levels are not anticipated to exceed the 85 dBA Leq noise criteria. Unmitigated temporary noise level increases that would be experienced at sensitive receiver locations when project construction noise is added to the ambient daytime conditions are presented in ***Table 13.7: Unmitigated Construction Noise Level Compliance***. As shown in ***Table 13.7***, the project would contribute unmitigated, worst-case construction noise level increases between 6.1 to 24.8 dBA Leq at the adjacent sensitive receiver locations during the daytime hours. Therefore, mitigation is required.

Table 13.6: Unmitigated Construction Equipment Noise Level Summary

Receiver Location	Unmitigated Construction Noise Levels (dBa Leq)				
	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating	Highest Construction Noise Level[1]
R1	68.4	67.0	64.8	57.9	68.4
R2	70.6	69.1	67.0	60.0	70.6
R3	70.4	68.9	66.7	59.8	70.4
R4	77.3	75.9	73.7	66.8	77.3
R5	68.1	66.6	64.5	57.5	68.1

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 30.

Notes:

(1) Estimated construction noise levels during peak operating conditions.

Table 13.7: Unmitigated Construction Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location	Highest Construction Noise Level[1]	Measurement Location	Threshold[2]	Threshold Exceeded?	Reference Ambient Noise Level[3]	Combined Project and Ambient[4]	Temporary Worst-Case Project Contribution[5]	Threshold Exceeded[6]
R1	68.4	STNM4	85.0	No	44.9	68.4	23.5	Yes
R2	70.6	STNM3	85.0	No	65.7	71.8	6.1	No
R3	70.4	STNM3	85.0	No	65.7	71.7	6.0	No
R4	77.3	STNM1	85.0	No	52.5	77.3	24.8	Yes
R5	68.1	STNM2	85.0	No	47.3	68.1	20.8	Yes

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 31.

Notes:

(1) Highest modeled construction noise level from all construction phases as shown in Table 13.6.

(2) Construction noise threshold per the Criteria for Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure prepared by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

(3)Measured average daytime ambient noise level (Leq) from Table 8 of the Noise Impact Analysis.

(4)Represents the combined ambient conditions plus the project construction activities.

(5)The temporary noise level increase expected with addition of the unmitigated proposed project construction activities.

(6)Based on the 12 dBA temporary increase significance criteria identified above.

Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through **NOI-4**, below, would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigated construction noise levels are shown in ***Table 13.8: Mitigated Construction Equipment Noise Level Summary*** and mitigated construction noise level compliance is shown in ***Table 13.9: Mitigated Construction Noise Level Compliance***. As shown, the project would contribute mitigated, worst-case construction noise level increases between 0.7 and 11.8 dBA Leq. Therefore, project construction source noise level increases would not exceed 12 dBA Leq with incorporation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** through **NOI-4**. All construction would be conducted during the hours allowed in the Municipal Code and therefore would be consistent with the applicable plans and policies. 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.

Table 13.8: Mitigated Construction Equipment Noise Level Summary

Receiver Location[1]	Mitigated Construction Noise Levels (dBa Leq)				
	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating	Highest Construction Noise Level[2]
R1	56.4	55.0	52.8	45.9	56.4
R2	58.6	57.1	55.0	48.0	58.6
R3	58.4	56.9	54.7	47.8	58.4
R4[3]	57.3	55.9	53.7	46.8	57.3
R5	56.1	54.6	52.5	45.5	56.1

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 32.

Notes:

(1) Mitigation requiring that all construction equipment include mufflers and/or enclosures or acoustical tents (as appropriate) that provide at least 12 dB of noise reduction.

(2) Estimated construction noise levels during peak operating conditions.

(3) Mitigation requiring a 10-foot wall to be constructed along the western property line adjacent to R4 before beginning all other construction activities (the 10-foot wall in this location is required for operation of the project). The wall will reduce noise levels by approximately 20 dB.

Table 13.9: Mitigated Construction Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location	Highest Construction Noise Level[1]	Measurement Location	Threshold[2]	Threshold Exceeded?	Reference Ambient Noise Level[3]	Combined Project and Ambient[4]	Temporary Worst-Case Project Contribution[5]	Threshold Exceeded[6]
R1	56.4	STNM4	85.0	No	44.9	56.7	11.8	No
R2	58.6	STNM3	85.0	No	65.7	66.5	0.8	No
R3	58.4	STNM3	85.0	No	65.7	66.4	0.7	No
R4	57.3	STNM1	85.0	No	52.5	58.5	6.0	No
R5	56.1	STNM2	85.0	No	47.3	56.6	9.3	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 33.

Notes:

(1) Highest modeled construction noise level from all construction phases as shown in Table 13.8 with mitigation measures implemented.

(2) Construction noise threshold per the Criteria for Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure prepared by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

(3) Measured average daytime ambient noise level (Leq) from Table 8 of the Noise Impact Analysis.

(4) Represents the combined ambient conditions plus the project construction activities.

(5) The temporary noise level increase expected with addition of the mitigated proposed project construction activities.

(6) Based on the 12 dBA temporary increase significance criteria identified above.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** through **NOI-4**, General Plan Policy N-24, and compliance with the City's restrictions on the hours allowed for construction activities would reduce construction noise levels to a less than significant level.

LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL IMPACTS

Off-Site Transportation Noise Impacts

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 13.10: Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of the Project (dBA CNEL)***, project-generated vehicle trips are projected to result in increases in the existing ambient noise level of less than 1.5 dB for all modeled roadway segments other than the roadway segment of Grapewin Street east of Archibald Avenue. Grapewin Street east of Archibald Avenue has a projected increase of 3.0 dB; however, the modeled Existing with Project noise level is 52.3 dBA CNEL for this roadway segment, which is substantially lower than the lowest significance criteria of 60 dBA.

Table 13.10: Change in Existing Noise Levels Along Roadways as a Result of Project (dBA CNEL)

Roadway	Segment	Distance from Roadway Centerline to Nearest Receptor	Modeled Noise Levels (dBA CNEL)				
			Existing Without Project	Existing With Project	Change in Noise Level	Exceeds Standards	Increase of 3 dB or more
Archibald Avenue	North of Smith River Road/ Eastvale Parkway	65	75.6	75.8	0.2	Yes	No
	South of Smith River Road/ Eastvale Parkway	65	75.3	75.6	0.3	Yes	No
	North of Chandler Street	65	75.3	75.6	0.3	Yes	No
	Chandler Street to Wind River Road/Grapewin Street	65	76.1	76.3	0.3	Yes	No
	South of Wind River Road/ Grapewin Street	45	77.1	77.3	0.2	Yes	No
Smith River Road	West of Archibald Avenue	42	56.0	56.7	0.7	No	No
Eastvale Parkway	East of Archibald Avenue	50	59.4	59.7	0.3	No	No
Chandler Street	West of Archibald Avenue	52	71.1	72.4	1.3	Yes	No
	East of Archibald Avenue	42	69.7	70.2	0.5	Yes	No
Wind River Road	West of Archibald Avenue	40	56.8	57.5	0.6	No	No
Grapewin Street	East of Archibald Avenue	15	49.3	52.3	3.0	No	Yes

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 14.

Notes:

(1) Distance calculated from the centerline of the roadway segment to the property line of the nearest adjacent land use. Distances estimated through the use of Google Earth.

Based on the significance criteria described above, the project-related noise level increases are considered less than significant.

Noise Impacts to Off-Site Receptors Due to On-Site Operational Noise

Compliance with General Plan Stationary Noise Standards

Significant impacts related to project operations would occur if project-related operational (stationary-source) noise levels:

- exceed the exterior 60 dBA Leq daytime or 50 dBA Leq nighttime noise level standards at nearby sensitive receiver locations (City of Eastvale General Plan Noise Element, Table N-4, described above and shown as Table 13.2).

Unmitigated noise levels associated with project operational noise sources are expected to range from 43.0 to 50.0 dBA Leq at sensitive off-site receiver locations R1 to R5, including backyard, first floor, and second floor building façades. Project operational noise is not expected to exceed daytime or nighttime noise standards. This impact is less than significant.

CEQA - Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Significant impacts related to project operations would occur if the existing ambient noise levels at the noise-sensitive receivers near the project site:

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

As shown in ***Table 13.11: Project Operational Noise Levels***, operation of the project would result in increases in ambient noise levels of up to 3.3 dB but would not result in violation of any of the above thresholds due to relatively quiet ambient noise levels.

Table 13.11: Project Operational Noise Levels

Receiver Location			Highest Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Noise Level Standard (dBA Leq)[1]		Threshold Exceeded?[2]	
ID	Modeled	Location		Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
R1	1	Backyard	48.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R2	3		48.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R3	6		46.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R4	10		51.0	60.0	50.0	No	Yes
R5	8		47.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R1	2-1	First-Floor Building Façade	45.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R2	4-1		45.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R3	5-1		45.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R4	9		50.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R5	7-1		45.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R1	2-2	Second-Floor Building Façade	46.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R2	4-2		46.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R3	5-2		46.0	60.0	50.0	No	No
R4	n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Receiver Location			Highest Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Noise Level Standard (dBA Leq)[1]		Threshold Exceeded?[2]	
ID	Modeled	Location		Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
R5	7-2		46.0	60.0	50.0	No	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 18.

Notes:

(1) Exterior noise level standards from the City of Eastvale General Plan Noise Element, Table N-4

(2) Do the estimated project operational noise source activities exceed the noise level threshold?

(3) R4 represents a single-story single-family detached residential dwelling unit.

Based on the significance criteria described above, impacts relative to project operational noise would be less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. It is expected that ground-borne vibration from project construction activities would cause only intermittent, localized intrusion. The proposed project's construction activities most likely to cause vibration impacts are:

- Heavy Construction Equipment: Although all heavy mobile construction equipment has the potential of causing at least some perceptible vibration while operating close to buildings, the vibration is usually short term and is not of sufficient magnitude to cause building damage.
- Trucks: Trucks hauling building materials to construction sites can be sources of vibration intrusion if the haul routes pass through residential neighborhoods on streets with bumps or potholes. Repairing the bumps and potholes generally eliminates the problem.

