DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL
CEQA MEMORANDUM
FORE FOOTHILL & GROVE PROJECT
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2021050261
SITE CODE 402039

February 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

This California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Memorandum has been prepared to address the Department of Toxic Substances' (DTSC) Fore Foothill & Grove Response Plan (Project) and determine whether the Project activities were analyzed by the City of Rancho Cucamonga (City) in their previous CEQA documents described herein. Project activities include soil excavation (approximately 5,000 cubic yards [CY] of soil removal), off-Site soil disposal, installation of a vapor intrusion mitigation system (VIMS), implementation of a land use covenant (LUC), and an operations and maintenance (O&M) Plan and Agreement.

CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum: Pursuant to the provisions of the CEQA, the City, as the Lead CEQA Agency, prepared a CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum (15183 Compliance Memorandum), Michael Baker International, May 2024, to evaluate the environmental effects associated with the Foothill and Grove mixed use project (Mixed Use Project). The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum was prepared pursuant to Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning) based on the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the City's 2021 General Plan Update (GPU), which was certified by the City on December 15, 2021 (State Clearinghouse No. 2021050261). The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum included applicable GPU EIR mitigation measures, regulations, and standard conditions of approval to eliminate or reduce any potentially significant Project impacts to less than significant.

The Mixed Use Project will involve development of 308 residential units, approximately 14,704 square feet of retail space, and approximately 22,610 square feet of leasing and recreational amenities on an approximately 9.86 acre property[1] located at the northeast corner of Foothill Boulevard and Grove Avenue (8112 Foothill Boulevard and 8118 through 9226 Red Hill Country Club Drive)[2] in the City (Site). The Mixed Use Project does not include any subsurface parking spaces, basements, or other occupied subsurface space.

The City Planning Commission unanimously approved the Mixed Use Project, including the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum, on June 12, 2024 (Project Approval). As detailed below, the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum requires the implementation of various standard conditions of approval and Project-specific avoidance and minimization measures for the Mixed Use Project, including the remedial actions addressed in the Response Plan. The City Planning Commission also imposed various other conditions of approval for the Mixed Use

[1] This is the approximate Site acreage excluding right-of-way dedications to the City that will be made in connection with the Property (398,443 sf).

[2] APNs: 207-011-35, -36, -41, -43, -44, & -45.

Project, which pertains to the Response Plan. For example, City Planning Commission condition of Project Approval No. 46 provides:

> If soil contamination is suspected or observed in the Project area, or the Project proposes to import/export soil that is suspected or observed to be contaminated, the applicant shall provide a report evaluating status of the soil to determine if it has been contaminated by oil and gasoline. The potential solutions for addressing any contamination and a timeline for implementing the chosen solution shall be included in the report. If the soil is contaminated, it shall be disposed of properly in accordance with all applicable and relevant laws and regulations.

The Site includes approximately 6.1 acres of land used for agricultural (strawberry) production; while the balance of the Site is used for on-Site operations and equipment storage, including three associated structures: a single-story 1,000 square foot residential building, a 2,000 square foot high-bay barn structure, and a single-story 500 square foot shed structure. The Site has operated as a strawberry farm since the mid-1930s. Prior to that the Site was vacant with no known or established prior uses. The Site is generally surrounded by commercial buildings, single-family residences, and a private golf course.

Environmental investigations conducted at the Site identified concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in soil vapor and heavy metals in shallow soil. Therefore, DTSC approval of a Response Plan for the Site is required prior to commencement of Project construction, including grading activities. The Response Plan proposes remediation, engineering controls, and institutional controls. As explained in more detail in Section III below, remediation will be accomplished with soil excavation, removal, and off-Site disposal. In addition, there will be engineering and institutional controls. Engineering controls include the installation of a VIMS in the applicable on-Site structure. Institutional controls include the use of land use controls (LUC) to place recorded restrictions on the future use of applicable portions of the Site, and an O&M Plan and Agreement between the owner of the Site and DTSC. Project construction workers will also be required to adhere to a Health and Safety Plan meeting Cal/OSHA (Title 8) requirements.

II. PURPOSE OF CEQA MEMORANDUM

The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum provides: "An environmental Response Plan will be prepared by Fore Green and approved by DTSC prior to commencement of grading activities as part of the proposed Project" and "remedial actions for the Project may include, but are not limited to, excavation and off-Site disposal (e.g., air monitoring, dust monitoring and control, traffic impacts and control); soil vapor extraction; other on-Site contamination treatment technologies as applicable; VIMS including long-term O&M, financial assurance, deed restrictions; and administrative controls (e.g., O&M Agreement)."

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the purpose of this CEQA Memorandum is to confirm, for informational purposes, that the remedial actions set forth in the Response Plan are a part of the Mixed Use Project, and to document DTSC's determination that the activities described in the

Response Plan will not result in any significant environmental impacts not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum or a more severe significant environmental impact.

If the Project activities were not being completed as part of the Mixed Use Project, it would have qualified for a Class 30 CEQA exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15330 (Minor Actions to Prevent, Minimize, Stabilize, Mitigate, or Eliminate the Release or Threat of Release of Hazardous Waste or Hazardous Substances), which "consists of any minor cleanup actions taken to prevent, minimize, stabilize, mitigate, or eliminate the release or threat of release of a hazardous waste or substance which are small or medium removal actions consisting of $1 million or less." However, because the activities are occurring concurrently, this Project must be addressed in conjunction with the Mixed Use Project, and a Class 30 exemption is not applicable.

III. PROJECT RESPONSE PLAN

The following is a summary of the required actions in the September 12, 2025 draft Response Plan for the Project, which was prepared by Farallon and is on file with DTSC (Site Code 402039). The Response Plan was prepared in compliance with the California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act (CLRRA) Agreement with DTSC dated March 9, 2023, the Site Assessment Plan approved by DTSC on October 31, 2023, and the Report of Findings approved for the Response Plan by DTSC on December 24, 2024. The "Current Conditions and Protective Remedial Approaches Memorandum" for the Project, which was prepared by Farallon on April 4, 2024, is on file with the City and is attached to this CEQA Memorandum as Attachment A (Remedial Approaches Memorandum).

A. Soil Remediation

Soil sampling revealed that concentrations of lead and arsenic exceed DTSC unrestricted residential soil screening levels in specific areas on the Site. Elevated lead levels were found primarily in the northwestern and northern portions of the Site, while elevated arsenic levels were confined to the upper one foot of soil in a small section of the southwestern parking lot.

