

El Camino Project EIR Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Revised September 24, 2025

1 OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

These Findings of Fact and this Statement of Overriding Considerations are made with respect to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR)(SCH# 2023080369) for the El Camino Project (the “**Project**”) considered by the City Council of the City of Rancho Cucamonga (the “**City**”) relating to the potentially significant environmental effects of the Project.

The following Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations are required by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), California Public Resources Code Section 21081, 21081.5 and 21081.6, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (the “CEQA Guidelines”) Sections 15091 through 15093, for the Project.

This document provides the findings required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and the specific reasons for finding the Project acceptable notwithstanding that the Project results in significant adverse and unavoidable impacts that are infeasible to mitigate. Section 7 of this document addresses these unavoidable adverse impacts through a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

According to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines, “the most common type of EIR examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.” This City Council concludes that the El Camino Project meets the definition of a project under CEQA so the El Camino Project EIR is a project-level EIR as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15161 and contains all the sections and information required in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15120 to 15132.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A private company, Lone Oak – Rancho LLC, is proposing to expand an existing beverage distribution facility. Existing development currently occupies the southern and northern portions of the site (approx. 17.9 acres) while the central portion (a former vineyard) occupies 12.2 acres of the site. The southern portion is developed with a beverage distribution facility and two office buildings. The northern portion of the site contains an existing 62,210-square foot warehouse on approximately 3 acres. The Project applicant is proposing to demolish up to 237,895 square feet of existing buildings and construct up to 1,054,541 square feet of new manufacturing, light industrial, and office uses on the Project site. Building heights will range from 34 to 130 feet and the Project will have a solar energy/battery storage system and a cogeneration system to help reduce energy consumption.

The proposed Project includes two different development options. Phase 1 plus Phase 2A results in 783,741 net square feet of building area of non-residential uses (Industrial and Office), not including a new parking structure which does not generate vehicular trips or house employees. In contrast, Phase 1 plus Phase 2B results in 761,616 square feet of building area, or 22,125 less

square feet than Phase 1 plus Phase 2A. The difference between the two options is that Phase 2A would reuse the existing 62,210 square-foot warehouse building while Phase 2B would demolish the existing warehouse building and construct a new 40,085 square foot light industrial building.

2.1 – PROJECT BACKGROUND

The City of Rancho Cucamonga (City or Lead Agency) has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed El Camino Project (“proposed Project” or “the Project”). The adoption and implementation of the Project is discretionary and defined as a “project” and is subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 1970 (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et. seq.). Accordingly, the City has prepared this environmental impact report (EIR) to assess the short term, long term and cumulative environmental consequences that could result from adoption and implementation of the proposed Project. This report has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines and with the City’s local rules and procedures for implementing CEQA. It was prepared by professional planning consultants under contract to the City. The City is the Lead Agency for the preparation of this EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2023080369), as defined by CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21067, as amended), because it has primary discretionary authority with respect to the adoption and implementation of the proposed Project. The content of this document reflects the independent judgment of the City.

The approach to the analysis presented in this EIR is at a project level because specific development information is available regarding the proposed Project. Each environmental issue is analyzed at a similar project level, starting with a discussion of the existing environmental setting, including physical conditions of the site and surrounding area, pertinent City General Plan goals, and policies and City Municipal Code requirements. Thresholds of significance are then defined and are used to measure the proposed Project’s potential impact to the environment. Thresholds of significance are based on a broad list of questions and impact topics set forth in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the typical CEQA thresholds used by the City.

The impact analysis provided for each the 20 topical areas examines the specific short- and long-term environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed industrial development Project, including compliance with applicable General Plan goals and policies and City Municipal Code requirements. The assessment of impacts focuses on how the impact in question could occur and whether aspects of the proposed Project would reduce or ameliorate such impacts. The presence of sensitive environmental resources, hazards onsite or in the immediate area, and the broad implications of the General Plan relative to the proposed Project are considered in the determination of impact significance. If the analysis indicates that a significant impact could occur, then mitigation measures are specified.

2.2 – PROJECT LOCATION

The 30.1-acre Project site is located in the southern area of the City of Rancho Cucamonga in southwestern San Bernardino County. The Project site is bounded on all sides by public roadways: 7th Street to the north, Utica Avenue to the east, 6th Street to the south, and Haven Avenue to the west. The Project is located approximately 1.8 miles west of the I-15 Freeway and approximately 1.2 miles north of the I-10 Freeway. The Project site is comprised of eight contiguous Assessor Parcels (APNs 209-411-02, -03, -04, -23, -24, -32, -34, and -35).

2.3 – EXISTING CONDITIONS

Regional Setting

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the nation's largest metropolitan planning organization (MPO), representing six counties, 191 cities and more than 19 million residents. SCAG is currently the MPO of six of the ten counties in Southern California, serving Imperial County, Los Angeles County, Orange County, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, and Ventura County.

The SCAG Regional Council adopted the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), now called “Connect SoCal”, in September 2020. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS includes goals and policies applicable to transportation and land use projects.

The City is within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) which is under South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) jurisdiction. The SoCAB includes portions of San Bernardino County, Los Angeles County, and Riverside County, and all of Orange County. The SCAQMD is the entity responsible for mitigating emissions from stationary, mobile and indirect sources. SCAQMD utilizes a sequence of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) that contain rules and regulations directed at attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS).

The entire Southern California region contains many regional and local faults which results in the area being subject to moderate to high levels of groundshaking from earthquakes. The Project site is located in the Upper Santa Ana Valley Basin-Chino Subbasin and Chino Creek Watershed. Runoff out of the mountains to the north can result in areas of localized flooding during heavy storms.

The City of Rancho Cucamonga is within the western part of the San Bernardino Valley on a deep alluvial plain formed by runoff from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. The general area supported agriculture, mainly citrus and vineyards, since the late 1800's but now it is largely urbanized. Past agricultural uses used hazardous chemicals in some locations for pesticides, fungicides, etc.

The mountain foothills to the north and some of the drainages out of the foothills support native vegetation but much of the land has been covered over by development and supports mainly weedy invasive species and wildlife tolerant of human activity. The region has been occupied by Native Americans for thousands of years and grading activities sometimes yield historical and archaeological artifacts.

Surrounding Land Uses

The Project site is surrounded by land designated in the City's General Plan as 21st Century Employment District. Existing land uses in this district include warehousing, commercial, vacant land, medical offices, hospitality uses, and other professional offices. A day care/pre-school is located near the southeast corner of the site, just east of Utica Ave. and just north of 6th Street.

Onsite Conditions

The 30.1-acre Project site is developed with beverage distribution, warehousing, and offices totaling 270,800 square feet. According to the County Assessor's Office website, the Project site is located on eight contiguous parcels: Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 209-411-023, 209-411-024, 209-411-032, 209-411-034, 209-411-035, 209-411-002, 209-411-003, and 209-411-004.

At the time the NOP was issued, the southern three parcels (APNs 209-411-23, 209-411-24, 209-411-34) contained a Distribution Center (DC) facility, two office buildings and support infrastructure with 208,590 square feet of space. The central two parcels (APNs 209-411-32, 209-411-35) are currently vacant. The northern three parcels (APNs 209-411-02, 209-411-03, 209-411-04) located along 7th Street are developed with an existing 62,210 square foot industrial warehouse (total existing building area is 270,800 SF).

The Project site is generally flat and gently slopes from the northwest towards the southeast. Project site elevations range from approximately 1,091 feet above mean sea level (amsl) on the northwest corner down to 1,067 feet amsl on the southeast corner of the Project site with a total elevation difference of approximately 24 feet. The existing building pads and developed parcels have been graded and are generally flat. Ground surface cover of the vacant parcels consists of sparse to moderate native and non-native grasses and shrubs.

The Project site is partially developed with warehouse and office buildings and is surrounded by other industrial and commercial land uses in all directions. The Project site has a General Plan designation of 21st Century Employment District and is within the Mixed Employment 2 (ME2) zone. The Project will not require a general plan amendment or a change of zone. The site also has a former vineyard in the northern half of the Phase 1 property and the entire site has over 200 landscape trees throughout the site including along the north side of the former vineyard.

Site History

For the purposes of this discussion, the southern and central portions of the site (25.5 acres) constitute Phase 1 while the northeasterly portion (4.6 acres) of the site constitutes Phase 2.

Phase 1 Site. The Project site supported agricultural uses in the past, including an orchard in the 1930s and grapevines in the southern and central portions of the site. The existing beverage distribution facility was developed in 1981-1982 in the southern portion of the site and currently supports a beverage distribution facility, but which once included the manufacturing and bottling of beverages, office uses, and drink distribution¹. This facility now includes a warehouse, office, fleet service shop, 126 parking spaces, and landscaping. The main warehouse building was expanded in 1986 and again in 1998. The site of the existing beverage facility is a 9.1-acre parcel (APN 209-411-34). The existing beverage facility office and warehouse occupy a total of 160,020 square feet and has been in operation since its construction in 1981. The two existing office buildings in the southwest corner of the site were constructed in 1990 as a multi-tenant office development and are currently occupied by various office uses. In December 2022 the Project applicant acquired this part of the Project site. These offices occupy APNs 209-411-23 and 209-411-24. At present there is no beverage production or bottling at the facility only warehousing and distribution activities.

Phase 2 Site. The northeastern portion of the site contains the 7th Street warehouse building (i.e., Phase 2 property) which was developed in 1986 on the corner of Utica Avenue and 7th Street (APNs 209-411-02, 209-411-03, and 209-411-04). The 62,210-square foot warehouse was

originally developed as a three-unit concrete tilt-up complex constructed by General Dynamics. Since 1996, this building is currently occupied and has housed a series of unrelated industrial manufacturing uses in the past.

3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Project is intended to implement the goals and policies of the City's General Plan. The purpose of this Project is to implement the vision laid out in the Project objectives. The Project would generally increase the City's production capacity and further fortify the economic base of the City. It would also revitalize a portion of the City with new and renovated industry and production. The Project is proposed to be developed to accomplish the following objectives:

Objective 1: Facilitate the continued operation of the existing distribution facility with expanded operations and employment capacity.

Objective 2: Redevelop an existing industrial site with modern and sustainable facilities, including large-scale buildings, intricate manufacturing processes, and large employment opportunities.

Objective 3: Develop and operate an attractive state-of-the-art manufacturing and distribution facility in the City that meets industry standards to be competitive with similar facilities in the region.

Objective 4: Maximize the efficiency of the existing operations during the expansion process by providing interim manufacturing steps within the same building envelope.

Objective 5: Develop and operate a production and bottling facility that positively contributes to the local economy through new capital investment and the creation of new employment opportunities, including opportunities for highly trained workers.

Objective 6: Develop an industrial and manufacturing facility that is in close proximity to Interstate 10, Interstate 15, and other major transportation arterial roadways, to support the production of consumer goods and the distribution of manufactured goods throughout the region.