Ground-borne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring within the project site were estimated by data published by the FTA. Construction activities that would have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration within the project site include grading. Project vibration impacts were estimated based on the methodology described in the Noise Impact Analysis. ***Table 13.12: Unmitigated Construction Equipment Vibration Levels*** presents the unmitigated project construction-related vibration levels at each of the sensitive receiver locations.

Based on the reference vibration levels provided by the FTA, a large bulldozer represents the peak source of vibration with a reference velocity of 0.089 in/sec PPV at 25 feet. At distances ranging from 10 to 150 feet from the project construction activities, construction vibration velocity levels are expected to range from 0.000 to 0.352 in/sec PPV. Based on the City of Eastvale vibration standard of 0.0787 in/sec PPV, the proposed project construction activities would generate unmitigated vibration levels which remain below the 0.0787 in/sec PPV threshold at R1, R2, R3, and R5; however, due to the proximity to the western property line, R4 could have potentially significant impacts. Therefore, to satisfy the City of Eastvale vibration standard of 0.0787 in/sec PPV, **Mitigation Measure NOI-5** restricts the use of jackhammers within 15 feet,

loaded trucks within 25 feet, and large bulldozers within 28 feet of the residential structure located at the western project boundary (R4).

Table 13.12: Unmitigated Construction Equipment Vibration Levels

Receiver Location	Distance to Construction Activity (feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)1					Threshold Exceeded?2
		Small Dozer	Jackhammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Highest Levels (PPV)	
R1	125	0.000	0.003	0.007	0.008	0.008	No
R2	135	0.000	0.003	0.006	0.007	0.007	No
R3	150	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.006	0.006	No
R4	10	0.012	0.138	0.300	0.352	0.352	Yes
R5	140	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.007	0.007	No

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 34.

Notes:

(1) Based on the vibration source levels of construction equipment included in Table 13.5.

(2) Does the peak vibration exceed the maximum acceptable vibration threshold of 0.0787 PPV in/sec per the City of Eastvale General Plan Noise Element, Policy N-3?

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-5** would reduce groundborne vibration levels to a less than significant level.

Table 13.13: Mitigated Construction Equipment Vibration Levels, presents the mitigated project construction-related vibration levels at each of the sensitive receiver locations.

Table 13.13: Mitigation Construction Equipment Vibration Levels

Receiver Location1	Distance to Construction Activity (feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold Exceeded?2
		Small Dozer	Jackhammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Highest Levels (PPV)	
R1	125	0.000	0.003	0.007	0.008	0.008	No
R2	135	0.000	0.003	0.006	0.007	0.007	No
R3	150	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.006	0.006	No
R4	10[3]	0.012	0.075	0.076	0.075	0.076	No
R5	140	0.000	0.003	0.006	0.007	0.007	No

Notes:

Source: Ganddini Group, Inc. Noise Impact Analysis, November 17, 2020, Table 35.

(1) Based on the vibration source levels of construction equipment included in Table 13.5.

(2) Does the peak vibration exceed the maximum acceptable vibration threshold of 0.0787 PPV in/sec per the City of Eastvale General Plan Noise Element, Policy N-3?

(3) With incorporation of mitigation requiring jackhammers to be restricted within 15 feet, loaded trucks to be restricted within 25 feet and large bulldozers to be restricted within 28 feet of R4.

As shown in ***Table 13.13***, with implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-5**, impacts at location R4 would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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 closest airport to the project site is Chino Airport, which is approximately 2.15 miles northwest of the project site boundaries. The project site is not located within 2 miles of a public airport or within an airport land use plan, nor is the project within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As such, the project site would not be exposed to excessive noise levels from airport operations, and 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, *General Sound Level Standards*.

MITIGATION MEASURES

NOI-1 The construction contractor(s) shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

NOI-2 The construction contractor(s) shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment (between the hours of 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM June through September, and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM October through May).

NOI-3 The contractor shall install temporary construction noise barriers/blankets along the western boundary. The barrier/blankets shall be solid with no cracks or holes and shall also reach to the ground.

NOI-4 During all project construction phases on-site, construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with either properly operating and maintained mufflers or enclosures/acoustical tents (as appropriate) that achieve at least 12 dB reduction from applicable noise level specifications.

NOI-5 The contractor shall restrict the use of jackhammers within 15 feet, loaded trucks within 25 feet, and large bulldozers within 28 feet of the residential structure located at the western project boundary.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures NOI-1** through **NOI-5**, impacts relative to noise would be reduced to a less than significant level.

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

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 involves the development of a commercial/retail center on approximately 2.71 acres located on the northwest corner of Chandler Street and Archibald Avenue; the project does not include the construction of new homes.

The project would generate temporary construction and long-term operational employment. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) estimates that employment in the City of Eastvale will increase from 7,400 jobs in 2016 to 21,600 jobs in 2045.[11] Thus, it is expected that the project would absorb workers from the regional labor force and would not attract new workers into the region. Therefore, the project would not directly induce population growth in the area through the introduction of new residents. 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.

There are currently no existing houses on the project site. Therefore, the displacement of existing housing would not occur, and no replacement of housing would be needed. Impacts would be less than significant.