Approximately 5,000 CY of soil containing lead or arsenic at concentrations exceeding DTSC unrestricted residential screening levels will be removed from the Site during the planned Project grading. The excavated soil will be disposed of in accordance with local and state requirements to an appropriate landfill that will accept soil with the concentrations of lead and arsenic as found in the soil. Following grading of the Site and confirmation sampling there will be no open exposure pathways to impacted soil.

During soil excavation and soil loading, best management practices will be implemented which consist of dust suppression, dust monitoring, covering the soil in trucks loaded for transport, and preventing vehicles from tracking affected soil off-Site. The Impacted Soil Removal Plan (Section 9.0 of the draft Response Plan) for the Project includes specific procedures for removal, collection, and containment of impacted soil. The Project contractor will be responsible for implementing the Impacted Soil Removal Plan.

B. Health and Safety Plan

A Project specific Health and Safety Plan will also be prepared prior to any soil movement or removal to provide for on-Site worker and community safety during Project construction and any post-construction maintenance activities that may encounter soils.

C. VIMS

Soil sampling revealed that concentrations of VOCs in soil vapor exceed DTSC unrestricted residential soil screening levels for tetrachloroethylene (PCE), which may have originated from an off-Site dry cleaner located approximately 100 feet west of the Site that likely used PCE as a dry-cleaning solvent from 1989 to 2020. Only one of the residential buildings proposed as part of the Project – Building 1 – would be located generally over the soil vapor exceedance. Therefore, the construction and design of Building 1 will incorporate a VIMS that is designed to run in active or passive mode and is planned to start operation in active mode as a subslab depressurization (SSD) system. The SSD system may require an Authority to Construct/Permit to Operate from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The VIMS has a subslab fan/vacuum-assisted venting system and vapor barrier membrane consisting of the following primary components:

- Sand/Gravel layer: This "clean" layer will provide a subslab region of high permeability that is ventilated by vapor-collection piping and ambient air supply.

- Subslab -vent piping/vent risers: Air will be vented from the subslab sand/gravel layer through low-profile, square channel perforated horizontal vapor-collection piping that will exhaust above the building roofline via vent risers.

- Soil vapor probes: Subslab soil vapor sampling probes will be installed in the sand/gravel layer between vapor barriers to allow collection of subslab soil vapor samples (or measurement of differential pressure).

- Vapor-barrier membranes and geotextile fabrics: The vapor-barrier membranes will be installed above the sand/gravel layer and will provide waterproofing protection and vapor-intrusion mitigation by providing a physical barrier to vapor intrusion into the building.

- Fan: A fan will be installed and operated continuously to extract air from the subslab venting piping, creating negative pressure. The negative pressure will induce the flow of fresh air into the sand layer.

- Automatic pressure monitoring components: For SSD operation, the VIMS has automatic pressure monitoring components, including a pressure switch that is connected to the blower inlet, a controller, auto-dialer, and cellular transmitter. The pressure switch will be set to trigger a maintenance condition. If a maintenance condition occurs, the system will automatically notify all designated personnel of that condition.

As detailed in the Response Plan, confirmation sampling will be conducted to confirm the effectiveness of the VIMS and methods will also be implemented to prevent vapor migration through utilities.

D. O&M Plan and Agreement

To ensure long-term stewardship, the parties will enter into an O&M Agreement with DTSC, creating an enforceable agreement establishing the obligation on the part of the owner of the Site to maintain the engineering controls and undertake the other measures established under the O&M Plan. As part of the long-term O&M Plan, ongoing monitoring and maintenance will be implemented to ensure the long-term efficacy of the VIMS, as detailed in the Response Plan.

The O&M Agreement for the Project will create an enforceable agreement establishing the obligation on the part of the owner of the Site to undertake the measures established under the O&M Plan. It is further anticipated that the owner of the Site and DTSC will enter into a financial assurance mechanism which will guarantee the necessary funding is present to implement the obligations specified in the O&M Agreement.

E. LUC

As the Site will be remediated and risks mitigated, but not to unrestricted use, DTSC requires the recordation of a LUC in the form of a Covenant to Restrict Use of Property. The LUC will be limited to residential Building 1 where VOC concentrations in soil vapor require the use of a VIMS to allow for residential occupancy and the non-residential buildings (leasing, recreation, and retail buildings) where VOC concentrations in soil vapor limit building use to commercial/industrial activities. As detailed in the Response Plan, the LUC will impose restrictions related to disturbing the remedy and monitoring systems without approval, excavation, soil disturbance, subsurface work, and groundwater extraction.

IV. CEQA ANALYSIS

As noted above, the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum provides: "An environmental Response Plan will be prepared by Fore Green and approved by DTSC prior to commencement of grading activities as part of the proposed Project" and "remedial actions for the Project may include, but are not limited to, excavation and off-Site disposal (e.g., air monitoring, dust monitoring and control, traffic impacts and control); soil vapor extraction; other on-Site contamination treatment technologies as applicable; vapor intrusion mitigation systems including long-term operation and maintenance, financial assurance, deed restrictions; and administrative controls (e.g., operation and maintenance agreement)."

The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum analyzed the excavation and export of approximately 15,300 CY of soil. This includes the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of soil containing lead or arsenic at concentrations exceeding DTSC unrestricted residential screening levels pursuant to the Response Plan, and all associated activities (e.g. vehicle trips, equipment types, and associated impacts). The following documents which were submitted both to the City and DTSC during Project review confirm that the total 15,300 CY of soil export from excavation for the Project, as assumed and analyzed in the City's

15183 Compliance Memorandum, included the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of contaminated soil in accordance with the Response Plan:

- The Remedial Approaches Memorandum dated April 4, 2024 (Attachment A hereto), which was submitted to the City to provide information necessary to complete the portions of the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum that addressed the remedial work as a part of the Project, refers to the 15,000 CY of export, and cites up to 8,500 CY[3] of impacted soil. (Attachment A, pp. 2 [Proposed Project], 9 [Soil Excavation], 25 [Proposed Development].) For example, the description of the proposed development states that "[a]pproximately 15,000 cubic yards of material is currently estimated to be exported from the Site. This volume of exported material will also include an estimated 8,500 cubic yards of nonhazardous soil containing lead at concentrations exceeding the DTSC residential [screening level] SL of 80 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)." (*Id.* at p. 25.)