Objective 7: Implement a microgrid energy production system via cogeneration at an existing manufacturing site to minimize manufacturing waste and to reduce the demand on existing public services and systems while employing carbon-reducing technologies and reduce the facility's potential climate impact.

4 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

4.1 – LEAD AGENCY, CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA

The entitlement process will require review and approval from the City's Design Review Committee (DRC), the Planning Commission, and the City Council. Due to its size and scale, the Project must implement a Master Plan as an entitlement tool to adopt specific development standards for the Project that vary from the City codes but incorporate various community benefits in exchange for the identified deviations from the City Code requirements. The Project requires the following discretionary actions/approvals:

- Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2023080369)
- Master Plan (DRC2023-00072) - The Project site is presently zoned ME2 Mixed Employment designation with a Corridor Fronting Commercial and Retail Overlay along the Haven Avenue frontage. The Project Master Plan identifies specific exceptions to the zone development standards. It also includes building details, elevations, landscaping and fencing plans, and other design elements. It should be noted the RCMC requires this document and the City is not offering any discretionary reductions in zoning standards.
- Design Review (DRC2023-00067) – The Design Review of the site plan and architectural design for the development of the bottling and distribution facility. The Project is being developed in two Phases which are evaluated in the EIR for potential impacts (Phase 1 and Phase 2). A new Design Review or Minor Design Review application will be required by the City for approval once plans for Phase 2 are completed. The City will review Phase 2 plans for consistency with the environmental analysis of the potential environmental impacts for Phase 2 included in this EIR. This applies to both Phase 2A (reuse of the existing building) as well as Phase 2B (demolition of the existing building and construction of a new building).
- Conditional Use Permit (DRC-2023-00068) – The Project will operate a “Manufacturing, Light-Large” land use as defined in the City’s zoning ordinance and continue operations of “Wholesale and Distribution, Medium” land use in the Mixed Employment 2 (ME2) District. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Wholesale and Distribution has been included for the Project since this use is no longer permitted in the ME2 zone per the City’s updated development standards. Impacts associated with the Project and the CUP (including 1,000 square feet of cold storage space) will be analyzed in the EIR and evaluated in the technical studies.
- Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (original SUB TPM20713 to VTPM20713) – The proposed Vesting Tentative Parcel Map (VTPM) would include a request to consolidate the eight existing parcels and create three new parcels for the Project. The VTPM would create the following three lots: Parcel 1 would be approximately 25.39 acres in size for the new industrial buildings, parking structure and office building; Parcel 2 would be 0.68 acres and would provide a new access from 7th Street to the Project site; and Parcel 3 would be 3.88 acres and would encompass the existing 7th Street warehouse building and parking area. Additionally, three lettered lots would be created for access.
- ~~Tentative Parcel Map (SUB TPM20713) – The proposed Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) would include a request to consolidate the eight existing parcels and create three new parcels for the Project. The TPM would create the following three lots: Parcel 1 would be approximately 25.39 acres in size for the new industrial buildings, parking structure and office building; Parcel 2 would be 0.68 acres and would provide a new access from 7th Street to the Project site; and Parcel 3 would be 3.88 acres and would encompass the existing 7th Street warehouse building and parking area. Additionally, three lettered lots would be created for access.~~

- Uniform Sign Program (DRC 2023-00069) - The proposed Project includes the review of a Uniform Sign Program which governs the design and construction of all planned and future signs.
- Tree Removal Permit (DRC2023-00070) –The Project proposes the removal of a number of trees that require the submittal of a removal permit as the identified trees meet the intent of Section 17.80 of the City’s Development Code.

4.2 – OTHER AGENCIES

Federal Agencies

- None

State and Regional Agencies

- State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water for approval of a domestic water supply permit amendment of a new source and possible treatment changes (Cal. Code Regs. § 64556)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) – Permits for individual pieces of equipment as appropriate.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) – Rule 2305 – New Warehouses
- Cucamonga Valley Water District (new water well permits for construction and operation)
- Connection permits and approvals by various regional utility providers

Local Agencies

- Connection permits and approvals by various local utility providers

5 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists, without limitation, of the following documents:

- Two Notices of Preparation (“NOP”) and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project; in this case dated August 17, 2023 and September 14, 2023;
- All comments submitted by public agencies or members of the public during the two (2) 30-day public comment period for the first NOP that began on August 17, 2023 and ran through September 15, 2023 and the second NOP period that began on September 14, 2023 and ran through October 13, 2023;
- The El Camino Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (sometimes referred to herein as the “DEIR,”) dated April 25, 2025;
- All comments submitted by public agencies or members of the public during the 45-day public comment period for the DEIR that began on April 29, 2025, and ended on June 13, 2025;

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

- The El Camino Project Final Environmental Impact Report (including Response to Comments), dated September 18, 2025;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project which is included as Section 4.0 of the FEIR;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by City decision-makers in connection with the Project, and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, staff reports, maps, exhibits, illustrations, diagrams or other planning materials relating to the Project prepared by the City, or by consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies that were submitted to the City with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's actions on the Project;
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the Project;
- Minutes, as available, of all public meetings and public hearings held by the City in connection with the Project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- Matters of common knowledge within the City, including, but not limited to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The City Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the Project. The Draft EIR, Final EIR, and administrative record for the El Camino Project are available for review upon request at:

City of Rancho Cucamonga
Planning Department
10500 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

6 FINDINGS OF FACT

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project where an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) has been certified that identifies one or more significant impacts on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

With respect to significant effects which were subject to finding (3) above, the public agency must find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

References for discussion of environmental impacts within the Final EIR are noted with each finding. Impact numbers refer to the section number and the threshold letter referenced in the Draft EIR where the full discussion of impacts is included. The Findings of Fact are presented on the following pages.

A. Effects Determined to Have No Impact or a Less than Significant Impact

The evaluation prepared in the El Camino Project EIR found and provided substantial evidence that certain environmental issues related to the El Camino Project would have no impact or have impacts that are less than significant. The City Council agrees with the characterization of the FEIR with respect to all of the El Camino Project impacts identified as resulting in “no impact” or “less than significant” impacts and finds that those impacts have been described and analyzed accurately and are supported by substantial evidence as described in the FEIR, including the Draft EIR. Reference should be made to the DEIR and FEIR for a more complete description of the findings regarding these impacts.

This finding applies to the evaluation of the potential impacts for the following items, as further described in the DEIR, that the project will either have no impact or a less than significant impact.

Aesthetics

- AES-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- AES-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
- AES-3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site/planning area or its surroundings.
- AES-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime.
- AES-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.

Agricultural Resources

- AG-1: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.
- AG-2: Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
- AG-3: Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest (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)).
- AG-4: Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- AG-5: Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- AG-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

Air Quality

- AIR-3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- AIR-4: Result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Biological Resources

- BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- BIO-3: 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.
- BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.
- BIO-7: Cause substantial adverse impacts with respect to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

- CUL-1: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.
- CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5.
- CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.
- CUL-4: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.

Energy

- ENG-1: Significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- ENG-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.
- ENG-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to energy.

Geology and Soils

- GEO-1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - 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. (Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)
 - Strong seismic ground shaking.
 - Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.
 - Landslides.
- GEO-2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- GEO-3: Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- GEO-4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.
- GEO-5: 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.
- GEO-6: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
- GEO-7: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils, including paleontological resources.

Greenhouse Gases

- GHG-2: Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs.

Hazardous and Hazardous Materials

- HAZMAT-1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- HAZMAT-3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

- HAZMAT-4: 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- HAZMAT-6: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- HAZMAT-7: Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.
- HAZMAT-8: Cause substantial cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- HYD-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.
- HYD-2: Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.
- HYD-3: 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; (a) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (b) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite; (c) 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; (d) provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (e) impede or redirect flood flows.
- HYD-4: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.
- HYD-5: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.
- HYD-6: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

- LAND-1: Physically divide an established community;
- LAND-2: 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.
- LAND-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.

Mineral Resources

- MIN-1: 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.
- MIN-2: Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land-use plan.
- MIN-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to mineral resources.

Noise

- NOISE-2: Would the project result in generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

The EIR found that within this impact category, less than significant impacts without mitigation were found for: (1) increase in onsite noise levels (Phase 1 Office and Parking Facilities and Phase 2A/2B 7th Street Warehouse Facility); (2) increase in onsite noise levels (CVWD Well Facility); and (3) increase in offsite traffic noise levels.

- NOISE-3: Would the project generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

The EIR found that within this impact category, less than significant impacts without mitigation were found for: (1) temporary construction vibration levels; and (2) operational vibration levels.

- NOISE-4: 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 area to excessive noise levels.
- NOISE-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to noise or vibration.

Population and Housing

- POP-1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- POP-2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- POP-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to population and housing.

Public Services

- PS-1: 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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
 - Fire protection
 - Police protection
 - Schools
 - Parks
 - Other public facilities.
- PS-2: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to public services.

Recreation

- REC-1: 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.
- REC-2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- REC-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreation facilities.

Transportation

- TRANS-1: Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- TRANS-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- TRANS-4: Result in inadequate emergency access.

Tribal Cultural Resources

- TCR-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to tribal cultural resources.

Utilities and Service Systems

- UTS-1: Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- UTS-2: Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.
- UTS-3: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
- UTS-4: 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.
- UTS-5: Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
- UTS-6 Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to Utilities and Service Systems.

Wildfire

- WIL-1: Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuated plan.
- WIL-2: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- WIL-3: 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.
- WIL-4: 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 Sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- WIL-5: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to wildfire.

In addition, the EIR determined that potential impacts with respect to growth-inducing effects and irreversible environmental changes would be less than significant.

B. Impacts Determined to Be Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

The Final EIR (including the Draft EIR) identifies the following significant environmental impacts associated with the Project. Based on the environmental analysis of the Project and the identification of feasible mitigation measures, potentially significant impacts have been determined by the City to be reduced to a level of less than significant, and the City has found in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) that *“changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigates or avoid the significant effects on the environment.”* The descriptions of the impacts in these findings are summary statements. Mitigation Measures are numbered to correspond to listings in the Draft EIR and Final EIR. Reference should be made to the Draft EIR and Final EIR for a more complete description.

AIR QUALITY

IMPACT AIR-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District 2022 Air Quality Management Plan.