[11] Southern California Association of Governments. 2020. Connect SoCal, RTP/SCS 2020-2045, Demographics and Growth Forecast. Accessed July 8, 2020. https://www.connectsocal.org/Documents/Draft/dConnectSoCal_Demographics-And-Growth-Forecast.pdf.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

None required.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

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?			✓	
	ii) Police protection?			✓	
	iii) Schools?			✓	
	iv) Parks?			✓	
	v) Other public facilities?			✓	

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 the Chandler Fire Station #31 located at 14491 Chandler Street in Eastvale, approximately 0.35 miles west of the project site.

The proposed project would create an increased demand for fire protection services. However, as a commercial/retail development, 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 IV.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, *Development Impact Fee Program,* 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 to the City under contract from the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. Specifically, police protection services for the project area are provided by the Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station located at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Jurupa Valley, approximately 9.5 miles northeast of the project site.

The proposed project would create an increased demand for police protection services. However, as a commercial/retail land use, 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 IV.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 Riverside County Sheriff's 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 neighborhood-servicing commercial/retail land use, 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. 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 IV.14, *Population and Housing*. Additionally, because no new housing is proposed with the project, no additional student generation would occur.

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 involves the development of commercial/retail land uses and does not propose new or physically altered parks or recreational facilities. 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 involves the development of commercial/retail land uses and does not propose new or physically altered public facilities. 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.

2. California Government Code Section 65996 indicates that payment of school impact fees is considered full mitigation for project impacts to a school district.

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

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 IV.15(a)(iv). It is not anticipated that the proposed project would generate a substantial number of new jobs or induce substantial population growth in the city. Thus, the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

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 IV.15(a)(iv). The proposed General Plan Amendment and Change of Zone would not include the construction or expansion of any parks or recreational facilities. As described previously, the proposed project would not increase the demand for parks or other recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

STANDARD CONDITIONS & REQUIREMENTS

1. City of Eastvale Municipal Code Chapter 110.28, *Development Impact Fee Program,* indicates that a project applicant is required to pay the established development impact fees once a development application is submitted to mitigate potential impacts on the Jurupa Community Services District, and in compliance with the Development Impact Fee Program.

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		

The analysis and findings throughout this section are based on the *Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis* (TIA), prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc., dated October 28, 2020, and provided as **Appendix 14** of this IS/MND.

DISCUSSION

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.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 was released on December 28, 2018, to address the determination of significance for transportation impacts. The new guideline requires that the analysis is based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of congestion (such as level of service, or LOS). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(c), this change in analysis is mandated to be used beginning July 1, 2020. Refer to Response IV.17(b) below for the project impacts relative to VMT. However, General Plan Policy C-10 of the Eastvale General Plan requires that the City maintain a LOS C on all City maintained roadways, and a LOS D in employment and commercial areas. Thus, a discussion relative to the project consistency with Policy C-10 has been included.

Study Area

Based on the City-approved scoping agreement for the project, ***Table 17.1, Study Area Intersections and Roadway Segments***, shows the intersections and roadway segments within the City of Eastvale jurisdiction that are included in the traffic impact study area.

Table 17.1: Study Area Intersections and Roadway Segments

		Jurisdiction
Intersections		
1. Project West Access at Chandler Street		City of Eastvale
2. Archibald Avenue at Eastvale Parkway		City of Eastvale
3. Archibald Avenue at Project North Access		City of Eastvale
4. Archibald Avenue at Project South Access		City of Eastvale
5. Archibald Avenue at Chandler Street		City of Eastvale
6. Archibald Avenue at Wind River Road		City of Eastvale
Roadway Segments		
1. Archibald Avenue	Eastvale Parkway to Chandler Street	City of Eastvale
2. Archibald Avenue	Chandler Street to Wind River Road	City of Eastvale
3. Chandler Street	West of Archibald Avenue	City of Eastvale
4. Chandler Street	East of Archibald Avenue	City of Eastvale
Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. P. 1-2.		

Methodology

LOS is used to qualitatively describe the performance of a roadway facility, ranging from LOS A (free-flow conditions) to LOS F (extreme congestion and system failure). Study area intersections within the City are analyzed using the methodology in accordance with the City's *Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines* (May 2020) (City of Eastvale TIA Guidelines). The technique used to assess the performance of an intersection is known as the intersection delay method, based on the procedures contained in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 6th Edition). The methodology considers the traffic volume and distribution of movements, traffic composition, geometric characteristics, and signalization details to calculate the average control delay per vehicle and corresponding LOS. Control delay is defined as the portion of delay attributed to the intersection traffic control (such as a traffic signal or stop sign) and includes initial deceleration, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. The intersection control delay is then correlated to LOS based on the thresholds shown in ***Table 17.2, Intersection LOS Thresholds***, below.

Table 17.2: Intersection LOS Thresholds

Level of Service	Intersection Control Delay (Seconds / Vehicle)	
	Signalized	Unsignalized
A	≤ 10.0	≤ 10.0
B	≤ 10.0 to ≤ 20.0	≤ 10.0 to ≤ 15.0
C	≤ 20.0 to ≤ 35.0	≤ 15.0 to ≤ 25.0
D	≤ 35.0 to ≤ 55.0	≤ 25.0 to ≤ 35.0
E	≤ 55.0 to ≤ 80.0	≤ 35.0 to ≤ 50.0
F	> 80.0	> 50.0

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. P. 6.