- The Farallon Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) dated March 15, 2024, submitted to both DTSC and the City during the pendency of the Project states that "[a]pproximately 15,000 cubic yards of material is currently estimated to be exported from the Site. This volume of exported material will also include an estimated 8,500 cubic yards of nonhazardous soil containing lead at concentrations exceeding the DTSC residential SL of 80 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg)." (Phase II ESA, pp. 2-2.)

- The Report of Findings dated December 09, 2024 and approved for the Response Plan by DTSC on December 24, 2024; the Draft Response Plan dated June 2, 2025 and the Revised Draft Response Plan dated September 12, 2025 all consistently contain some version of the following statement: "As a part of project grading, approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soil containing lead or arsenic at concentrations exceeding DTSC unrestricted residential screening levels is planned to be removed from the Site. The excavated soil will be transported to an appropriately permitted landfill for disposal." (*E.g.,* Revised Draft Response Plan, p. 2-4.)

The activities specified in the Response Plan would be confined to the Project area and would comply with the same regulatory requirements and implement the same components specified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum and conditions of Project Approval that serve to mitigate impacts on the environment.

---

[3] The volume of contaminated soil was originally conservatively estimated to be 8,500 CY of the total export of 15,300 CY, but following further site characterization efforts documented in the Report of Findings and other documents submitted to DTSC, this estimate was reduced to 5,000 CY. Specifically, as documented at Section 9.2.4.2 and Figure 6 of the Revised Draft Response Plan: "The areas to be excavated to address lead concentrations that exceed unrestricted residential screening levels were delineated through soil sampling conducted between 2020 and 2024. Based on this sampling, Farallon estimates that approximately 5,000 cubic yards of soil (including the arsenic-impacted soil) will be removed to achieve mitigation goals (Figure 6)."

Per Farallon and in accordance with the documents described above, the majority of the total export of 15,300 CY of soil for the Project, including the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of contaminated soil, will likely be disposed of to the following locations:

- *California Hazardous Waste (total lead concentrations greater than 1,000 mg/kg and soluble lead concentrations exceeding 5.0 milligrams per liter (mg/L) by Waste Extraction Test (WET)* - Approximately 25 CY will likely be taken to the South Yuma County Landfill in Arizona, or similarly permitted facility.

- *Nonhazardous soil containing total lead at concentrations between 400 and 1,000 mg/kg, soluble lead concentrations below 5.0 mg/L (WET), and arsenic concentrations below 500 mg/kg* – A small amount of the contaminated soil on-Site (approximately 215 CY) will likely be taken to the El Sobrante Landfill at 10910 Dawson Canyon Rd in Corona, California (or similarly permitted facility), which is located approximately 29 miles from the Site.

- *Nonhazardous soil containing lead at concentrations less than 400 mg/kg and arsenic concentrations below 12 mg/kg* – The balance of the contaminated soil on-Site will likely be taken to: Waste Management Azusa at 1211 W. Gladstone Street in Azusa, California (or similarly permitted facility), which is located approximately 21.8 miles from the Site.

- *Clean soil* – The non-contaminated soil export will also likely be taken to Waste Management Azusa,[4] or similarly permitted facility.

As documented in the Remedial Approaches Memorandum: "Except for approximately [25][5] cubic yards of non-Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste associated with the lead-impacted soil, it is anticipated all soil impacted with lead and arsenic requiring management would be excavated and exported for disposal as part of the earthwork required to level the Site to achieve grade. Only a de minimis amount of soil would be removed expressly for remedial purposes. The [25] cubic yards of non-RCRA hazardous waste would be excavated and exported…" (Attachment A, p. 9)

All facilities that will receive export from the Project (other than the de minimus amount of non-RCRA removal noted above) are within the same approximate range of 22-29 miles from the Project Site. All soil types will utilize the same standard dump truck vehicle type for soil export work, whether clean or contaminated. There is no difference in vehicle type or vehicle miles traveled for the clean or contaminated soil removal, and therefore the contaminated soil removal work per the Response Plan was included in the City's impacts analysis for its CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

[4] If another project in the vicinity of the Site needs additional soil for balancing, clean soil could also be exported a shorter distance to these properties for this purpose.

[5] The reference to "5 cubic yards" of soil in Attachment A was made in error. The correct amount is 25 cubic yards. The change in volume was accounted for in the analysis.

In addition, the City's Compliance Memorandum stated that the Project would be constructed as a single phase with a 27-month construction period. Anticipated construction activities include demolition, grading, paving, building construction, and architectural coating. It is anticipated that approximately 45,000 CY of cut and 29,700 CY of fill would be required, resulting in the need for approximately 15,300 CY of imported fill material. Installation of the sand/gravel layer for the VIMS will be included in this phase.

Based on these considerations, for the following impact issue areas there would be no change to the analyses and findings presented in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum and no further review is warranted: Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. In addition, this analysis confirms, for informational purposes, that the Response Plan activities would have no new impacts associated with: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, or Transportation. Therefore, the impacts associated with the activities in the Response Plan for these issue areas would be within the scope of impacts identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum, as described below.

A. Air Quality

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

The Project would not exceed any applicable SCAQMD threshold and thus would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants. Additionally, the Project would incorporate Standard Condition of Approval (COA) 5.3-1 (see below) to reduce construction emissions by using Best Management Practices (BMPs) recommended by SCAQMD and Standard COA 5.3-3 (see below) to reduce fugitive dust emissions using BMPs that exceed SCAQMD Rule 403.