The EIR found that within this impact category, regional construction emissions were found to be potentially significant for VOCs (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and NO_x (Phase 1 only) and thus would conflict with the 2022 AQMP.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.3.5 of the DEIR states the proposed Project is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. Pursuant to the methodology provided in Chapter 12 of the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, consistency with the AQMP is affirmed if the Project: (1) is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP; and (2) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new one. Consistency Criterion 1 refers to the growth forecasts and associated assumptions included in the AQMP. Projects that are consistent with the AQMP growth assumptions would not interfere with attainment of air quality standards, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. The proposed Project is estimated to create approximately 289 net new jobs. This value is within the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS growth projection for the City of Rancho Cucamonga of 420 jobs per year, which is an average rate across almost three decades (2016 to 2045). The employment growth associated with the Project (net 289 jobs) represents less than 2% of the anticipated total employment growth in the City between 2016 and 2045 (16,800 jobs). Therefore, the proposed Project would not exceed the growth assumptions contained in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion 2 refers to AQMP control measures intended to achieve attainment of ambient air quality standards in the South Coast Air Basin. The Project would comply with SCAQMD rules developed as part of the AQMP; however, as described under Impact AIR-2, the proposed Project's mitigated emissions levels are anticipated to exceed SCAQMD NO_x emissions thresholds during Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations and during combined Phase 1 operations and Phase 2B construction. This increase in emissions above recommended thresholds could result in new and/or more frequent or more severe exceedances of regional air quality standards. As such, the proposed Project is determined to have the potential to conflict with the SCAQMD 2022 AQMP due to exceedances of the SCAQMD NO_x daily significance threshold even after mitigation. This impact would be significant and unavoidable even with recommended mitigation measures MM-AIR-2A and MM-AIR-2B shown below (DEIR pages 4.3-49 to 4.3-50).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential VOC and NO_x emissions during project construction:

MM-AIR-2A: Reduce Construction VOC Emissions. To reduce construction-related emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the City shall require the applicant to implement the following measures during all Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction activities:

- 1) Use architectural coatings that meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) "Super Compliant" VOC standard of 10 grams/liter or less for all interior and exterior primer, sealer, paint, and other coating applications for which a super compliant product is commercially available.
 - a) If feasible given contract, logistical, and other construction factors, avoid painting during peak smog season (July, August, and September) if super compliant coatings are not commercially available.
- 2) Keep all coating containers closed when not in use to prevent VOC emissions.
- 3) Keep all paint and solvent laden rags and other materials in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- 4) Clean up water-based paints with water only and when possible do not rinse clean-up water down the drain, onto the ground, or into a storm drain.
- 5) Use SCAQMD compliant Clean Air Solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- 6) Recycle leftover paint.

MM-AIR-2B: Reduce Construction NO_x and PM Exhaust Emissions. To reduce construction-related exhaust emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM), including diesel particulate matter (DPM), the City shall require the applicant to implement the following measures during all Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction activities:

- 1) Connect to existing electrical service to power construction trailers and stationary and portable equipment (e.g., pumps, generators, compressors, and welding sets). This measure shall be subject to the approval of the local electric utility. If it is not feasible to connect to electrical service and/or extend electrical service to all work sites, biodiesel (no more than B20 blend), renewable diesel, or propane shall be used to power stationary and portable equipment provided the use of such fuels is allowed pursuant to manufacturer's specifications. The use of stationary or portable diesel-fueled equipment shall be prohibited in the project area unless electrical service is denied, alternative fuels are not permitted by the manufacturer for the specific equipment in use, and there are no alternative equipment types capable of being powered by alternative fuels that can be used instead of the standard diesel-fueled equipment.
- 2) All construction equipment with a rated power-output of 50 horsepower (hp) or greater shall be certified to meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 Final nonroad diesel engine emissions standards for NO_x and PM₁₀, or be retrofitted with California Air Resources Board (CARB)-verified diesel emissions control strategies capable of reducing exhaust NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions to levels that meet Tier 4 Final emissions standards, unless the applicant submits evidence to the City that specific equipment meeting this requirement is not available on loan, rent, or other terms of use within 200 miles of the City. In this instance, the next highest available emissions tier (e.g., Tier 4 Interim, Tier 3) for the specific equipment in question shall be required.

- 3) Limit idling of diesel-powered construction equipment, vendor delivery trucks, and hauling trucks to no more than two minutes unless manufacturer's specifications specifically require main engine idling is necessary to maintain equipment in good working order.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AIR-2A and MM-AIR-2B, the Project would have less than significant impacts for regional construction emissions of VOCs (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and NO_x (Phase 1 only) and thus would be consistent with the 2022 AQMP (DEIR page 4.3-51)

IMPACT AIR-2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is designated non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

The EIR found that within this impact category, regional construction emissions were found to be potentially significant for VOCs (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and NO_x (Phase 1 only).

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.3.5 of the DEIR states the Phase 1 regional construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended threshold for CO, SO₂, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}, but would exceed the SCAQMD's recommended threshold for VOCs and NO_x, both of which are precursors to O₃. SCAQMD's regional criteria air pollutant threshold for VOC is 75 pounds per day and the threshold for NO_x is 100 pounds per day. The Project's construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD-recommended regional thresholds for VOCs (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and NO_x (Phase 1 only), both of which are precursors to ozone (O₃, a pollutant for which the region is designated nonattainment). This is considered a potentially significant impact. Accordingly, the City shall require the applicant to implement Mitigation Measure AIR-2A, Reduce Construction VOC Emissions, and Mitigation Measure AIR-2B, Reduce Construction NO_x and PM Exhaust Emissions), which would limit the VOC content in the coatings used during construction and require construction equipment to meet stringent U.S. EPA / CARB Tier IV Final emissions standards. These measures would lower maximum daily VOC and NO_x emissions by approximately 67% and 58%, respectively. Mitigation Measures AIR-2A and AIR-2B would reduce the Project's maximum daily regional NO_x emissions to levels below the SCAQMD's thresholds. This impact would be less than significant with mitigation (DEIR pages 4.3-52 to 4.3-53).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential VOC and NO_x emissions during project construction:

MM-AIR-2A: Reduce Construction VOC Emissions. See Impact AIR-1 above.

MM-AIR-2B: Reduce Construction NO_x and PM Exhaust Emissions. See Impact AIR-1 above.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-AIR-2A and MM-AIR-2B, the Project would have less than significant impacts for regional construction emissions of VOCs (Phase 1 and Phase 2) and NO_x (Phase 1 only)(DEIR page 4.3-53).

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

IMPACT BIO-1: 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.4.4 of the DEIR states that no special-status plant species were observed during field investigations conducted at the Project site, so no impacts would occur to these species. Additionally, no special-status wildlife species were observed onsite during field investigations, and it was determined the Project site does not have the potential to support special-status wildlife species that would occur in the area. While not federally- or state-listed as endangered or threatened, the BRA determined the Project site has the potential to support Cooper's hawk, Costa's hummingbird, and California horned lark, as well as burrowing owl. A pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey is recommended prior to Project clearing and grading and is included as Mitigation Measure BIO-1. With implementation of the recommended mitigation, impacts to special-status wildlife species will be less than significant.

Based on the results of the 2023 burrowing owl focused survey, no burrowing owls or evidence of recent or historic use by burrowing owls were observed on the Project site. As a result, burrowing owls are presumed to be absent from the Project site. However, this species can rapidly occupy a vacant site by taking over small mammal burrows. To ensure burrowing owl remain absent from the Project site, the BRA and BFS recommended that a pre-construction clearance survey be conducted in accordance with CDFWs 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation prior to any ground disturbing activities, as is outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-2. If burrowing owls are determined to remain absent from the Project site during the pre-construction clearance survey, no further review will be needed. If burrowing owls are found to occupy the Project site during the pre-construction clearance survey, a burrowing owl relocation plan will be prepared and need to be approved by CDFW prior to construction activities. With implementation of the recommended mitigation, impacts either directly or through habitat modifications, on candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be reduced to less than significant levels (DEIR page 4.4-12).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential impacts to nesting birds and burrowing owl prior to grading:

MM-BIO-1: Nesting Bird Survey. Bird nesting season generally extends from February 1 through August 31 in southern California. To avoid impacts to nesting birds (common and special-status) during the nesting season, a qualified avian biologist will conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey three (3) days prior to project-related disturbance to identify any active nests. If no active nests are found, no further action will be required.

If an active nest is found, the biologist will set appropriate no-work buffers around the nest which will be based upon the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, nesting stage and expected types, intensity and duration of disturbance. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved no-work buffer zone shall be clearly marked in the field, within which no disturbance activity shall commence until the qualified biologist has determined the young birds have successfully fledged and the nest is inactive. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Director.

MM-BIO-2: Burrowing Owl Survey. A pre-construction clearance survey for burrowing owl shall be conducted in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation³ (California Department of Fish and Wildlife 2012) prior to ground disturbance to ensure burrowing owl remain absent from the project site.

If burrowing owls are found to occupy the project site during the pre-construction clearance survey, a burrowing owl relocation plan will need to be prepared and approved by CDFW prior to the commencement of any ground disturbing activities. The burrowing owl relocation plan shall outline recommended methods proposed to relocate the burrowing owls from the project site and provide measures that will be implemented for the maintenance, monitoring, and reporting of the relocated burrowing owls to increase chances of survivorship and better ensure compliance with CDFW guidelines. This plan should be implemented during the non-breeding season, and prior to seasonal rains to promote the best outcome for conservation of the burrowing owl. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Director.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2 prior to grading, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or state/federal regulatory agencies (DEIR page 4.4-13).

IMPACT BIO-4: 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.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.4.4 of the DEIR states that implementation of the proposed Project is not expected to have a significant impact to wildlife movement opportunities or prevent local wildlife movement through the area. The Project site is separated from regional wildlife corridors and linkages by existing development, and there are no riparian corridors or creeks connecting the Project site to these areas. The Project site is also not within any existing connectivity areas or wildlife linkages identified in Figure 5.4-6, Wildlife Movement Linkages Map, of the City General Plan⁴. Therefore, the Project site does not function as a major wildlife movement corridor or linkage. Due to the lack of any identified impacts to wildlife movement, migratory corridors or linkages or native wildlife nurseries, there are no impacts and no mitigation is required.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald/Golden Eagle Protection Act prohibit impacts to native resident or migratory wildlife (i.e., birds and raptors) and this issue was largely addressed in Impact BIO-1 relative to listed or sensitive birds that may utilize or reside on the site. That section determined those impacts were potentially significant and recommended Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 to conduct surveys for nesting birds and burrowing owl on the site just prior to the start of ground disturbance to prevent impacts to those species. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2, the Project will have less than significant impacts relative to migratory species or wildlife corridors under either the Phase 1 plus Phase 2A scenario or under the Phase 1 plus Phase 2B scenario (DEIR page 4.4-15).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential impacts to nesting birds and burrowing owl prior to grading:

MM-BIO-1: Nesting Bird Survey. See Impact BIO-1 above

MM-BIO-2: Burrowing Owl Survey. See Impact BIO-1 above

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-BIO-1 and MM-BIO-2, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to 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 (DEIR page 4.4-15).

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

IMPACT HAZMAT-2: 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.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.9.4 of the DEIR stated that three of the recent Phase I/II ESA documents did not identify any areas of existing contamination on their portions of the Project site (i.e., the two existing office buildings and the vacant property just north of the existing two offices). However, the 2017 Ramboll ESA indicates the existing beverage distribution facility has had a long-documented history involving the storage and use of hazardous materials. Based on available information, the EIR concluded it was at least possible that there may be unanticipated buried materials onsite from construction or operation of past and present onsite uses (i.e., orchard, vineyard, farmhouse, and existing beverage distribution facility). Therefore, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 was recommended to assure that any unanticipated hazardous materials that are found during grading will be identified and properly remediated in a safe and effective manner (DEIR page 4.9-13).