The technique used to assess the performance of roadway segments is known as the volume-to-capacity (V/C) analysis, based on the procedures contained in the Highway Capacity Manual. The methodology compares the average daily traffic volume using the roadway segment to the capacity of the roadway segment to calculate the V/C ratio, which is then correlated to a LOS based on the thresholds shown in ***Table 17.3, Roadway Segment LOS Thresholds***, below.

Table 17.3: Roadway Segment LOS Thresholds

Level of Service	Volume/Capacity
A	0.000 - 0.600
B	0.601 - 0.700
C	0.701 - 0.800
D	0.801 - 0.900
E	0.901 - 1.000
F	> 1.0

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. P. 7.

The City's General Plan seeks to maintain LOS C along all City-maintained roads. A peak hour LOS D may be allowed in commercial and employment areas, and at intersections of any combination of major highways, urban arterials, secondary highways, or freeway ramp intersections. The City has established LOS D as the minimum acceptable LOS. Based on General Plan Policy C-10, a project traffic impact is considered significant if the addition of project-generated trips is forecast to cause an intersection to deteriorate from an acceptable LOS (D or better) to an unacceptable LOS (E or F).

Project Trip Generation

The proposed project is forecast to generate a total of approximately 4,871 net new daily trips, including 141 net new trips during the AM peak hour and 179 net new trips during the PM peak hour.

Analysis Scenarios and Results

The following scenarios are analyzed during typical weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing Plus Project Conditions
- Opening Year (2022) Without and With Project Conditions[12]
- Horizon Year (2040) Without and With Project Conditions

Existing Conditions

Regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 15 (I-15) approximately one-half mile to the east. Local north-south circulation is provided by Archibald Avenue, and east-west circulation is provided by Chandler Street. Archibald Avenue is a north-south five-lane divided to six-lane divided roadway, classified as an Urban Arterial (six-lane divided with 152 feet of right-of-way) in the General Plan Circulation Element. Chandler Street is an east-west four-lane divided roadway, classified as an Arterial (four-lane divided with 128 feet of right-of-way) from Archibald Avenue to Harrison Avenue and a Secondary Highway (four-lane undivided with 100 feet of right-of-way) from Archibald Avenue to Harrison Avenue in the General Plan Circulation Element.

Existing sidewalks are currently provided along the roadways adjacent to the project site, except at the location of the project site. There are no existing bike lanes in the project area; however, future bicycle lanes are proposed for both Archibald Avenue and Chandler Street. Existing transit facilities provided by the Riverside Transit Agency in the project vicinity include Transit Route 3 and Route 29, which operate in the City of Eastvale; however, the study area is currently not served.

The study intersection LOS for Existing (Year 2020) conditions are shown in ***Table 17.4, Existing Intersection LOS***. As shown in ***Table 17.4***, the study intersections currently operate within acceptable LOS (D or better) for City of Eastvale intersections.

The study roadway segment volume to capacity and LOS is shown in ***Table 17.5, Existing Roadway Segment Daily Capacity Analysis***. As shown in ***Table 17.5***, the study roadway segments currently operate at an acceptable LOS (D or better) for existing conditions.

Table 17.4: Existing Intersection LOS

ID/Study Intersection	Traffic Control[1]	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]
2. Archibald Avenue at Smith Road/Eastvale Parkway	TS	15.8	B	10.0	A
5. Archibald Avenue at Chandler Street	TS	27.0	C	20.4	C

[12] Opening Year conditions include existing plus ambient growth plus cumulative traffic volumes.

6. Archibald Avenue at Wind River Road/Grapevine Street	TS	15.4	B	5.8	A

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. Table 1, P. 11.

1 = TS = Traffic Signal

2 = Delay is shown in seconds per vehicle. For intersections with traffic signal or all way stop control, overall average intersection delay and LOS are shown.

3 = LOS = Level of Service

Table 17.5: Existing Roadway Segment Daily Capacity Analysis

ID/Roadway	Segment		Classification	Lanes	Capacity[1]	Existing		
	From	To				ADT[2]	V/C[2]	LOS[2]
1. Archibald Avenue	Eastvale Parkway	Chandler Street	Urban Arterial	6D	53,900	19,420	0.43	A
2. Archibald Avenue	Chandler Street	Wind River Road	Urban Arterial	6D	53,900	23,000	0.41	A
3. Chandler Street	West of Archibald Avenue	Archibald Avenue	Arterial	4D	35,900	6,900	0.19	A
4. Chandler Street	Archibald Avenue	East of Archibald Avenue	Secondary Collector	4U	18,000	9,290	0.26	A

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. Table 2, P. 12.

1 = Source: Roadway classifications and maximum average daily traffic volumes (City of Eastvale General Plan Update, Transportation Circulation Element, June 2012)

2 = ADT = Average Daily Traffic; V/C = Volume to Capacity; LOS = Level of Service

Existing Plus Project Conditions

The study intersection LOS for Existing Plus Project conditions are shown in ***Table 17.6, Existing Plus Project Intersection LOS***. As shown in ***Table 17.6***, the study intersections are forecast to operate within acceptable LOS (D or better) during the peak hours for Existing Plus Project conditions. A less than significant impact would occur.