There are no direct or cumulatively considerable impacts of the Project related to cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment status that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

In compliance with the applicable Standard COA 5.3-3 (see below) the Project would implement required SCAQMD dust control techniques (i.e., daily watering) and limitations on construction hours, and exceed SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 – which require watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc. – to reduce concentrations of particulate matter with a diameter of 10 micrometers (μm) or less (PM10) and particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 μm or less (PM2.5). The total PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for criteria pollutants during construction. Standard COA 5.3-4 would not apply to the Project because fugitive dust emissions would not exceed applicable thresholds. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants for

which the region is in non-attainment due to fugitive dust emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment and Worker Vehicle Exhaust

Exhaust emissions from construction activities include emissions associated with the transport of machinery and supplies to and from the Project Site, employee commutes to the Site, emissions produced on-Site as the equipment is used, and emissions from trucks transporting materials to/from the Site. Construction equipment and worker vehicle exhaust emissions (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG], nitrogen oxides [NO_X], carbon monoxide [CO], sulfur dioxide [SO_2], PM10, and PM2.5) would not exceed the established SCAQMD threshold for all criteria pollutants. In compliance with Standard COA 5.3-1 (see below), the Project would incorporate BMPs as recommended by the SCAQMD to help reduce emissions below the applicable threshold. Standard COA 5.3-4 would not apply as the Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment due to exhaust emissions from construction activities and impacts would be less than significant.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

According to the Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos Report (August 2000), serpentinite and ultramafic rocks are not known to occur within the Site. Thus, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Sensitive Receptors

The Project's air emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional criteria air pollutants and Localized Significance Thresholds and CO hotpots would not occur as a result of the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project would not exceed the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards for emissions of ROG, CO, sulfur oxides (SO_X), NO_X, PM10, or PM2.5. It should be noted that the ambient air quality standards are developed and represent levels at which the most susceptible persons (e.g., children and the elderly) are protected. In other words, the ambient air quality standards are purposefully set in a stringent manner to protect children, elderly, and those with existing respiratory problems. As such, the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of Toxic Air Contaminants.

Standard Conditions of Approval

COA 5.3-1: The City shall ensure that discretionary development will incorporate BMPs to reduce emissions to be less than applicable thresholds. These BMPs include but are not limited to the most recent SCAQMD recommendations for construction BMPs (per the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) (Connect SoCal), or as otherwise identified by SCAQMD.

COA 5.3-3: The City shall ensure that discretionary development that will generate fugitive dust emissions during construction activities will, to the extent feasible, incorporate BMPs that exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403 requirements to reduce emissions to be less than applicable thresholds.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's air quality impacts analysis for its CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

As detailed above, the total 15,300 CY of soil export from excavation for the Project included the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of contaminated soil and associated truck trips for this soil removal work. Installation of the VIMS will be conducted as part of the grading and building construction.

As documented in the Remedial Approaches Memorandum: "Except for approximately [25] cubic yards of non-Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste associated with the lead-impacted soil, it is anticipated all soil impacted with lead and arsenic requiring management would be excavated and exported for disposal as part of the earthwork required to level the Site to achieve grade. Only a de minimis amount of soil would be removed expressly for remedial purposes. The [25] cubic yards of non-RCRA hazardous waste would be excavated and exported…" (Attachment A, p. 9)

All facilities that will receive export from the Project (other than the de minimus amount of non-RCRA removal noted above) are within the same approximate range of 22-29 miles from the Project Site. All soil types will utilize the same standard dump truck vehicle type for soil export work, whether clean or contaminated. There is no difference in vehicle type or vehicle miles traveled for the clean or contaminated soil removal, and therefore the contaminated soil removal work per the Response Plan was included in the City's air quality impacts analysis for its CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

The Response Plan will also comply with Standard COA 5.3-1 and COA 5.3-3. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

B. Biological Resources

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

The Project would comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), Standard COAs 5.4-1 and 5.4-4 (see below), Project-specific avoidance and minimization measure (AMM) BIO-1 (see below), Rancho Cucamonga Municipal Code Chapter 17.80, and tree removal permit requirements. As such, impacts related to sensitive plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and sensitive communities, wetlands and aquatic resources,

migratory wildlife, policies protecting biological resources, and provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan would be less than significant.

As detailed in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum, there are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to sensitive plant and wildlife species, riparian habitat and sensitive communities, wetlands and aquatic resources, migratory wildlife, policies protecting biological resources, and provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Standard Conditions of Approval

COA 5.4-1: Special status plant and wildlife species have the potential to occur within the proposed GPU Study Area. Any project that involves the removal of habitat must consider if any special status species (e.g., Threatened or Endangered species, CNPS [California Native Plant Society] List 1B and 2 plants, or species protected under Section 15380 of CEQA) are potentially present on the Project Site and if the Project impacts could be considered significant by the City. If potential habitat is present in an area, focused surveys shall be conducted prior to construction activities in order to document the presence or absence of a species on the Project Site. Botanical surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate blooming period for a species. If no special status species are found on the Project Site, no additional action is warranted. If special status species are found, appropriate mitigation would be required in coordination with the City, consistent with its performance criteria of mitigating lost habitat at a ratio no less than one to one (one acre restored for every acre impacted).

COA 5.4-4: To avoid conflicts with the MBTA and Bald/Golden Eagle Protection Act, construction activities involving vegetation removal shall be conducted between September 16 and March 14. If construction occurs inside the peak nesting season (between March 15 and September 15), a preconstruction survey (or possibly multiple surveys) by a qualified biologist is recommended prior to construction activities to identify any active nesting locations. If the biologist does not find any active nests within the Site, the construction work shall be allowed to proceed. If the biologist finds an active nest within the Site and determines that the nest may be impacted, the biologist shall delineate an appropriate buffer zone around the nest; the size of the buffer zone shall depend on the affected species and the type of construction activity. Any active nests observed during the survey shall be mapped on an aerial photograph. Only construction activities (if any) that have been approved by a biological monitor shall take place within the buffer zone until the nest is vacated. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor when construction activities take place near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests occur. Results of the pre-construction survey and any subsequent monitoring shall be provided to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the City.

Project-Specific AMM

AMM BIO-1: As a condition of grading permit issuance, two pre-construction surveys for resident burrowing owls shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. The first survey shall occur between 14 and 30 days prior to commencement of grading and construction activities, with the second survey occurring 24 hours prior to any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities. If ground disturbing activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the preconstruction surveys, the site shall be resurveyed for burrowing owls as indicated above. The pre-construction survey and any relocation activity shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements of CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. In the event that burrowing owl is determined to be present, or in the event that an assumption is made that the burrowing owl occurs on-Site, a burrowing owl management plan shall be prepared and implemented in coordination with the City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department and the CDFW that shall detail the relocation of owls from the project site, passively and/or actively. A copy of the results of the pre-construction survey (and all additional surveys), as well as copies of the Burrowing Owl Management Plan, if required, shall be provided to the City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department for review and approval (in the case of the Burrowing Owl Management Plan) prior to any vegetation clearing and ground disturbance activities.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's biological resources impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum. The Response Plan will also comply with Standard COA 5.4.-1, COA 5.4-4, AMM BIO-1, the MBTA, CFGC, City Municipal Code Chapter 17.80, and tree removal permit requirements. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

C. Energy

The following analysis pertains to construction-related energy consumption, which is relevant to the Response Plan.