According to the SCAQMD, demolition of older buildings and structures may pose a hazard regarding asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint. It should be noted that Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) and lead based paint (LBP) do not represent a significant public health hazard when they are left undisturbed, however, site development requires demolition of the existing office and warehouse buildings prior to grading. Due to the age of the existing onsite building, the EIR recommended a survey prior to any demolition on the site to determine if or to what degree the existing buildings contain ACMs and/or LBP. In this regard, Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 is recommended to be implemented prior to any demolition activities (DEIR page 4.9-15).

According to the State Water Resources Control Board, there are no leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cleanup sites or disposal sites within the Project site (DEIR page 4.9-15).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential impacts from accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

MM-HAZ-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Hazardous Materials. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase 1 and/or Phase 2, the project proponent shall retain a qualified environmental professional (QEP) experienced with remediating hazardous materials from infill urban

construction sites. The QEP must be on-call and summoned to the site immediately if any potentially hazardous materials are found during grading. Grading must be halted within 100 feet of an area that appears to contain hazardous materials. The QEP will halt grading as necessary to effectively identify the potential contaminated materials, including directing any sampling and laboratory testing that may be required.

If soils are found to be contaminated at levels that are only slightly in excess of applicable residential standards, the QEP shall exercise professional discretion and have the option to coordinate with the grading contractor and developer to either remove contaminated soil and/or mix the contaminated soil with clean soil from either onsite or offsite to dilute any contaminants to below applicable exposure standards for residential development.

Remediated areas must be retested to assure potential contaminant levels are below applicable residential standards. The results of any testing shall be provided to the City or other agencies as appropriate. Any contaminated soil that must be removed from the site shall be done by a licensed contractor and hauled to a landfill approved for such materials. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Department.

MM-HAZ-2: ACMs and LBP Survey. Prior to demolition of any structures on the project site in either Phase 1 or 2, the developer shall retain qualified licensed environmental contractor(s) to survey the existing onsite office and warehouse buildings and any related structures for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and Lead-Based Paints (LBPs). If the survey finds the presence of any ACMs or LBPs on the site, the contractor(s) shall follow all relevant guidance from affected regulatory agencies (e.g., CalEPA, SCAQMD, DTSC, County Health Department, etc.) in terms of safe removal and disposal of the contaminated materials as appropriate. The contractor(s) shall prepare and submit a final report to the City Community Development Department within 30 days after completion of demolition/removal for ACMs and LBPs on the project site.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (DEIR page 4.9-16).

IMPACT HAZMAT-5: For projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.9.4 of the DEIR states that the Project site is located 1.95 miles north of the airport. San Bernardino County has delegated each airport proprietor to create individual Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, rather than establish an Airport Land Use Commission. The Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ONT ALUCP) serves to promote safe compatibility between the airport and the surrounding land uses. As stated previously, the site is zoned as Mixed Employment 2 (ME2), allowing for medium to high intensity professional office or industrial/manufacturing spaces. The Project involves the demolition and new construction of the existing onsite beverage facility to allow for the new production, bottling, and expanded distribution of beverage products. The surrounding land uses of the Project site all include

commercial and industrial developments, and development of the proposed Project will be in compliance with the City's applicable land use designations and zoning.

The Project site will be developed and operated in cooperation with the ONT ALUCP and will not encroach on airport property. The Project site is outside of the ONT Safety Zones and ALUCP noise contour maps and will not expose persons residing or working in the Project area to excessive airport safety hazards or noise.

Map 2-4, Compatibility Policy Map, Airspace Protection Zones, in the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (OIA LUCP) indicates the majority of the Project site is within the maximum 70 foot building height in the High Terrain Zone and a portion of the site is within the maximum 70 foot - 100 foot building height area. The Project proposes several tall buildings on the site (i.e., ASRS is maximum 130 feet and 70 feet average, PC building is maximum 41 feet, and DC is maximum 45 feet). These buildings are approximately 10,000 feet north-northeast of the closest ONT runway. Therefore, the Project will need to obtain clearance from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and comply with its lighting/signage restrictions and warning improvements. These potential restrictions are addressed in Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 below.

The Project applicant initiated and concluded consultation with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Obstruction Evaluation / Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) Group on January 26, 2024, to determine whether the construction or operation of the Project would affect the National Airspace System (NAS). The Project applicant provided site plan, building elevation, and topographical information to the FAA for their review through the FAA OE/AAA online portal. Email and telephone communication continued through June 11, 2024.

The FAA determined that the main building structure would create no hazard on the NAS on April 4, 2024, and conditioned requirements such as no strobe lighting with which the Project will comply as required by MM-HAZ 3 listed below. The Project would require the use of a crane during its construction, which the FAA determined on June 11, 2024, that the crane, as a temporary structure, would have no hazard on the NAS.

As a result, the construction and operation of the Project would not create a hazard on the NAS and a less than significant impact would occur with the implementation of the required lighting restrictions as conditioned by the FAA.

As noted in the existing conditions of the PlanRC General Plan Update, the southern border of the City is located approximately one mile north of the Ontario Airport's 65 dBA CNEL noise contour, and as such, aircraft noise does not significantly impact persons on the site. The proposed Project will adhere to all noise and safety policies as established in the Noise Element of PlanRC, as well as those policies outlined in the ONT ALUCP. With this regulatory compliance, potential impacts related to airport hazards will be less than significant and no mitigation is required (DEIR pages 4.9-19 to 4.9-20).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential impacts related to proximity to airports:

MM-HAZ-3: FAA Lighting Hazards. A minimum of 45 days prior to submittal of an application for a building permit for the project, the applicant shall consult with the City of Rancho Cucamonga Planning Department in order to demonstrate the Project is consistent with FAA lighting or other restrictions or prohibitions which may include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- b. Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.
- c. Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- d. Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.
- e. All retention and water quality basins shall be designed to dewater within 48 hours of a rainfall event.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-3, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to proximity to airports (DEIR page 4.9-20).

NOISE

IMPACT NOISE-1: Would the project generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.

Substantial Evidence:

Section 4.13.4 of the DEIR states the proposed Project's potential construction noise impacts were estimated using the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), Version 1.1, and guidance for conducting general, quantitative construction noise assessments contained in the FTA's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Construction activities from Phase 1 and Phase 2B could exceed the City's 70 dBA construction noise standard for commercial land uses established by Development Code Section 17.66.050. To reduce construction noise levels, the City shall require the applicant to implement Mitigation Measure NOI-1, which would restrict work hours to periods when humans are less sensitive to elevated noise levels in accordance with Development Code requirements, implement construction staging and equipment noise control measures, and require installation of a temporary noise barrier between work areas and affected properties. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce construction noise levels by 5 dBA to 7 dBA at individual receptor locations during the daytime, with the greatest reductions occurring at R07 due to a greater barrier height next to the well site than at other locations. The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would avoid the potential for Project construction noise levels to exceed development code standards (DC Section 17.66.050) which would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise levels and, therefore, results in potential Project construction noise levels that are less than significant with mitigation (DEIR pages 4.13-31 to 4.13-34).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measure to help reduce potential impacts related to construction noise (i.e., substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in excess of local standards):

MM-NOI-1: Reduce Noise Construction Levels. To reduce potential construction noise to levels that are consistent with the City's 70 dBA L_{eq} standard for commercial land uses, the City shall require the applicant and/or its designated contractor, contractor's representatives, or other appropriate personnel to implement the following measures during construction activities:

1. *Restrict Work Hours.* All construction-related work activities, including material deliveries, shall be subject to the requirements of Municipal Code Section 17.66.050(D)(4). Construction activities, including deliveries, shall only occur during the hours of 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM on weekdays and Saturday, and shall not occur on Sunday. The applicant and/or its contractor shall post a sign at all entrances to the construction site informing contractors, subcontractors, construction workers, etc. of this requirement.
2. *Construction Staging and Equipment Noise Control Measures.*
 - a) Construction site access and staging activities such as receipt of deliveries, equipment and material storage, etc., shall occur as far away as possible from occupied parts of land uses (e.g., buildings, outdoor areas) adjacent to the Project site given site and active work constraints.
 - b) All stationary noise generating equipment shall be shielded and located as far as possible from adjacent land uses given site and active work constraints. Shielding may consist of trailers, stored materials, or a three- or four-sided enclosure provided the structure/barrier breaks the line of sight between the equipment and the receptor, provides for proper equipment ventilation and operations, and complies with all other applicable occupational safety and health requirements.
 - c) Heavy equipment shall include standard noise suppression devices such as mufflers, engine covers, and engine/mechanical isolators, mounts, etc. Equipment and noise suppression devices shall be maintained in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations while on-site.
 - d) Pneumatic tools shall include a suppression device on the compressed air exhaust.
 - e) Connect to existing electrical service to power stationary and portable equipment (e.g., pumps, generators, compressors, and welding sets). This measure shall be subject to the approval of the local electric utility.
3. *Construction Activity Noise Control Measures:*
 - a) *Demolition Sequencing:* Demolition/deconstruction activities shall be sequenced to take advantage of existing shielding/noise reduction provided by existing buildings, parts of buildings, and/or other structures (e.g., construction trailers), and shall use methods that minimize noise and vibration, such as sawing concrete blocks instead of crushing or other pulverization activities, unless there are project-specific technical and logistical constraints that require such activities.
 - b) *Install Phase 1 Construction Noise Barrier.* During all Phase 1 demolition, site preparation, grading, structure foundation work (e.g., excavation, pad pour, etc.), paving, and well

drilling activities, the applicant shall install and maintain a physical noise barrier along the portion of the southeast perimeter of the site from 6th Street north (i.e., adjacent to Utica Avenue) a distance of 500 feet. The barrier shall be installed at-grade (or mounted to structures located at-grade, such as a K-rail) and extend to a height of at least six (6) feet above grade, except adjacent to the well drilling area, where the barrier shall extend to a height of 10 feet above grade, and shall consist of a solid material that is free of openings or gaps (other than weep holes) and that has a minimum rated transmission loss value of 25 dB adjacent to the well drilling area and 20 dB in all other areas. Potential materials that are capable of achieving required noise level reductions include nominal 0.5-inch plywood (20 dB), nominal 0.75-inch plywood (25 dB), commercially available acoustic panels, blankets, or other products, or any combination of noise barriers and commercial products that achieve a minimum transmission loss value of 20 dB or 25 dB as required. The barrier may be removed following the completion of all Phase 1 demolition, site preparation and grading, structure foundation, paving, and well drilling within the 7-acre southeast quadrant shown in EIR Exhibit 4.13-3.