Table 17.6: Existing Plus Project Intersection LOS

ID/Study Intersection	Traffic Control[1]	Existing				Existing Plus Project			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]
1. Project West Driveway at Chandler Street	CSS	--		--		10.1	B	9.7	A
2. Archibald Avenue at Smith Road/Eastvale Parkway	TS	15.8	B	10.0	A	15.9	B	10.2	B
3. Archibald Avenue at Project North Driveway	CSS	--		--		14.5	B	13.6	B
4. Archibald Avenue at Project South Driveway	CSS	--		--		14.8	B	13.9	B
5. Archibald Avenue at Chandler Street	TS	27.0	C	20.4	C	30.1	C	23.2	C
6. Archibald Avenue at Wind River Road/ Grapevine Street	TS	15.4	B	5.8	A	21.1	C	6.0	A

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. Table 5, P. 53.

1 = TS = Traffic Signal; CSS= Cross Street Stop

2 = Existing Delay is shown in seconds per vehicle. For intersections with traffic signal or all way stop control, overall average intersection delay and LOS are shown. For intersections with cross street stop control, LOS is based on average delay of the worst individual lane (or movements sharing a lane).

3 = LOS = Level of Service

Opening Year (2022) Without and With Project Conditions

The study intersection LOS for Opening Year (2022) Without and With Project conditions are shown in ***Table 17.7, Opening Year (2022) Intersection LOS***. As shown in ***Table 17.7***, the study intersections are forecast to operate within acceptable LOS (D or better) during the peak hours for Opening Year (2022) Without and With Project conditions. The proposed project does not exceed the City-established operating requirements for General Plan consistency at the study intersections for Opening Year (2022) With Project conditions. A less than significant impact would occur.

Table 17.7: Opening Year (2022) Intersection LOS

ID/Study Intersection	Traffic Control[1]	Opening Year (2022) Without Project				Opening Year (2022) With Project			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]
1. Project West Driveway at Chandler Street	CSS	--		--		10.3	B	10.1	B
2. Archibald Avenue at Smith Road/Eastvale Parkway	TS	20.7	C	11.9	B	21.5	C	12.1	B
3. Archibald Avenue at Project North Driveway	CSS	--		--		17.2	C	17.5	C
4. Archibald Avenue at Project South Driveway	CSS	--		--		17.5	C	18.0	C
5. Archibald Avenue at Chandler Street	TS	31.9	C	25.8	C	37.9	D	27.8	C
6. Archibald Avenue at Wind River Road/ Grapevine Street	TS	17.4	B	5.8	A	21.0	C	6.1	A

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. Table 6, P. 54.

1 = TS = Traffic Signal; CSS= Cross Street Stop

2 = Existing Delay is shown in seconds per vehicle. For intersections with traffic signal or all way stop control, overall average intersection delay and LOS are shown. For intersections with cross street stop control, LOS is based on average delay of the worst individual lane (or movements sharing a lane).

3 = LOS = Level of Service

Horizon Year (2040) Without and With Project Conditions

The study intersection LOS for Year 2040 Without and With Project conditions are shown in ***Table 17.8, Horizon Year 2040 Intersection LOS***. As shown in ***Table 17.8***, the study intersections are forecast to operate within acceptable LOS (D or better) during the peak hours for Year 2040 Without Project conditions. The proposed project does not exceed the City-established operating requirements for General Plan consistency at the study intersections for Year 2040 With Project conditions with the recommended improvements. A less than significant impact would occur.

Table 17.8: Horizon Year 2040 Intersection LOS

ID/Study Intersection	Traffic Control[1]	Horizon Year (2040) Without Project				Horizon Year (2040) With Project			
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]	Delay[2]	LOS[3]
1. Project West Driveway at Chandler Street	CSS	--		--		10.6	B	10.6	B
2. Archibald Avenue at Smith Road/Eastvale Parkway	TS	21.7	C	14.6	B	21.9	C	20.7	C
3. Archibald Avenue at Project North Driveway	CSS	--		--		17.2	C	23.6	C
4. Archibald Avenue at Project South Driveway	CSS	--		--		17.6	C	24.4	C
5. Archibald Avenue at Chandler Street	TS	32.0	C	31.3	C	39.0	D	36.8	D
6. Archibald Avenue at Wind River Road/ Grapevine Street	TS	16.9	B	6.6	A	22.4	C	6.8	A

Source: Archibald at Chandler Commercial Project Traffic Impact Analysis. 2020. Table 7, P. 55.

1 = TS = Traffic Signal; CSS= Cross Street Stop

2 = Existing Delay is shown in seconds per vehicle. For intersections with traffic signal or all way stop control, overall average intersection delay and LOS are shown. For intersections with cross street stop control, LOS is based on average delay of the worst individual lane (or movements sharing a lane).

3 = LOS = Level of Service

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Changes to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 became effective July 1, 2020, which require all lead agencies to adopt VMT as a replacement for automobile delay-based LOS as the new measure for identifying transportation impacts for land use projects. On June 24, 2020, the City of Eastvale adopted Resolution No. 20-44, which establishes VMT impact thresholds for assessing consistency with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

Resolution No. 20-44 includes screening criteria for certain types of projects that are local-serving in nature or generate a low number of vehicle trips and may be presumed to have a less than significant impact. Such projects include local-serving retail projects, defined as retail developments with less than 50,000 square feet. Local-serving retail projects will generally redistribute shopping trips rather than creating new trips. By adding retail opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving proximity, local-serving retail projects tend to shorten trips and reduce VMT. This is especially true here given that this project is significantly less than 50,000 square feet, proposes uses that are duplicative of uses at the east end of the City limits, and adds neighborhood retail uses which are largely absent from the southwest quadrant of the City.

The proposed project meets the definition of local-serving retail since it consists of retail uses totaling less than 50,000 square feet. Therefore, the proposed project satisfies the project type screening criteria for local-serving retail and, as such, would result in a less than significant VMT impact in accordance with VMT guidelines established by the City of Eastvale.

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.

The proposed project would construct the following improvements to provide project site access:

- Project West Driveway at Chandler Street - #1
    - Install southbound stop control.
    - Construct the southbound approach to consist of one right-turn-only lane.
- Archibald Avenue at Project North Driveway - #3
    - Install eastbound stop control.
    - Construct the eastbound approach to consist of one right-turn only lane.
- Archibald Avenue at Project South Driveway - #4
    - Install eastbound stop control.
    - Construct the eastbound approach to consist of one right-turn-only lane.

The project does not involve any unusual conditions, or hazardous design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses. The TIA recommended improvements would be constructed to be consistent with the identified roadway classifications and respective cross-sections in the City of Eastvale General Plan Circulation and Infrastructure Element. The project driveways and project improvements (i.e., signage, buildings, and landscaping) would be designed in accordance with City standards so that adequate sight distance for drivers entering and exiting the site is maintained. On-site traffic signing and striping would be implemented in conjunction with detailed construction plans for the project site. With implementation of the TIA recommended configuration of the driveways and frontage improvements as part of the project design, a less than significant impact would occur.

17(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.

The access and circulation features on the project site would accommodate emergency ingress and egress. As discussed above, the proposed project would provide three restricted access driveways: two right-turn in/out only driveways at Archibald Avenue and one right-turn in/out only driveway at Chandler Street. The proposed site access improvements would ensure that access is maintained for fire trucks, police units, and ambulance/paramedic vehicles.

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 temporary impacts to 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 comply with state standards set forth in the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and 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

With implementation of **Mitigation Measure TRA-1**, impacts relative to traffic and transportation would be reduced 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?

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 commenced consultation with the appropriate and potentially affected Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO). City staff is consulting with representatives from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation to discuss the project, including mitigation for potential tribal cultural resources. City Staff closed consultation with these tribes during the public review of the draft IS/MND. As noted in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the project site contains limited known cultural resources. To mitigate potential impacts to resources that could be discovered during project construction, **Mitigation Measures TCR-1** through **TCR-4** have been developed in coordination with the tribes, City, and applicant. **Mitigation Measures TCR-1** through **TCR-4** would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels.

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 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;; 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/copies of the agreement(s) 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, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), as an 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 archaeological 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 Registered Professional archaeologist, in consultation with consulting Tribe(s) identified above, 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 and provide the plan to the City for approval. 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.

TCR 4 **TCR-4 Discovery of Human Remains**. If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains. The following procedures as set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (PRC) (Section 5097.98), and the State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) shall then be undertaken:

If human remains or funerary/sacred items are encountered, the archaeological monitor or tribal monitor will halt work within the immediate area and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains, establish an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) boundary to protect the find from impact, and immediately notify the City Archaeologist. Project work outside the established ESA may continue. In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the Riverside County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, s/he shall notify the NAHC in Sacramento within 48 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons

it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures TCR-1** through **TCR-4** 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?			✓	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			✓	
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?			✓	
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?			✓	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	

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

- Telephone – AT&T
- Natural Gas – Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas)

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, 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 stormwater needs are met by the City of Eastvale and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The nearest stormwater facility to the project site is the Chandler Street flood control channel, adjacent to the project boundary to the north. In the event of a storm, water would drain from the project site into underdrain pipes and overflow to a 15-inch collector pipe that drains into the Chandler Street channel at the northwest corner of the site. 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,[13] as described in the City's General Plan. Through a joint powers authority, the JCSD partners with the Chino Desalter Authority, the owner and operator of two water treatment plants (desalters), to treat potable water for the JCSD service area. Each desalter has the current capacity to treat 12 million gallons per day (mgd) of water.

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

JCSD estimates water supply availability for normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry year scenarios from 2020 through 2040 in its 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. For all years and all scenarios, anticipated supply exceeds anticipated demand. ***Table 19-1, JCSD Normal and Single-Dry Year Supply and Demand in Acre-Feet per Year (AFY),*** summarizes supply, demand, and excess supply for the normal and single-dry year.

Table 19.9: JCSD Normal and Single-Dry Year Supply and Demand in Acre-Feet per Year (AFY)

	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Supply	31,993	36,493	40,993	40,993	40,993
Demand	25,477	28,088	30,968	34,151	37,670
Excess Supply	6,516	8,405	10,025	6,842	3,323
Source: Jurupa Community Services District. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Table 7-3.					