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

There are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

During construction, the Project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass. It is noted that construction fuel use is temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. There are no unusual Project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at

comparable construction sites in the region or State (CEQA Appendix F – Criterion 5). Therefore, construction fuel consumption would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar development projects of this nature. Therefore, the Project would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during Project construction, or preempt future energy development or future energy conservation.

Consistent with the findings of the GPU EIR, Project construction and operations would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Further, the energy demands of the Project can be accommodated within the context of available resources and energy delivery systems. The Project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. The Project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservations goals within the State of California. The proposed development would not result in a substantial increase in electricity, natural gas, and fuel consumption compared to the Countywide consumption (refer to [15183 Compliance Memorandum] Table 4.6-1) or compared to what was anticipated and analyzed in the 2021 GPU. Thus, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the excavation and installation of a VIMS proposed as part of the Response Plan was included in the City's energy impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

D. Geology and Soils

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

There are no direct or cumulatively considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to seismic hazards, soil erosion and topsoil loss, unstable soils, soil expansion, septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system, and paleontological resources or unique geologic features that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Soil Stability

Consistent with the requirements of Standard COAs 5.7-3 and 5.7-6 (see below), a Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the proposed Project. Based on the Geotechnical Investigation, the Site is relatively flat with slopes at around four percent grade towards Foothill Boulevard. As such, the potential for mass movement failures such as landslides, rockfalls, or debris flows is low. The Site is covered with silty sand that ranges from one to eight feet with traces of cobble and boulders. The Site is not subject to liquefaction or landslides. The Geotechnical

Investigation recommends the removal of upwards to five feet below grade through excavation and the insertion of compacted engineered fill which would mitigate potential differential settlement. With adherence to seismic design regulations in accordance with the California Building Code, and implementation of the recommendations included in the design-level geotechnical investigation, impacts related to instability of the Site's geologic materials would be less than significant.

Soil Erosion

Following Project construction, wind and water erosion on the Site would be reduced compared to existing conditions because the Project would introduce landscaping and impervious surfaces. Drainage would be controlled through infrastructure that would facilitate the infiltration of stormwater. Further, the Project-specific stormwater pollution prevention plan ("**SWPPP**") would identify effective BMPs to reduce or eliminate sediment discharge to surface water from storm water and non-storm water discharges. As such, impacts due to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil during long-term operation would be less than significant. Regarding short-term construction impact, the Project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit and would implement the BMPs in the Project-specific SWPPP. Adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403, which requires dust control, would further reduce erosion during the construction phase of the Project. As such, impacts due to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil during short-term construction and operation would be less than significant. Adherence to the requirements noted in the Project's SWPPP would further ensure that potential erosion and sedimentation effects would be less than significant.

Expansive Soils

Soils in the City have a relatively low amount of clay and therefore are not susceptible to expansion. Additionally, the Project would comply with California Building Code design regulations and would incorporate seismic design recommendations included in the design-level geotechnical investigation. Thus, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact associated with expansive soils.

Soil Support

The Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Project would connect to existing sewer facilities and existing treatment facilities. Thus, no impact would occur related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Paleontological Resources/ Unique Geological Features

Based on the Paleontological Assessment prepared for the Project, the Site was not reported to have any known unique geologic features. Therefore, implementation of the Project has no potential to directly or indirectly destroy known unique geologic features. The Paleontological Assessment concluded that the Site has a low sensitivity for paleontological resources due to the distance of the previously recorded fossil localities from the Site, past activates conducted on-Site, and proposed excavation depth (a maximum of 5 feet below the ground surface). Thus, the potential to encounter uncovered paleontological resources would be low. Nevertheless, in the event that previously uncovered paleontological resources are encountered, compliance with the

City's Standard COA 5.7-7. Standard COA 5.7-7 (see below) would require the developer to retain a qualified paleontologist to monitor construction activities and protect any discovered resources if paleontological resources are encountered during construction. With compliance with Standard COA 5.7-7 (see below), Project impacts to paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be less than significant.

Standard Conditions of Approval

COA 5.7-3 A geological report shall be prepared for an individual Project by a qualified engineer or geologist and submitted at the time of application for grading plan check.

COA 5.7-4 The final grading plan, appropriate certifications and compaction reports shall be completed, submitted, and approved by the [City] Building and Safety Official prior to the issuance of building permits.

COA 5.7-5 A separate grading plan check submittal is required for all new construction Projects and for existing buildings where improvements being proposed will generate 50 cubic yards or more of combined cut and fill. The grading plan shall be prepared, stamped, and signed by a California registered Civil Engineer.

COA 5.7-6 A soils report shall be prepared by a qualified engineer licensed by the State of California to perform such work.

COA 5.7-7 If any paleontological resource (i.e., plant or animal fossils) are encountered before or during grading, the developer shall retain a qualified paleontologist to monitor construction activities and take appropriate measures to protect or preserve them for study. The paleontologist shall submit a report of findings that will also provide specific recommendations regarding further mitigation measures (i.e., paleontological monitoring) that may be appropriate. Where mitigation monitoring is appropriate, the program must include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

- Assign a paleontological monitor, trained, and equipped to allow the rapid removal of fossils with minimal construction delay, to the Site full-time during the interval of earth-disturbing activities.

- Should fossils be found within an area being cleared or graded, divert earth-disturbing activities elsewhere until the monitor has completed salvage. If construction personnel make the discovery, the grading contractor should immediately divert construction and notify the monitor of the find.

- Prepare, identify, and curate all recovered fossils for documentation in the summary report and transfer to an appropriate depository (i.e., San Bernardino County Museum).

- Submit summary report to City of Rancho Cucamonga. Transfer collected specimens with a copy to the report to San Bernardino County Museum.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the excavation and installation of a VIMS proposed as part of the Response Plan was included in the City's geology and soils impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

F. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

Project-related GHG emissions would include emissions from construction activities, area sources, mobile sources, and refrigerants, while indirect sources include emission from energy consumption, water demand, and sold waste generation. Annual average construction emissions were amortized over 30 years and included in the emissions inventory to account for GHG emissions from the construction phase of the Project. As explained below, the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum concludes that Project GHG impacts would be less than significant.