- c) *Install Phase 2B Construction Noise Barrier.* During all Phase 2B demolition, site preparation, grading, structure foundation (e.g., excavation, pad pour, etc.), and paving work, the applicant shall install and maintain a physical noise barrier along the Phase 2B northern, eastern, and western boundary. The noise barrier shall be installed at-grade (or mounted to structures located at-grade, such as a K-rail) and shall extend to a height of at least six (6) feet above grade. The noise barrier shall consist of a solid material that is free of openings or gaps (other than weep holes) and has a minimum rated transmission loss value of 20 dB. Potential materials that are capable of achieving required noise level reductions include nominal 0.5-inch plywood (20 dB), commercially available acoustic panels, blankets, or other products, or any combination of noise barriers and commercial products that achieve a minimum transmission loss value of 20 dB. The barrier may be removed following the completion of all Phase 2B demolition, site preparation and grading, structure foundation, and paving work.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to construction noise (DEIR page 4.13-37).

IMPACT NOISE-2: Would the project generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.

Substantial Evidence:

As described in DEIR Section 4.13.5, the DEIR estimated the proposed Project's potential on- and off-site operational noise levels using empirical equipment noise measurements from a similar beverage facility (the Downey PC/DC), manufacturer's specifications, Project-specific development assumptions regarding the location of equipment, trip generation, etc., and the FHWA Traffic Noise Model. DEIR Section 4.13.5 indicates the increase in onsite noise levels from Phase 1 PC, DC, and ASRS and Phase 2 cogeneration facilities could be potentially significant and require mitigation) (DEIR pages 4.13-37 to 4.13-46). The analysis made the following specific determinations:

- (a) increases in onsite noise levels from Phase 1 PC, DC, and ASRS and Phase 2 cogeneration facilities would be potentially significant due to an increase in ambient noise levels in excess of the standards established in Development Code Section 17.66.110. However, these levels are reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2 (see below);
- (b) Increases in onsite noise levels from Phase 1 office and parking facilities and Phase 2A/2B 7th Street warehouse facility would be less than significant;
- (c) increases in onsite noise levels (backup generator) would be potentially significant by increasing ambient noise levels in excess of the standards established in Development Code Section 17.66.110. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2 (see below), impacts will be reduced to less than significant level;
- (d) increases in onsite noise levels from new CVWD well would be less than significant; and
- (e) increases in off-site traffic noise levels from Project traffic will be less than significant.

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measure to help reduce potential impacts related to operational noise (i.e., substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of local standards):

MM-NOI-2: Noise Verification Study. Prior to the issuance of any Phase 1 or Phase 2 grading permit for the project, the City shall review and approve a final noise analysis, prepared by or on behalf of the applicant, and based on the final project design, that: 1) Identifies the locations of the project's final exterior stationary equipment, including backup generators, and truck dock areas and any screening walls; and 2) Demonstrates the project's noise levels will not exceed the City's applicable industrial noise standards (as outlined in Development Code Section 17.66.110). The final analysis shall contain specific and verifiable information pertaining to the project's final site design and layout and equipment noise levels (e.g., manufacturer's specifications, empirical noise measurements). The analysis may be prepared for Phase 1, Phase 2, or combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 activities if final information is available.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to operational noise and not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of local standards (DEIR page 4.13-46).

TRANSPORTATION

IMPACT TRANS-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3(b) Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Substantial Evidence:

DEIR Section 4.17.4 states that a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Study was prepared for the Project consistent with the requirements of California Senate Bill 743 and the City's transportation report preparation guidelines. The EIR found the proposed Project did not satisfy any of the City-established screening thresholds so a quantitative VMT analysis was prepared using the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM) in accordance with the City's guidelines. The cumulative Project-generated VMT per employee of 16.9 does not exceed the City of Rancho Cucamonga General Plan Buildout VMT per employee of 17.0 so the proposed Project is forecast to result in a less than significant VMT impact based on the City-established threshold for cumulative Project-generated VMT. However, baseline project-generated VMT per employee of 18.3 exceeds the City-established threshold of 17.4 VMT per employee. To reduce the baseline project-generated VMT to a less than significant level, baseline project-generated VMT must be reduced by 0.9 VMT per employee, or approximately 4.9 percent. The VMT Study therefore recommended Mitigation Measure TRA-1 to reduce project VMT below the City's adopted standard. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, Project VMT impacts would be less than significant under either the Phase 1 plus Phase 2A scenario or the Phase 1 plus Phase 2B scenario (DEIR pages 4.17-19 to 4.17-23).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measure to help reduce potential impacts related to Project VMT to less than significant levels:

MM-TRA-1: VMT Transportation Demand Management Reduction Plan. The proposed project shall implement a commute trip reduction program consisting of transportation demand management (TDM) measures that achieve a minimum VMT reduction of 4.9 percent. The VMT reduction associated with the TDM measures to be implemented shall be quantified in accordance with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association *Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity, Designed for Local Governments, Communities, and Project Developers* (December 2021). Per General Plan Condition of Approval (COA) 5.17-3, the project shall provide but is not limited to the following as determined applicable by City staff:

- 1) Provide car-sharing, bike sharing, or ride-sharing programs;
- 2) Improve or increase access to transit;
- 3) Include project measures to reduce transportation requirements such as work from home and flexible work schedules;
- 4) Link to existing pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service; and/or
- 5) Provide traffic calming where applicable.

Alternatively, the project may participate in a regional VMT mitigation exchange/banking program (if one has been established) to reduce VMT from the project or other land uses to achieve stated levels.

Within one year of Phase 2 becoming fully operational, the developer must demonstrate a project trip reduction of at least 4.9% from estimated trips based on implementation of the actions and

programs outlined in this mitigation measure. If the 4.9% reduction cannot be demonstrated at that time, the project shall expand its VMT program offerings or participate in a regional VMT mitigation bank if such a program is available to achieve the 4.9% reduction goal. The project shall submit annual reports to the City to demonstrate ongoing compliance with this project VMT reduction goal.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-1, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to vehicle miles traveled (DEIR page 4.17-24).

IMPACT TRANS-5: Would the Project cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to transportation and traffic.

Substantial Evidence:

Regarding Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) impacts, Impact TRANS-2 indicated the Project had a potentially significant VMT impact but that implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1, implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Program, would reduce this potential impact to less than significant levels. The VMT analysis for the Project included a regional analysis that compared the Project VMT levels to City-wide (cumulative) levels by 2040. Cumulative link-level boundary VMT per employee within the City boundary is estimated to decrease under the plus Project condition compared to the no Project condition; therefore, the proposed Project is forecast to result in a less than significant VMT impact based on the City-established threshold for cumulative project effect on VMT. The VMT Study recommended Mitigation Measure TRA-1 to reduce Project VMT below the City's adopted standard. Cumulative project-generated VMT and the cumulative project effect on regional VMT is forecast to be less than significant based on City-established thresholds.

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measure to help reduce potential impacts related to Project VMT to less than significant levels:

MM-TRA-1: VMT Transportation Demand Management Reduction Plan. See Impact TRA-2 above.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM-TRA-1, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to vehicle miles traveled including any potential cumulative contributions (DEIR page 4.17-30).

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

IMPACT TCR-1: Could the project result in a significant impact if it causes 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 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).

IMPACT TCR-2: Could the project result in a significant impact if it causes 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 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 Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Substantial Evidence:

The proposed Project site is located within the ancestral territory of both the Serrano and Gabrieleno tribal groups and is therefore of interest to both Tribes. However, only the Gabrieleno tribe requested consultation on this Project. In the past both the San Manuel and Gabrieleno tribes have expressed concern regarding impacts to artifacts and resources of their tribes and recommended four measures for tribal cultural resources (presented below) but did not indicate whether or not the Project would have any specific impacts on any tribal cultural resources. The text of all tribal measures have been incorporated into the four measures recommended in this EIR (TCR-1 through TCR-4). The only change is all the measures now apply to both tribal groups as appropriate (i.e., in those measures where the specific tribes are named).

The Project will be required to comply with all applicable laws and regulations including if unanticipated Native American artifacts or resources are found during grading. The City General Plan contains eight standard conditions of approval for cultural resources (5.5-1 through 5.5-8). However, the four mitigation measures included in Impact TCR-2 below (MM TCR-1 through TCR-4) include equivalent procedures and requirements so no standard conditions will be applied in this case. The Project will have less than significant impacts in this regard under either the Phase 1 plus Phase 2A scenario or the Phase 1 plus Phase 2B scenario (DEIR pages 4.18-5 and 4.18-6).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures to help reduce potential impacts related to tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels:

MM-TCR-1: Tribal Coordination. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (San Manuel) and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Gabrieleno) shall be contacted, as detailed in Mitigation Measure CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with San Manuel and Gabrieleno, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for monitors to be present that represent San Manuel and Gabrieleno for the remainder of the project, should San Manuel and/or Gabrieleno elect to place a monitor or monitors onsite.

MM-TCR-2: Tribal Monitoring. The project proponent shall retain one or more Native American Monitor(s) from or approved by the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Gabrieleno) and the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (San Manuel). The monitor(s) shall be

retained prior to the commencement of any “ground-disturbing activity” for the subject project at all project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). “Ground-disturbing activity” shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

A copy of the executed monitoring agreement(s) shall be submitted to the City as the lead agency prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity or prior to the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

The monitor(s) will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered tribal cultural resources (TCRs), including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or “TCR”), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the project proponent and/or /lead agency upon written request to the Tribes.

Onsite tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the Gabrieleno and San Manuel from a designated point of contact for the project proponent and/or the City as the lead agency that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the Gabrieleno and San Manuel to the project proponent and/or the City as the lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact Gabrieleno and San Manuel TCRs.

Upon discovery of any TCRs, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the Kizh monitor and/or Kizh archaeologist. The Kizh will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate, in the Tribe’s sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

MM-TCR-3: Document Distribution. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (San Manuel) and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Gabrieleno). The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with San Manuel and Gabrieleno throughout the life of project construction.

MM-TCR-4: Tribal Human Remains. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98(d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the project site, then Public Resource Code 5097.9 as well as Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources

Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2). Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

Finding:

The EIR found that with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-4, the Project would have less than significant impacts relative to tribal cultural resources (DEIR page 4.18-8).

C. Effects Determined to Be Significant, Adverse, and Unavoidable

As presented in the El Camino Project EIR, the City finds that adverse impacts identified below pertaining to Air Quality and Greenhouse Emissions cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels even with implementation of all feasible mitigation recommended in the DEIR.

AIR POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (AIR QUALITY)

IMPACT AIR-1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District 2022 Air Quality Management Plan.

Substantial Evidence:

DEIR Section 4.3.5 found that regional operational NO_x emissions were potentially significant for Phases 1 and 2 and required mitigation. In addition, it found that combined regional Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction were potentially significant for VOC and NO_x and required mitigation. The proposed Project is within the South Coast Air Basin which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. Pursuant to the methodology provided in the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, consistency with the AQMP is affirmed if the Project: (1) Is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP; and (2) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new one.