The JCSD uses a water demand generation rate of 8,100 gallons per day per gross acre for nonresidential land uses.[14] Using this generation rate, the proposed project would result in an increase in water demand of 21,951 gallons per day, equivalent to approximately 0.067 acre-feet per year (AFY).[15] An increase of 0.067 AFY represents an approximately 0.00017 percent increase in demand in comparison to the current (2020) existing and excess supplies. Therefore, impacts would be 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 Santa Ana 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, issuing water discharge permits, and establishing best management practices. Development of the project site would result in wastewater flows that would be collected and treated at the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority plant, which serves Eastvale.

The proposed project would receive wastewater conveyance services from the JCSD. The JCSD discharges wastewater from this area to the Inland Empire Brine Line (IEBL), which pumps the wastewater to the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD). The JCSD estimates that wastewater treatment plant capacity is currently 9.8 mgd with the ability to expand to 17 mgd. According to

[14] Jurupa Community Services District. 2011 Standards Manual for Water and Sewer Facilities. Accessed July 9, 2020.

[15] Based on 2.71 acres x 8,100 daily gallons per acre = 21,951 gallons daily.

the JCSD Standards Manual, 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 proposed project can be expected to contribute 5,420 gallons of wastewater flow to the IEBL and OCSD treatment plant daily.[16]

Since the project would only result in an increase of wastewater flows equal to 0.055 percent of current JCSD capacity,[17] adequate capacity is available to serve the proposed project. A less than significant impact would occur.

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. No landfills are located in Eastvale; however, solid waste services for the City are provided by the El Sobrante Landfill near the City of Corona, approximately 13 miles southeast of the project site. 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.[18]

For the proposed project, the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide provides an estimated generation rate for commercial uses of 10.53 pounds of waste per employee per day. Assuming an estimated operational number of employees of 190, the project would result in 2,000 pounds of waste daily.[19] Assuming operations seven days per week, the project would contribute 365 tons of waste each year. Considering the capacity of the El Sobrante Landfill, the project would not have a significant impact on local landfill capacity.

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 (Assembly Bill [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-

[16] Based on 2.71 acres x 2,000 daily gallons per acre = 5,420 gallons daily.

[17] Based on 5,420 gallons per day demand ÷ 9,800,000 gallons per day capacity= 0.055.

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

[19] Based on 190 employees X 10.53 pounds of waste.

related efficiency measures. Compliance with these programs would ensure the project's construction-related solid waste impacts are less than significant.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact.

Refer to Response IV.19(d). The project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. As such, the project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A less than significant impact would occur.

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.

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 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer,[20] the project site is not located in a zone designated as Very High Fire Hazard.

Fire protection in Eastvale is provided by the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD), which operates in coordination with CalFire. The RCFD operates two fire stations in Eastvale: Station #27, located approximately 2.1 miles northeast of the project site at 7067 Hamner Avenue, and Station #31, located adjacent and west of the project site at 14491 Chandler Street.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the City of Eastvale Emergency Operations Plan, Riverside County All Hazard Mitigation Plan, and the emergency access requirements of the California Fire Code, which include but are not limited to providing access with adjoining uses and providing suitable access for emergency vehicles. In addition,

[20] CalFire. 2019. Fire and Resource Assessment Program: FHSZ Viewer. Accessed October 28, 2020. https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/

emergency access to the site would be maintained during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

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. In addition, the project site is located within an urbanized area of the city, where the risk of wildland fire is decreased. As such, the proposed project would not be located in a critical fire danger zone or adjacent to wildlands subject to wildfires. Urban levels of fire protection would be provided to the project area. In addition, the project would adhere to building codes and any conditions included through review by the RCFD. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

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 proposed commercial uses on-site would not include any features that would have the potential to exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. The project would provide access to adjoining uses and suitable access for emergency vehicles. Emergency access to the site would be maintained during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

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.

The project site is relatively flat with no major changes in elevations; the average elevation at the site is 577 feet above mean sea level. There are no channels or creeks running through the project site. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. In addition, there are no known landslides at the project site, nor is the site in the path of any known or potential landslides. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to risks involving flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. A less than significant impact would occur.

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 Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

As discussed in Section IV.4, *Biological Resources*, after implementation of **Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2**, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to biological resources. Similarly, as discussed in Section IV.5, *Cultural Resources*, and Section IV.18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, after implementation of **Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, TCR-1, TCR-2, TCR-3**, and **TCR-4** the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to human remains, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources.

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

Determination: Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.

A significant impact may occur if the project, in conjunction with related projects proposed for development in the City, would result in impacts that are less than significant when viewed separately but would be significant when viewed together. When considering the proposed project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the project site, the proposed project does not have the potential to cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. As detailed in the above discussions, the proposed project would not result in any significant and unmitigable impacts in any environmental categories. In all cases, the impacts associated with the project are limited to the project site or are of such a negligible degree that they would not result in a significant contribution to any cumulative impacts.

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. While a number of the proposed project's impacts were identified as having the potential to significantly impact humans, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures herein, and standard requirements, these impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause significant adverse direct or indirect impacts to humans.

This page is intentionally left blank.