The Project's characteristics render it consistent with Statewide, regional, and local climate change mandates, plans, policies, and recommendations. Specifically, the GHG plan consistency analysis provided in [the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum] demonstrates that the Project complies with the regulations and GHG reduction goals, policies, actions, and strategies outlined in the California Air Resources Board 2022 Scoping Plan, SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, City's General Plan, and the City's Climate Action Plan. Consistency with these plans would reduce the impact of the Project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions. Accordingly, the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, regulation, or recommendation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Project GHG impacts would be less than significant. There are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to GHGs that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's GHG emissions impacts analysis for its CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

There are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, accidental release of hazardous materials, hazardous materials near a school, hazardous materials Sites, airport safety hazards and noise, emergency response, and wildland fire risks that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

The proposed Project would result in the implementation of provisions within the CLRRA agreement and the potential associated Site remediation activities, as deemed necessary by DTSC, comply with all applicable federal, State, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous construction-related materials, industry and City design standards, rules, and regulations, San Bernardino County Fire Department Certified Unified Program Agency permit, 2021 GPU goals and policies, the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Emergency Operations Plan, Community Wildfire Protection Plan, and Evacuation Assessment.

Construction Activities

The Project Site is currently occupied by an agricultural use and based on the Phase I ESA prepared for the Project by Apex dated April 15, 2022, the Site has been historically used for agricultural use since the early 1930s. Agricultural activities may include the application of pesticides and herbicides; may involve storage of significant quantities of hazardous materials on-Site; and may include on-Site maintenance, repair, and operation of farm equipment, all of which could result in soil, soil gas, and groundwater contamination. According to the Phase I ESA, limited Phase II Subsurface Investigations were conducted. As documented in the Phase II ESA prepared by Farallon dated March 15, 2024, the results indicated that the levels of pesticide contamination were below the thresholds determined to be acceptable for residential use. Arsenic and lead are also contaminants often found at agricultural Sites and therefore analyzed as part of the Phase II investigation. Arsenic concentrations were found to be within acceptable DTSC concentration levels with the exception of one soil sample taken in the southwest portion of the Site, west of the barn structure. Lead concentrations above acceptable DTSC residential screening levels were found in multiple soil samples taken in the northwestern portion of the Site. Additionally, VOCs, which may be sourced from an off-Site location, were detected at concentrations above applicable screening levels.

Regulatory Compliance Actions

The Project would comply with existing regulations and recommended remediation (as determined applicable by DTSC).

Fore Green Development, LLC, entered into a voluntary agreement under CLRRA to engage DTSC for regulatory oversight on March 9, 2023. In accordance with the CLRRA Agreement executed between Fore Green and DTSC, a Site Assessment Plan was prepared by Farallon, which provides a workplan for proposed additional soil and soil gas sampling at the Site. The

investigations would further delineate lead and arsenic contamination in soil and characterize potential total petroleum hydrocarbons and VOC contamination in soil gas. The Site Assessment Plan does not include an assessment of groundwater conditions based on the known Site history, environmental conditions, and depth of groundwater. Based on the Phase I ESA, depth to groundwater near the Site ranged from 15 to 48 feet based on data from a nearby Site taken in 2002. However, during investigations conducted as part of the Project, perched groundwater was found between 15 and 46 feet on-Site. The Response Plan notes that this may be due to heavy rains experienced in late 2023 and early 2024. Actual depth to groundwater is expected to be much deeper based on data from the Upland Sanitary Landfill. The closest monitoring well for the landfill is approximately 3,800 feet away and groundwater was measured between 424 and 512 feet in 2023[6]. DTSC approved the Site Assessment Plan in a letter dated October 31, 2023, and Phase II assessments were performed with results provided to DTSC in the Report of Findings prepared by Farallon (revised December 9, 2024). DTSC approved the Report of Findings on December 24, 2024. The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum reflects that, based on the environmental sampling conducted as of the date of that memorandum and DTSC guidance in light of the same, remedial actions for the Project may include, but are not limited to, excavation and off-Site disposal (e.g., air monitoring, dust monitoring and control, traffic impacts and control); soil vapor extraction; other on-Site contamination treatment technologies as applicable; VIMS including long-term O&M, financial assurance, deed restrictions; and administrative controls (e.g., O&M Agreement). An environmental Response Plan will be prepared by Fore Green and approved by DTSC prior to commencement of grading activities as part of the proposed Project.

In conclusion, implementation of provisions within the CLRRA agreement and the potential associated Site remediation activities, as deemed necessary by DTSC, would minimize potential impacts pertaining to accidental conditions potentially involving contaminated soils, soil gas, and/or groundwater. Upon compliance with existing regulations, impacts pertaining to a potentially significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction would be less than significant.

Response Plan

The City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum provides: "An environmental Response Plan will be prepared by Fore Green and approved by DTSC prior to commencement of grading activities as part of the proposed Project" and "remedial actions for the Project may include, but are not limited to, excavation and off-Site disposal (e.g., air monitoring, dust monitoring and control, traffic impacts and control); soil vapor extraction; other on-Site contamination treatment technologies as applicable; vapor intrusion mitigation systems including long-term operation and maintenance, financial assurance, deed restrictions; and administrative controls (e.g., operation and maintenance agreement)." Therefore, the Response Plan and activities under the Response

[6] Data from the Upland Landfill, located approximately 3,800 feet northwest of the Site indicated depth to groundwater to be between 424 and 513 feet below ground surface. https://documents.geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/esi/uploads/geo_report/3718672573/L10005341539.PDF

Plan have already been addressed and analyzed in the City's CEQA Section 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's hazards and hazardous materials impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum. As detailed above, the total 15,300 CY of soil export from excavation for the Project included the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of contaminated soil and associated truck trips for this soil removal work. All facilities that will receive export from the Project (other than the de minimus amount of non-RCRA removal noted above) are within the same approximate range of 22-29 miles from the Project Site. All soil types will utilize the same standard dump truck vehicle type for soil export work, whether clean or contaminated. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

Furthermore, the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum provides: "In conclusion, implementation of provisions within the CLRRA agreement and the potential associated Site remediation activities, as deemed necessary by DTSC, would minimize potential impacts pertaining to accidental conditions potentially involving contaminated soils, soil gas, and/or groundwater. Upon compliance with existing regulations, impacts pertaining to a potentially significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction would be less than significant."