Consistency Criterion 1 refers to the growth forecasts and associated assumptions included in the AQMP. Projects that are consistent with the AQMP growth assumptions would not interfere with attainment of air quality standards, because this growth is included in the projections used to formulate the AQMP. The proposed Project is estimated to create approximately 289 net new jobs. This value is within the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS growth projection for the City of Rancho Cucamonga of 420 jobs per year, which is an average rate across almost three decades (2016 to 2045). The employment growth associated with the Project (net 289 jobs) represents less than 2% of the anticipated total employment growth in the City between 2016 and 2045 (16,800 jobs). Therefore, the proposed Project would not exceed the growth assumptions contained in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion 2 refers to the AQMP which contains control measures intended to achieve attainment of ambient air quality standards in the South Coast Air Basin. The Project would comply with SCAQMD rules developed as part of the AQMP; however, as described under Impact AIR-2 below, however the proposed Project's mitigated emissions levels are anticipated to exceed SCAQMD NO_x emissions thresholds during Phase 1 and Phase 2 operations and during combined Phase 1 operations and Phase 2B construction. This increase in emissions above recommended thresholds could result in new and/or more frequent or more severe exceedances of regional air quality standards. Therefore, the proposed Project has the potential to conflict with

the SCAQMD 2022 AQMP due to exceedances of the SCAQMD NO_x daily significance threshold even after mitigation. This impact would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation (DEIR pages 4.3-49 to 4.3-50).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures in an attempt to reduce these air pollutant emission impacts to less than significant levels:

MM-AIR-2A: Reduce Construction VOC Emissions. To reduce construction-related emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the City shall require the applicant to implement the following measures during all Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction activities:

- 1) Use architectural coatings that meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) "Super Compliant" VOC standard of 10 grams/liter or less for all interior and exterior primer, sealer, paint, and other coating applications for which a super compliant product is commercially available.
 - a) If feasible given contract, logistical, and other construction factors, avoid painting during peak smog season (July, August, and September) if super compliant coatings are not commercially available.
- 2) Keep all coating containers closed when not in use to prevent VOC emissions.
- 3) Keep all paint and solvent laden rags and other materials in sealed containers to prevent VOC emissions.
- 4) Clean up water-based paints with water only and when possible do not rinse clean-up water down the drain, onto the ground, or into a storm drain.
- 5) Use SCAQMD compliant Clean Air Solvents to clean paint application equipment.
- 6) Recycle leftover paint.

MM-AIR-2B: Reduce Construction NO_x and PM Exhaust Emissions. To reduce construction-related exhaust emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM), including diesel particulate matter (DPM), the City shall require the applicant to implement the following measures during all Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction activities:

- 1) Connect to existing electrical service to power construction trailers and stationary and portable equipment (e.g., pumps, generators, compressors, and welding sets). This measure shall be subject to the approval of the local electric utility. If it is not feasible to connect to electrical service and/or extend electrical service to all work sites, biodiesel (no more than B20 blend), renewable diesel, or propane shall be used to power stationary and portable equipment provided the use of such fuels is allowed pursuant to manufacturer's specifications. The use of stationary or portable diesel-fueled equipment shall be prohibited in the project area unless electrical service is denied, alternative fuels are not permitted by the manufacturer for the specific equipment in use, and there are no alternative equipment types capable of being powered by alternative fuels that can be used instead of the standard diesel-fueled equipment.
- 2) All construction equipment with a rated power-output of 50 horsepower (hp) or greater shall be certified to meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 4 Final nonroad diesel engine emissions standards for NO_x and PM₁₀, or be retrofitted with California Air Resources Board (CARB)-verified diesel emissions control strategies capable of reducing exhaust NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions to levels that meet Tier 4 Final emissions standards, unless the applicant submits evidence to the City that specific equipment meeting this requirement is not available on loan, rent, or other terms of use within 200 miles of the city. In this instance, the next highest available emissions tier (e.g., Tier 4 Interim, Tier 3) for the specific equipment in question shall be required.

- 3) Limit idling of diesel-powered construction equipment, vendor delivery trucks, and hauling trucks to no more than two minutes unless manufacturer's specifications specifically require main engine idling is necessary to maintain equipment in good working order.

MM-AIR-2C: Reduce Light-duty Vehicle Trip Emissions. To reduce light duty vehicle trip emissions (i.e., passenger cars and pick-up trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of 8,500 pounds or less), the City shall require the applicant to comply with the voluntary Tier 1 designated parking for clean air vehicles and electric vehicle (EV) charging provisions contained in the version of the California Green Building Code (CalGreen Code) that is in effect at the time of building permit approval, unless the City has adopted local requirements that are more stringent than the CalGreen Code. As of January 1, 2025, the 2022 CalGreen Code includes the following voluntary clean air vehicle parking and EV charging provisions for non-residential projects:

- 1) Designated Parking for Clean Air Vehicles Tier 1 Provisions (CalGreen Code Section A5.106.5.1): The number of combined designated parking spaces for a zero-emitting, fuel-efficient, and car/vanpool vehicles shall be 35% of the total number of parking spaces provided by the project. Based on the project's current proposed 521 parking spaces, the total number of clean air vehicle designated parking spaces for the project equals 182 spaces.
- 2) EV Charging Tier 1 Provisions (CalGreen Code Section A5.106.5.3): The number of EV capable spaces, and EV capable spaces with electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE), which creates an electric vehicle charging station (EVCS) shall be determined based on the total number of actual parking spaces as set forth in CalGreen Code Table A5.106.5.3.1. Based on the project's current proposed number of 521 parking spaces:
 - a) The number of EV capable spaces shall be 30% of the total parking spaces provided. Based on the project's current proposed 521 parking spaces, the total number of EV capable spaces for the project equals 157 spaces.
 - b) The number of EV capable spaces provided with EVSE shall be 33% of the number of EV capable spaces provided by the project. Based on the project's estimated total number of EV capable spaces for the project (157, see subsection a) above), the number of EV capable spaces with EVSE for the project equals 52 spaces (assuming all EVSE are level 2 charging equipment). The spaces with EVSE count towards the total number EV capable spaces required by subsection a) above. The EVSE may be any combination of level 2 and direct current fast charging equipment as permitted by CalGreen Code Section 5.106.5.3.2 (EVCS), and the EVCS may be managed by an automatic load management system (ALMS) in accordance with CalGreen Code Section 5.106.5.3.3 (ALMS).

MM-AIR-2D: Prepare VMT/TDM Reduction Plan (SAME AS TRA-1). The project shall implement a commute trip reduction program consisting of transportation demand management (TDM) measures that achieve a minimum VMT reduction of 4.9 percent. The VMT reduction associated with the TDM measures to be implemented shall be quantified in accordance with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association *Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity, Designed for Local Governments, Communities, and Project Developers* (December 2021). Per General Plan Condition of Approval (COA) 5.17-3, the project shall provide but is not limited to the following as determined applicable by City staff:

- 1) Provide car-sharing, bike sharing, and ride-sharing programs;
- 2) Improve or increase access to transit;

- 3) Incorporate neighborhood electric vehicle networks into the project;
- 4) Include project measures to reduce transportation requirements such as work from home and flexible work schedules;
- 5) Link to existing pedestrian or bicycle networks, or transit service; and/or
- 6) Provide traffic calming where applicable.

MM-AIR-2E: Reduce Truck Trip Emissions. To reduce truck trip emissions (i.e., light-heavy, medium-heavy, and heavy-heavy duty trucks with a gross vehicle weight of 8,501 pounds or greater) and promote the use of near-zero emission (NZE) and zero emission vehicles (ZEV), the City shall require the applicant to:

- 1) Exceed the mandatory electric vehicle (EV) charging readiness requirements for planned off-street loading spaces specified in the version of the California Green Building Code (CalGreen Code) that is in effect at the time of building permit approval, unless the City has adopted local requirements that are more stringent than the CalGreen Code. As of January 1, 2025, the 2022 CalGreen Code, Section 5.106.5.4 (EV charging: medium-duty and heavy-duty), specifies minimum power requirements for dedicated branch circuits, reserved locations for medium and heavy-duty ZEV charging cabinets and conduit routing, and sufficiently sized raceways and busways between electrical service panels and ZEV charging areas. Therefore, the City shall require the applicant to:
 - a) Design and include sufficient space for the transformer, main service equipment, and cabinets/subpanels necessary to accommodate a sufficient number of branch circuits to provide future installation of electric vehicle service equipment (EVSE) at all truck docks and main truck parking areas.
 - b) Design and incorporate a sufficient number of raceways/busways to provide future EVSE installation at all truck docks and main truck parking areas.
 - c) Dedicate/preserve convenient locations near all truck docks and main truck parking areas for the future installation of EVSE and reserve pathways for conduits needed to connect the EVSE to other electrical service equipment (e.g., raceway, cabinet, etc.)
 - d) Install EVSE at 10% of the total truck docks included in the final Project design. Based on the project's estimated total number of truck docks (57, see subsection a) above), the number of docks with EVSE for the project equals 6 docks.
- 2) Transport Refrigeration Unit (TRU) Restrictions: The applicant shall prohibit the use of diesel fueled TRUs on-site. All TRUs operated at the site shall be powered by electricity
- 3) Idling Signage: Signs shall be posted at all truck access gates and loading dock areas reminding drivers of idling limitations. The signs shall be clearly visible, readable at a distance of 10 feet, and notify truck drivers that:
 - a) The vehicle's primary diesel engine shall be turned off when not in use.
 - b) The vehicle's primary diesel engine shall not idle for more than 5 consecutive minutes at any location pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485.

MM-GHG-1: Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions. To reduce GHG emissions from appliance-related energy consumption, the City shall require all applicant installed refrigerators, dishwashers, clothes washers and dryers, and room air conditioners intended for employee use to be Energy Star certified products.

MM-GHG-2: Reduce Building Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions. To reduce GHG emissions associated with the performance of the building envelope and systems components covered by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the City shall require all new construction and major renovations undertaken by the applicant associated with the Project to be designed to have a total energy design rating that is at least 5% less than the standard building design for Climate Zone 15. The energy budget for the standard design building and the energy budget for the proposed design building shall be determined in accordance with the definitions and approach set forth in the version of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Energy Code) that is in effect at the time of building permit approval (currently the 2022 Energy Code), unless the City has adopted local requirements that are more stringent than the Energy Code. The requirement to reduce a project's energy budget by 5% below the standard design building shall not apply if the Energy Code or the City has already established a zero net energy requirement for the standard design building.

Finding:

The DEIR found that, even with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project would still result in significant regional operational NOx emissions for Phases 1 and 2 and combined regional Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction emissions were still significant for NOx. These emissions were significant and unavoidable and require a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

IMPACT AIR-2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria air pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is designated non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Substantial Evidence:

DEIR Section 4.3.5 found the Project would have potentially significant regional NOx emissions during operation of Phases 1 and 2 and required mitigation. In addition, the EIR found that combined regional Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction Project emissions were potentially significant for VOC and NOx and required mitigation. This is the result of Project emissions from vehicles and stationary sources exceeding the daily significance thresholds established by SCAQMD for NOx and VOCs as indicated (DEIR pages 4.3-51 to 4.3-63).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures in an attempt to reduce these air pollutant emission impacts to less than significant levels:

MM-AIR-2A: Reduce Construction VOC Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2B: Reduce Construction NOx & PM Exhaust Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above)

MM-AIR-2C: Reduce Light-duty Vehicle Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2D: Prepare VMT/TDM Reduction Plan (SAME AS TRA-1). (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2E: Reduce Truck Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-GHG-1: Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-GHG-2: Reduce Building Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

Finding:

The DEIR found that, even with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project would still result in significant regional operational NOx emissions for Phases 1 and 2 and combined regional Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction emissions were still significant for NOx. These emissions were significant and unavoidable and require a Statement of Overriding Considerations (DEIR page 4.3-63).

IMPACT AIR-5: Would the project cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to air quality.

Substantial Evidence:

The level of expected future development in the City and surrounding areas is substantial (i.e., 174 projects in four jurisdictions with 8,362 residential units and approximately 15 million square feet of non-residential development). In addition, the City expects continued growth based on its General Plan population and housing projections. While it is possible that cumulative projects 16-18 may be under construction during the same timeframe as the Project, it is difficult to predict with any certainty due to the many factors involved in starting and maintaining construction (e.g., financing, equipment and staff availability, weather, etc.).

In developing its CEQA significance thresholds, the SCAQMD considered the emission levels at which a Project's individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. As described under Impact AIR-2A, the proposed Project would result in potentially significant VOC and NOx impacts for regional construction emissions, regional operational emissions, and combined Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B construction emissions. The Project would incorporate Mitigation Measures AIR-2A through AIR-2E; however, regional operational emissions for NOx as well as combined operational and construction emissions for NOx would remain above SCAQMD thresholds and have the potential cause or contribute to existing or future air quality violations, thus conflicting with the 2022 AQMP (DEIR pages 4.3-72 and 4.3-73).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures in an attempt to reduce these cumulative air pollutant emission impacts to less than significant levels:

MM-AIR-2A: Reduce Construction VOC Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2B: Reduce Construction NOx & PM Exhaust Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above)

MM-AIR-2C: Reduce Light-duty Vehicle Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2D: Prepare VMT/TDM Reduction Plan (SAME AS TRA-1). (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2E: Reduce Truck Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-GHG-1: Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-GHG-2: Reduce Building Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

Finding:

The DEIR found that, even with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project would still result in significant regional operational NOx emissions for Phases 1 and 2 and

combined regional Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction emissions were still significant for NO_x. These emissions were significant and unavoidable and require a Statement of Overriding Considerations (DEIR page 4.3-73).

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

IMPACT GHG-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Substantial Evidence:

DEIR Section 4.8.5 states the proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from the short-term construction and long-term operational sources. Construction activities would cease to emit GHG upon completion, unlike operational emissions that would be continuous year after year over the life of the Project. Accordingly, the SCAQMD recommends averaging construction GHG emissions over a 30-year period and combining this average with operational emissions estimates to facilitate comparison to potential thresholds, standards, plans, etc. that may be based on annualized GHG emissions estimates or GHG reduction targets.

The Project's construction-related GHG emissions were estimated using Project-specific construction activities and SCAQMD-recommended air quality and GHG emissions modeling software (i.e., CalEEMod). Once operational, the Project would generate GHG emissions from mobile, area, energy, water/wastewater, solid waste, refrigeration, off-road, and stationary sources. The Project's operational-related energy consumption was estimated using Project-specific development and operational characteristics, manufacturer's equipment specifications, and SCAQMD-recommended modeling software (i.e., CalEEMod). It is noted that the proposed Project's operational GHG emissions would vary by phase, equipment operations (anticipated minimum or potential maximum operations), and whether or not thermal recovery from the cogeneration system is used to offset natural gas combustion in Phase 2 boiler operation. The EIR evaluated worst-case GHG emissions estimates for each Project phase based on maximum potential stationary source equipment operations (i.e., maximum 100% operating times instead of anticipated typical operating times).

The proposed Project would result in a net increase in annual GHG emissions compared to existing conditions for all phases and operating scenarios that is above the SCAQMD's industrial threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e per year. During initial Phase 1 operations in 2026, the Project would result in a net increase in GHG emissions equal to 29,822 MTCO₂e, with the largest net increases occurring from trucks and passenger vehicles (approximately 55% of the net increase), building energy (approximately 20% of the net increase), and the primary boiler's natural gas consumption (approximately 19% of the net increase). The Project's GHG emissions would increase in Phase 2, beginning in 2027, due to the operation of more stationary source equipment in the PC, including a second primary boiler and the cogeneration system. The net increase in GHG emissions during Phase 2 would be contingent on the amount of net electricity and thermal recovery that occurs from the proposed cogeneration system but would be between approximately 43,899 MTCO₂e per year and approximately 41,126 MMBtu with thermal recovery. Similar to Phase 1, the largest net increases in GHG emissions during Phase 2 would be from truck and passenger vehicle trips (approximately 37% to 39% of the net increase) and boilers (between approximately 27% and 29% of the net increase); however, the planned cogeneration system would substantially reduce building energy GHG emissions from approximately 7,663 MTCO₂e per year in Phase 1 to 4,504 MTCO₂e per year in Phase 2.

The proposed Project's net increase in GHG emissions, at worst-case, would be approximately 29,822 MTCO₂e per year during Phase 1 and approximately 43,899 MTCO₂e per year during Phase 2, which exceeds the SCAQMD's industrial 10,000 MTCO₂e threshold. To reduce the proposed Project's operational GHG emissions levels, the City will require the implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1, Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions, and GHG-2, Reduce Building Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions. These mitigation measures will increase the Project's energy efficiency and reduce building energy consumption. Combined, these measures are estimated to lower GHG emissions between approximately 68 MTCO₂e and 150 MTCO₂e per year, or 1.5% to 2% of total building energy emissions (DEIR pages 4.8-25 to 4.8-31).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures in an attempt to reduce these greenhouse gas emission impacts to less than significant levels:

MM-GHG-1: Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions. To reduce GHG emissions from appliance-related energy consumption, the City shall require all applicant installed refrigerators, dishwashers, clothes washers and dryers, and room air conditioners intended for employee use to be Energy Star certified products.

MM-GHG-2: Reduce Building Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions. To reduce GHG emissions associated with the performance of the building envelope and systems components covered by Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the City shall require all new construction and major renovations undertaken by the applicant associated with the Project to be designed to have a total energy design rating that is at least 5% less than the standard building design for Climate Zone 15. The energy budget for the standard design building and the energy budget for the proposed design building shall be determined in accordance with the definitions and approach set forth in the version of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Energy Code) that is in effect at the time of building permit approval (currently the 2022 Energy Code), unless the City has adopted local requirements that are more stringent than the Energy Code. The requirement to reduce a project's energy budget by 5% below the standard design building shall not apply if the Energy Code or the City has already established a zero net energy requirement for the standard design building.

Finding:

Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-GHG-1 and MM-GHG-2, the greenhouse gas emissions of the Project would not be reduced to less than significant levels and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required. Impacts are significant and unavoidable.

IMPACT GHG-3: Cause substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to GHGs.

Substantial Evidence:

Global climate change is the result of GHG emissions worldwide; individual projects do not generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change. Thus, the analysis of GHG emissions is by nature, an inherently cumulative analysis focused on whether an individual project's contribution to global climate change is cumulatively considerable. As described under Impacts GHG-1 and GHG-2, the proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions but would generate GHG emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's 10,000 MTCO₂e per year industrial significance threshold applied in this EIR. Accordingly, the proposed Project would result in a cumulatively

considerable and significant GHG emissions contribution even after the incorporation of mitigation measures.

In addition to the GHG-specific mitigation measures, the City shall also require the applicant to implement Mitigation Measures AIR-2C, Reduce Light-Duty Vehicle Trip Emissions, AIR-2D/TRA-1, Prepare VMT/TDM Reduction Plan, and AIR-2E, Reduce Truck Trip Emissions, which would increase the amount of passenger vehicle and truck EV charging infrastructure installed at the Project site and reduce employee trips and associated VMT by approximately 5% (DEIR page 4.8-39).

The EIR recommended the following mitigation measures in an attempt to reduce these greenhouse gas emission impacts to less than significant levels:

MM-GHG-1: Reduce Appliance Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact GHG-1 above).

MM-GHG-2: Reduce Building Energy Consumption & GHG Emissions. (see Impact GHG-1 above).

MM-AIR-2C: Reduce Light-duty Vehicle Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2D: Prepare VMT/TDM Reduction Plan (SAME AS TRA-1). (see Impact AIR-1 above).

MM-AIR-2E: Reduce Truck Trip Emissions. (see Impact AIR-1 above).

Finding:

Even with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, cumulative greenhouse gas emissions of the Project would not be reduced to less than significant levels and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required. Impacts are significant and unavoidable.

6 ALTERNATIVES

This section contains a discussion of the alternatives considered and rejected in the El Camino Project DEIR, including the No Project – No Development; Expand Existing Facility (Alternative 1); Reduced Intensity (Alternative 2); and Mixed Use (Commercial/Residential/Office)(Alternative 3). For alternative locations, “only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR” (Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A)). The significant impacts of the proposed Project (NOx and GHG emissions) are based on the type and size of the proposed use so this project on any other site would still result in significant impacts identified in the EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), this EIR does not evaluate every conceivable alternative. A feasible range of alternatives that will allow decision-makers to make a reasoned choice and that meet most of the Project’s guiding principles has been evaluated.

Project Objectives

The Project is intended to implement the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan. The purpose of this Project is to implement the vision laid out in the Project objectives. The Project would generally increase the City’s production capacity and further fortify the economic base of the City. It would also revitalize a portion of the City with new and renovated industry and production. The Project is proposed to be developed to accomplish the following objectives:

Objective 1: Facilitate the continued operation of the existing distribution facility with expanded operations and employment capacity.

Objective 2: Redevelop an existing industrial site with modern and sustainable facilities, including large-scale buildings, intricate manufacturing processes, and large employment opportunities.

Objective 3: Develop and operate an attractive state-of-the-art manufacturing and distribution facility in the City that meets industry standards to be competitive with similar facilities in the region.

Objective 4: Maximize the efficiency of the existing operations during the expansion process by providing interim manufacturing steps within the same building envelope.

Objective 5: Develop and operate a production and bottling facility that positively contributes to the local economy through new capital investment and the creation of new employment opportunities, including opportunities for highly-trained workers.