The Response Plan is also consistent with the City's related analysis in the GPU EIR, which provides[7]:

- Grading and excavation in infill areas may expose construction workers and the public to known or potentially unknown hazardous materials in the soil or groundwater. As summarized [in the GPU EIR], there are various sites throughout the city that the SWRCB [State Water Resources Control Board] and DTSC have identified containing hazardous materials, which have the potential to pose health hazards. However, contaminated areas on construction sites would be required to be remediated prior to construction activities.
- Under the General Plan Update, the City would encourage and facilitate the adequate and timely cleanup of existing and future contaminated sites and the compatibility of future land uses. Remediation would be required to satisfy the appropriate responsible agency—DTSC, RWQCB [Regional Water Quality Control Board], or the San Bernardino County Fire Department—and would prevent exposure of people and the environment to these hazards.
- Future development in accordance with implementation of the General Plan Update may be impacted by hazardous substance contamination remaining from historical operations on a particular site. However, properties contaminated by hazardous substances are

[7] GPU EIR Section 5.9.

regulated at the federal, state, and local levels and are subject to compliance with stringent laws and regulations for investigation and remediation. Therefore, impacts resulting from buildout of the General Plan Update would be less than significant with the compliance with existing laws and regulations.

The Project complies with all of the foregoing requirements by complying with existing laws and regulations, including the remediation required by DTSC pursuant to the Response Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

H. Noise

The following analysis pertains to construction-related noise and vibration, which is relevant to the Response Plan.

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

Construction Noise

Construction activities generally are temporary and have a short duration, resulting in periodic increases in the ambient noise environment. Construction activities would occur over approximately 27 months and would include the following phases: demolition, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Ground-borne noise and other types of construction-related noise impacts typically occur during the initial demolition and grading phase.

Based on Standard COA 5.13-1 (see below) and [City] Development Code Section 17.66.050 [Noise Standards], construction activities would not occur between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a national holiday. Expanding on Standard COA 5.13-1, as construction activities would occur within 580 feet of residential uses, the Project would be required to show compliance with the noise standards as outlined in [City] Development Code Section 17.66.050.

Project construction activities would exceed the applicable noise standards. As such, the Project would implement Project-specific [avoidance and minimization measure] (AMM) N-1 (see below), which includes restrictions on construction timing to avoid nighttime hours, restrictions on the location of equipment and vehicle use within the construction Site, installing noise mufflers on construction equipment, and use of sound blankets on construction equipment. Implementation of Project-specific AMM N-1 would further reduce noise levels; however, noise levels may still exceed the applicable noise standards. As such, even with the implementation of Project-specific AMM N-1, short-term construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Furthermore, the GPU EIR concluded that construction activities would result in temporary noise increases in the vicinity of the future development under the 2021 GPU, even with compliance with Standard COA 5.13-1 and [City] Development Code Section 17.66.050 and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. No substantial new information shows that Project impacts related to construction noise would be more significant than described in the GPU EIR

because even with compliance with the above described COAs, development standards, and Project-specific AMM, the Project would have a significant and unavoidable noise impact during construction. Therefore, there are no impacts peculiar to the Project Site related to construction noise that would exceed what was previously disclosed in the GPU EIR. Further, there are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project that were not already evaluated in the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Construction Vibration

The nearest structure from the Project Site is the single-family residential building located immediately to the north and east of the Project Site. However, the nearest construction activity would occur at approximately 15 feet from the nearest residential buildings to the north and east due to the proposed setback distances. According to the Standard COA 5.13-5a (see below), construction activities within 500 feet of existing sensitive land uses, the City shall require applicants, at the time of application submittal, to prepare a Project-specific vibration analysis that identifies vibration-reducing measures to ensure the Project construction does not exceed applicable vibration criteria (e.g., Federal Transit Administration [FTA], Caltrans) for the purpose of preventing disturbance to sensitive land uses and structural damage. At the distance of 15 feet, the maximum vibration velocities would be approximately 0.1915 inch-per-second Peak Particle Velocity (PPV), which would not exceed the Caltrans significance threshold for older residential structures (i.e., 0.3 inch-per-second PPV). Furthermore, the City's Municipal Code Section 17.66.070, Vibration, exempts the vibration from temporary construction/activities. Therefore, ground-borne vibration impacts during Project construction is considered temporary and would be less than significant.

Standard Conditions of Approval

COA 5.13-1 For construction activities that do not involve pile driving occurring within 580 feet of residential, schools, churches, or similar uses or within 330 feet of commercial/industrial uses or for construction activities involving pile driving occurring within 1,000 feet of residential, schools, churches, or similar uses, or within 330 feet of commercial/industrial uses, or nighttime construction activities, as defined in Development Code Section 17.66.050, the City shall require that Project applicants prepare a Site-specific construction noise analysis demonstrating compliance with the noise standards of Development Code Section 17.66.050, as determined by the City. The analysis shall be completed prior to Project approval and can be completed as part of the environmental review process for Projects subject to CEQA. Potential Project-specific actions that can feasibly achieve compliance include, but are not limited to, restrictions on construction timing to avoid nighttime hours, restrictions on the location of equipment and vehicle use within the construction Site, installing noise mufflers on construction equipment, use of electric-powered vehicles and equipment, use of sound blankets on construction equipment, and the use of temporary walls or noise barriers to block and deflect noise.

COA 5.13-5a For development involving construction activities within 500 feet of existing sensitive land uses (places where people sleep or buildings containing vibration-sensitive uses), the City shall require applicants, at the time of application submittal, to prepare a Project-specific vibration analysis that identifies vibration-reducing measures to ensure the Project construction

does not exceed applicable vibration criteria (e.g., FTA, Caltrans) for the purpose of preventing disturbance to sensitive land uses and structural damage. The analysis shall include, but is not limited to, the following requirements:

- Ground vibration-producing activities, such as pile driving, shall be limited to the daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and prohibited on Sundays and holidays.

- If pile driving is used, pile holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat a pile.

- Maximize the distance between construction equipment and vibration-sensitive land uses.

- Earthmoving, blasting and ground-impacting activities shall be prohibited from occurring at the same time if simultaneous activity would result in exceedance of vibration criteria.

- Where pile driving is proposed, alternatives to traditional pile driving (e.g., sonic pile driving, jetting, cast-in-place or auger cast piles, non-displacement piles, pile cushioning, torque or hydraulic piles) shall be implemented when the Project cannot otherwise demonstrate vibration levels in compliance with the structural damage threshold.

- Minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures shall be established. Factors to be considered include the specific nature of the vibration producing activity (e.g., type and duration of pile driving), soil conditions, and the fragility/resiliency of the nearby structures. Established setback requirements (100 feet for pile driving, 25 feet for other construction activity) can be revised only if a Project-specific analysis is conducted by a qualified geotechnical engineer or ground vibration specialist that demonstrates, as determined by the City, that the structural damage vibration threshold would not be exceeded.

- Minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration producing activities (e.g., pile driving) for the purpose of preventing negative human response shall be established based on the specific nature of the vibration producing activity (e.g., type and duration of pile driving), soil conditions, and the type of sensitive receptor. Established setback requirements (500 for pile driving, 80 for other construction) can be revised only if a Project-specific ground vibration study demonstrates, as determined by the City, that receptors would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of negative human response vibration threshold levels, depending on the frequency of the event and receiver type.

- All vibration-inducing activity within the established setback distances for preventing structural damage and negative human response shall be monitored and documented to compare recorded ground vibration noise and vibration noise levels at affected sensitive land uses to the applicable vibration threshold values. The results included recorded vibration data shall be submitted to the City.

Project-Specific AMM

AMM N-1 To reduce noise impacts due to construction, the Project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Rancho Cucamonga that the Project complies with the following:

- Construction contracts shall specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, will be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state-required noise attenuation devices.

- A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet, shall be posted at the Project construction Site providing a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints. This sign shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities. In conjunction with this required posting, a noise disturbance coordinator shall be identified to address construction noise concerns received. The coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the disturbance coordinator will notify the City within 24 hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (starting too early, malfunctioning muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the City. All signs posted at the construction Site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator.

- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. No construction activities will occur during nighttime hours.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's noise impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum. The Response Plan will also comply with Standard COA 5.13-1, COA 5.13-5a, AMM N-1, and City Development Code Section 17.66.050 (Noise Standards). The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

I. Transportation

The following analysis pertains to construction-related traffic, which is relevant to the Response Plan. For informational purposes, the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum also concludes that there are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the Project related to Vehicle Miles Traveled ("**VMT**") during Project operation or Project circulation plans.

City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum

There are no direct or cumulatively-considerable impacts of the proposed Project related to geometric hazards, and emergency access that were not already evaluated by the GPU EIR. Therefore, pursuant to Public Resources Code [CEQA] Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, no further environmental review is required.

Geometric Hazards

Construction-related traffic would primarily be associated with delivery of building materials and construction equipment, removal of construction debris, and construction workers commuting to/from the Project Site; construction staging and worker parking would occur on-Site. Trucks would be used to haul soil, equipment, and building materials to and from the Project Site. Pursuant to [City] Municipal Code Section 10.56.010, Unrestricted truck routes, trucks would use designated truck routes including Foothill Boulevard and Grove Avenue, which are unrestricted truck routes. Construction work in the public right-of- way would be conducted in compliance with [City] Municipal Code Section 12.03.040, Permit required, which requires an encroachment permit from the City. The City also requires compliance with applicable standards in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The MUTCD would be used to determine the necessary temporary traffic-control devices in and near construction work areas. Compliance with these City requirements would ensure that obstruction of City streets during construction activities is minimized and that public facilities are returned to their original conditions unless otherwise improved. Therefore, construction activities would not substantially increase hazards resulting in a less than significant impact.

Emergency Access

Construction activity would occur on the Project Site and within roadway right-of-way (e.g., for new ingress/egress access points, curb and gutter, sidewalk, street lighting, undergrounding of existing overhead utilities, signing and striping, angled parking, and pavement rehabilitation). Therefore, the Project may result in temporary obstructions to adjacent sidewalks and travel lanes, which could impact vehicle movement or emergency access. Construction activities would be conducted in compliance with applicable City requirements, and temporary traffic control measures would be implemented in accordance with the MUTCD. This includes coordination and accommodation of the needs of emergency service providers. Thus, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.

Response Plan

Activities proposed in the Response Plan would not result in any new impacts as the construction activities proposed as part of the Response Plan (e.g., soil excavation, removal and transport, and installation of a VIMS) were included in the City's transportation impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

As detailed above, the total 15,300 CY of soil export from excavation for the Project included the excavation and off-Site disposal of approximately 5,000 CY of contaminated soil and associated truck trips for this soil removal work.

As documented in the Remedial Approaches Memorandum: "Except for approximately [25] cubic yards of non-Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste associated with the lead-impacted soil, it is anticipated all soil impacted with lead and arsenic requiring management would be excavated and exported for disposal as part of the earthwork required to level the Site to achieve grade. Only a de minimis amount of soil would be removed expressly for remedial purposes. The [25] cubic yards of non-RCRA hazardous waste would be excavated and exported…" (Attachment A, p. 9)

All facilities that will receive export from the Project (other than the de minimus amount of non-RCRA removal noted above) are within the same approximate range of 22-29 miles from the Project Site. All soil types will utilize the same standard dump truck vehicle type for soil export work, whether clean or contaminated. There is no difference in vehicle type or vehicle miles traveled for the clean or contaminated soil removal, and therefore the contaminated soil removal work per the Response Plan was included in the City's transportation impacts analysis for its 15183 Compliance Memorandum.

The Response Plan will also comply with applicable City requirements, including City Municipal Code Sections 10.56.010 and 12.03.040 and the applicable standards in the MUTCD. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact.

V. CONCLUSION

Pursuant to the foregoing analysis, this CEQA Memorandum confirms, for informational purposes, that the activities proposed in the Response Plan would not alter the impact findings in the City's CEQA Compliance Memorandum for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, or Transportation. The engineering controls proposed in the Response Plan would be installed simultaneously during construction of the Project and would not result in any significant environmental impact not already identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum (pursuant to the GPU EIR) or a more severe significant environmental impact. No additional mitigation measures are required for the Response Plan. Therefore, the impacts for the Response Plan are within the scope of impacts identified in the City's 15183 Compliance Memorandum, and the Compliance Memorandum adequately addressed all impacts of the Project.

A Notice of Determination will be filed with the State of California Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, State Clearinghouse, upon DTSC approval of the Response Plan pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15062.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the statements furnished above present the data and information required for this evaluation to the best of my ability and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

	2/23/2026
Eileen Mananian, Branch Chief Brownfields Enforcement and Military Solutions Branch Site Mitigation and Restoration Program Department of Toxic Substances Control	Date

.