Objective 6: Develop an industrial and manufacturing facility that is in close proximity to Interstate 10, Interstate 15, and other major transportation arterial roadways, to support the production of consumer goods and the distribution of manufactured goods throughout the region.

Objective 7: Implement a microgrid energy production system via cogeneration at an existing manufacturing site to minimize manufacturing waste and to reduce the demand on existing public services and systems while employing carbon-reducing technologies and reduce the facility’s potential climate impact.

Selection of Alternatives

To provide a basis for further understanding of the environmental effects of a proposed project and possible approaches to reducing its identified significant impacts, the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to also “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” In addition to the No Project-No Development Alternative, which is essentially existing conditions on the site at the time the NOP was issued, the following three alternatives were selected for detailed evaluation in comparison to the proposed Project:

Alternative 1 - Expand Existing Facility. This alternative would almost double the area of the existing beverage distribution facility to 400,000 square feet for new non-residential uses and provide beverage bottling in addition to and in conjunction with the current distribution facility. It would have no residential units and would allow the existing beverage warehouse/distribution building to continue operation. This plan would utilize surface parking and the new building would have a maximum height of approximately 35-40 feet. The land not needed for the new building footprint or parking would be landscaped with walkways for employees and possibly public use if such areas were created along the boundaries of the site (i.e., along adjacent roadways). This alternative would also include use/reuse of the existing warehouse on the Phase 2 property. This alternative includes a new CVWD well but not cogeneration.

Alternative 2 - Reduced Intensity. This alternative would develop about 540,000 square feet of light industrial (non-residential) use, which is approximately 30% less new building area compared to the proposed Project. This plan would have no residential units but require demolition of the existing beverage distribution facility. This plan would eliminate the proposed parking structure and use the remaining non-built area of the site for surface parking. This plan would have landscaping and outdoor use areas for employees consistent with the City General Plan and Development Code requirements. This alternative includes cogeneration and a new CVWD well.

Alternative 3 - Mixed Use (C/R/O). This alternative would develop 675,000 square feet of new office and commercial uses on the first two floors of three new four-story buildings on the site (commercial on ground floor and offices on the 2nd floor). This plan would also have 270 residential units on the top two floors of the three new buildings. The remainder of the site would have covered and uncovered surface parking, landscaping, and employee and tenant and public use areas on the remainder of the site (play equipment, pickleball courts, walkways, dog park, etc.). The site would be developed according to the General Plan and Development Code requirements for the site with a small internal street east off Haven Avenue visually dividing the property which would be consistent with the development code and general plan block network standards and policies. This alternative is consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation (21st Century Employment District) and the existing zoning classification (ME2). While there are other possible variations of land plans that meet the General Plan and zoning designations, this one was selected as a reasonable alternate land plan for evaluation in the EIR.

Evaluation of Alternatives

Substantial Evidence:

No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative represents existing conditions on the site and would have no impacts or less than significant impacts compared to those of the proposed Project due to the fact there would be no new development and only a continuation of uses under this Alternative, and it would result in no significant and unavoidable impacts. It would also not achieve any of the Project Objectives which would involve some type of new development on the site.

Alternative 1: Expand Existing Facility

DEIR Section 5.5 concluded this alternative would have the following less than significant impacts that are equivalent to those of the proposed Project due to the fact the entire site will be disturbed: Agriculture and Forest Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources; Mineral Resources; and Tribal Cultural Resources.

DEIR Section 5.5 also concluded that Alternative 1 would have the following reduced and less than significant impacts relative to those of the proposed Project since it involves less intense development: Aesthetics; Air Quality (health risks, odors); Energy; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Population, Housing, and Employment; Noise and Vibration; Public Services; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Transportation; and Wildfire

Alternative 1 would have the following impacts that are less than those of the proposed Project but are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality (AQMP Consistency, project and cumulative NOx emissions); and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity

DEIR Section 5.6 concluded this alternative would have the following less than significant impacts that are equivalent to those of the proposed Project due to the fact the entire site will be disturbed: Agriculture and Forest Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources; Mineral Resources; and Tribal Cultural Resources.

DEIR Section 5.6 also concluded that Alternative 2 would have the following reduced and less than significant impacts relative to those of the proposed Project since it involves less intense development: Aesthetics; Air Quality (health risks, odors); Energy; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Population, Housing, and Employment; Noise and Vibration; Public Services; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Transportation; and Wildfire

Alternative 2 would have the following impacts that are less than those of the proposed Project but are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality (AQMP Consistency, project and cumulative NOx emissions); and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Alternative 3: Mixed Use (Commercial/Residential/Office)

DEIR Section 5.7 concluded this alternative would have the following less than significant impacts that are equivalent to those of the proposed Project due to the fact the entire site will be disturbed: Agriculture and Forest Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources; Mineral Resources; and Tribal Cultural Resources.

DEIR Section 5.7 also concluded that Alternative 3 would have the following reduced and less than significant impacts relative to those of the proposed Project based on the analysis of the mix of land use proposed for this alternative (i.e., commercial, office, and residential): Aesthetics; Air Quality (health risks, odors); Energy; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Population, Housing, and Employment; Public Services; Recreation; Utilities and Service Systems; Transportation; and Wildfire.

Alternative 3 would have the following impacts that are less than those of the proposed Project but are still significant and unavoidable even with implementation of all recommended feasible mitigation measures: Air Quality (AQMP Consistency, project and cumulative VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions); Greenhouse Gas Emissions; and Noise and Vibration (from increased vehicular traffic)

Meeting Project Objectives

DEIR Section 5.9 indicated the No Project Alternative does not meet the Project Objectives since it involves no development. Alternatives 1 and 2 do not meet the Project Objectives to nearly the same degree as the proposed Project because they do not provide sufficient additional space to adequately manufacture, bottle, and distribute the planned beverages on the scale envisioned by the Project. In addition, Alternative 3 does not meet the Objectives of the Project because it proposes land uses that are consistent with the General Plan and zoning but do not provide for expanded beverage distribution and new bottling capabilities which is proposed by the Project.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

The No Project Alternative eliminates the significant impacts of the Project, so it is environmentally superior to the Project but it does not achieve any of the Project Objectives. Therefore, one of the development alternatives must be identified as an environmentally superior alternative as well.

Alternative 1 – Expand Existing Facility, reduces potential impacts of the Project to the greatest extent practical although it does not eliminate or reduce either of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project (air quality and greenhouse gas emissions) to less than significant levels. Alternative 2 also reduces impacts of the proposed Project but not nearly to the same degree as Alternative 1 and also does not eliminate either of the significant impacts of the Project. In addition, Alternative 3 would likely result in significant noise impacts due to its substantial increase in vehicular traffic so it would result in three significant and unavoidable impacts compared to the two significant impacts of Alternatives 1 and 2 and the proposed Project.

Alternatives 1 and 2 do not meet the Project Objectives to nearly the same degree as the proposed Project because they do not provide sufficient space to create a unified beverage manufacturing, bottling, and distribution facility as envisioned by the proposed Project. Alternative 3 does not meet the Objectives of the Project because it proposes a mix of land uses that do not include a larger beverage bottling and distribution facility as included in the proposed Project.

For these reasons, The EIR determined that Alternative 1 – Expand Existing Facility, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the proposed Project.

Findings:

DEIR Section 5.10 found Alternative 1 to be environmentally superior to the Project although it did not eliminate or reduce either of the significant impacts of the Project (NO_x and greenhouse gas emissions) to less than significant levels. In addition, Alternative 1 does not meet the Project Objectives to nearly the same degree as the proposed Project because it does not provide sufficient additional space to adequately manufacture, bottle, and distribute the planned beverages on the scale envisioned by the Project or needed for the existing facility to operate at peak efficiency. For these reasons, the City determines that Alternative 1 is less desirable than the proposed Project and therefore rejects the alternative per Public Resources Code § 21081(a)(3); CEQA Guidelines, §15091(a)(3).

7 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires that a Lead Agency balance the benefits of a project against its adverse and unavoidable effects in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a). CEQA requires that a Lead Agency support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or elsewhere in the administrative record pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b). The Lead Agency’s written reasons are referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations. For those significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the Lead Agency is required to find that the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant impacts on the environment.

Regarding a Statement of Overriding Considerations, Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following:

1. CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”
2. When the lead agency approves a project that will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
3. If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The City will approve the El Camino Project and has prepared a Final EIR that satisfies the requirements of CEQA. The following adverse impacts of the project are considered significant and unavoidable based on the analysis in the Draft EIR (DEIR), Final EIR (FEIR), and the Findings of Fact.

- Impact AIR-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plans because it would exceed the growth assumption of the 2022 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions would exceed SCAQMD’s regional threshold, thereby impeding AQMP attainment. (Regional operational and combined phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction).
- Impact AIR-2: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of non-attainment criteria pollutants for which the project region is in non-attainment (including NOx). (Regional operational and combined Phase 1 operational and Phase 2B regional construction).

- Impact AIR-5: Cause adverse substantial adverse cumulative impacts with respect to air quality (Cumulative Impact from NOx operational emissions).
- Impact GHG-1: Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- Impact GHG-3: Cause a substantial adverse cumulative impact with respect to greenhouse gas emissions (Cumulative Impact).

The City has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above are acceptable because those impacts are outweighed by the economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the Project, listed below.

- The project will maintain the City's economic viability and productivity over the long term by encouraging efficient and sustainable use of the overall site, a portion of which at present is vacant.
- The project increases an employment generating use thereby increasing employment opportunities within Rancho Cucamonga.
- The project provides for expanded and comprehensive siting of an important employer and business to help sustain a strong local economy, with design qualities that contribute to its success.
- The project will expand an industrial and manufacturing facility with ready access to Interstate 10, Interstate 15, and other major transportation arterial roadways, to support the production of consumer goods and the distribution of manufactured goods throughout the region.
- The project provides for the development and maintenance of a citywide bicycle network of off-street bike paths, off-street sidewalks, and on-street bike lanes, including along Haven Avenue, 6th Street, 7th Street, and Utica Avenue.
- The project proportionally supports a connected, balanced, integrated, safe, and multi-modal transportation system that accommodates all travel options.
- The project promotes the use of transit within the City as a means of reducing local traffic congestion, achieving greenhouse gases reduction targets, and connecting the community physically and socially.
- The project includes energy efficiency and conservation systems and measures that reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The project will Implement a microgrid energy production system via cogeneration at an existing manufacturing site to minimize manufacturing waste and to reduce the demand on existing public services and systems while employing carbon-reducing technologies and reduce the facility's potential climate impacts.

- The project will increase the potential for beverage manufacturing as a revenue-generating land use for the City.

The City Council hereby finds that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through the approval of the project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated. The City Council finds that each of the Project benefits separately and individually outweighs all of the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the EIR and therefore finds those impacts to be acceptable. The City Council further finds that no feasible alternative exists that both would provide all of the foregoing benefits to the public and reduce environmental impacts when compared to the Project.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank