# **PALOMINO BUSINESS PARK**



# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



NORCO, CALIFORNIA

NOVEMBER 2019 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2019039132

# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PALOMINO BUSINESS PARK NORCO, CALIFORNIA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2019039132

**PREPARED FOR:** 

### **CITY OF NORCO**

PLANNING DEPARTMENT 2870 CLARK AVENUE, NORCO, CALIFORNIA 92860 CONTACT: STEVE KING

### **PREPARED BY:**

ENVIRONMENT | PLANNING | DEVELOPMENT SOLUTIONS, INC.

### **EPD SOLUTIONS**

2030 MAIN STREET STE. 1200 IRVINE, CA 92614 CONTACT: KONNIE DOBREVA, JD, PROJECT MANAGER

November 18, 2019

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Page
LIST OF FIGURESii
LIST OF TABLESiii
APPENDICES
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
2.0 INTRODUCTION
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS
SECTION 5.1, AESTHETICS5.1-1SECTION 5.2, AIR QUALITY5.2-1SECTION 5.3, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES5.3-1SECTION 5.4, CULTURAL RESOURCES5.4-1SECTION 5.5, ENERGY5.5-1SECTION 5.6, GEOLOGY AND SOILS5.6-1SECTION 5.7, GREENHOUSE GASES5.7-1SECTION 5.8, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS5.8-1SECTION 5.9, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY5.9-1SECTION 5.10, LAND USE AND PLANNING5.10-1SECTION 5.11, NOISE5.11-1SECTION 5.12, PUBLIC SERVICES5.12-1SECTION 5.14, TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES5.14-1SECTION 5.15, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS5.15-1
6.0 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACT
7.0 ALTERNATIVES
8.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT AND SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS
9.0 EIR PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONTACTED

Figure

### LIST OF FIGURES

Page

FIGURE 3-1       REGIONAL LOCATION.       3-3         FIGURE 3-2       LOCAL AREA MAP       3-5         FIGURE 3-3       CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PHASES.       3-9         FIGURE 3-4       CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN.       3-11         FIGURE 3-5       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 1       3-13         FIGURE 3-6       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2       3-15         FIGURE 3-7A       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL CRUCALISTON PLAN       3-221         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CRUCALISTON PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CRUCALISTON PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-11       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA GE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA CRULANS       3-34         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA CRULANS       3-34         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA CRULANS       3-34         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA CRULANS       3-14         FIGURE 5-12       ULMININE MARY STORN DRAIN PLAN			
FIGURE 3-2       LOCAL AREA MAP       3-5         FIGURE 3-3       CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PHASES	FIGURE 3-1	REGIONAL LOCATION	3-3
FIGURE 3-3       CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PHASES.       3-9         FIGURE 3-4       CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN.       3-11         FIGURE 3-5       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 1       3-13         FIGURE 3-6       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2       3-15         FIGURE 3-7       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       SCONCEPTUAL CONCENCIAL BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-19         FIGURE 3-7       SCONCEPTUAL CONCECIAL BUILDING SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL CONCECIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-217         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CONCECIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-13       STREET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-14       PELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-34         FIGURE 3-14       PELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-34         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECT SITE       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECT SITE       4-15         FIGURE 5-1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5-1-1A       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-1A	FIGURE 3-2	LOCAL AREA MAP	3-5
FIGURE 3-4       CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN.       3-11         FIGURE 3-5       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 1       3-13         FIGURE 3-6       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2       3-15         FIGURE 3-7       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       MOUNTAIN AVENUE AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-7       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-23         FIGURE 3-7       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINA PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 4-1       A ERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       3-31         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       5.0-7         FIGURE 5-1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       5.1-17         FIGURE 5-1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIG	FIGURE 3-3	CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PHASES	
FIGURE 3-5       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 1       3-13         FIGURE 3-6       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2       3-15         FIGURE 3-7       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       MOUNTAIN AVENUE AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       MOUNTAIN AVENUE AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL CONCECLA BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CONCENCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE ECTONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DEAIN PLAN       3-34         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY STORM DEAIN PLAN       3-34         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-43         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-13         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-15         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING STE PHOTOS       5.1-77         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING STE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING STE PHOTOS       5.1-12 </td <td>FIGURE 3-4</td> <td>CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN</td> <td></td>	FIGURE 3-4	CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN	
FIGURE 3-6       TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2       3-15         FIGURE 3-7A       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-19         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-7C       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-9       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-27         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AEAIAL       AEAIAL       AEAIAL         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5.1       AEISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17	FIGURE 3-5	TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 1	
FIGURE 3-7A       PACIFIC AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-17         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-19         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-7C       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       3-37         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-3         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING STORM DRAINS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-13         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING STEP PHOTOS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING STEP PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-12       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION <t< td=""><td>FIGURE 3-6</td><td>TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2</td><td></td></t<>	FIGURE 3-6	TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, PHASE 2	
FIGURE 3-78       MOUNTAIN AVENUE AVENUE BUILDING ELEVATIONS       3-19         FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL CONCRECIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-9       CONCEPTUAL CIRCULATION PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CIRCULATION PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-43         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-113         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-18       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-19         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-21 <td>FIGURE <b>3-7</b>A</td> <td>Pacific Avenue Building Elevations</td> <td></td>	FIGURE <b>3-7</b> A	Pacific Avenue Building Elevations	
FIGURE 3-7C       SECOND STREET ELEVATIONS       3-21         FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-9       CONCEPTUAL CRCULATION PLAN       3-27         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL CRCULATION PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 4-1       Aerial Photograph       4-3         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       51-7         FIGURE 5.1-14       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-7         FIGURE 5.1-15       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-11         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-13         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       51-21         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       51-21         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       51-25         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       51-25         FIG	FIGURE 3-7B	Mountain Avenue Avenue Building Elevations	
FIGURE 3-8       CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN       3-23         FIGURE 3-9       CONCEPTUAL CIRCULATION PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STRET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN       3-35         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN       3-31         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AERIA PHOTOGRAPH       4-3         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-15         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-17         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-15         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-21       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-22       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25     <	FIGURE 3-7C	Second Street Elevations	
FIGURE 3-9       CONCEPTUAL CIRCULATION PLAN.       3-27         FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN.       3-31         FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS.       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN.       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-43         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5.1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       5.0-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-15         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1A       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-1B       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-1D       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25	FIGURE 3-8	CONCEPTUAL COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS SITE PLAN	3-23
FIGURE 3-10       CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN	FIGURE 3-9	CONCEPTUAL CIRCULATION PLAN	3-27
FIGURE 3-11       STREET LANDSCAPE SECTIONS       3-33         FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN.       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN.       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-3         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       5.0-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       5.0-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-15         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-15         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-21       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-22       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-24       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.3-1       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.3-1       VIEW SIMULATION       5.3-5	FIGURE 3-10	Conceptual Landscape Plan	
FIGURE 3-12       WATER, SEWER, AND DRAINAGE PLAN.       3-35         FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-13         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP       51-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-7         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-11         FIGURE 5.1-10       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       51-15         FIGURE 5.1-20       VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP       51-23         FIGURE 5.1-21       VIEW SIMULATION       51-23         FIGURE 5.1-22       VIEW SIMULATION       51-25         FIGURE 5.3-2       JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES       5.3-11         FIGURE 5.3-3       RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS       5.3-11         FIGURE 5.3-4       NORCO EGG RANCH       5.4-7         FIGURE 5.11-1       NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS       5.11-27	FIGURE 3-11	Street Landscape Sections	
FIGURE 3-13       PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN.       3-37         FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 3-14       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-3         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-13         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 4-3       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE       4-15         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1A       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-9         FIGURE 5.1-1D       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-1D       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-15         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION APP       5.1-23         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-23         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIE	FIGURE 3-12	Water, Sewer, and Drainage Plan	
FIGURE 3-14       PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN       3-41         FIGURE 4-1       AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH       4-3         FIGURE 4-2       GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 4-3       EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS       4-13         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       4-15         FIGURE 5-1       CUMULATIVE PROJECTS       50-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP       5.1-7         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-9         FIGURE 5.1-1       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-1D       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-23         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION MAP       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-3       VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	FIGURE 3-13	PRELIMINARY STORM DRAIN PLAN	
FIGURE 4-1AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH4-3FIGURE 4-2GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS4-13FIGURE 4-3EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE4-15FIGURE 5-1CUMULATIVE PROJECTS5.0-7FIGURE 5.1-1EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-9FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-11FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27 <t< td=""><td>FIGURE 3-14</td><td>PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN</td><td></td></t<>	FIGURE 3-14	PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN	
FIGURE 4-2GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS4-13FIGURE 4-3EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE4-15FIGURE 5-1CUMULATIVE PROJECTS5.0-7FIGURE 5.1-1EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-9FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-15FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.3-1VIEW SIMULATION5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-11-7FIGURE 5.1-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.1-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-6OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-7FORCE 5.11-3OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS <td< td=""><td>FIGURE 4-1</td><td>Aerial Photograph</td><td>4-3</td></td<>	FIGURE 4-1	Aerial Photograph	4-3
FIGURE 4-3EXISTING ZONING DESIGNATIONS WITHIN PROJECT SITE4-15FIGURE 5-1CUMULATIVE PROJECTS5.0-7FIGURE 5.1-1EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-9FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-51FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-13FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-1SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-72FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE	FIGURE 4-2	General Plan Designations	
FIGURE 5-1CUMULATIVE PROJECTS5.0-7FIGURE 5.1-1EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.1-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-72FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-72FIGURE 5.11-6OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION ALTERNATIVE SITE PIAN7-9	FIGURE 4-3	Existing Zoning Designations Within Project Site	
FIGURE 5.1-1EXISTING PHOTO LOCATION MAP5.1-7FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-9FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-15FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2VVIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2WVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2WVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.1-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MARGENER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MARGENER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MARGENER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MARGENER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MARGENER LOCATIONS5.11-	FIGURE 5-1	CUMULATIVE PROJECTS	5.0-7
FIGURE 5.1-1AEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-9FIGURE 5.1-1BEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-11FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-15FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.3-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE ADD RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.	FIGURE 5.1-1	Existing Photo Location Map	5.1-7
FIGURE 5.1-1B       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-11         FIGURE 5.1-1C       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-13         FIGURE 5.1-1D       EXISTING SITE PHOTOS       5.1-15         FIGURE 5.1-2       VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP       5.1-21         FIGURE 5.1-2A       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-23         FIGURE 5.1-2B       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-23         FIGURE 5.1-2C       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-25         FIGURE 5.1-2C       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.1-2C       VIEW SIMULATION       5.1-27         FIGURE 5.3-1       VEGETATION COMMUNITIES       5.3-5         FIGURE 5.3-2       JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES       5.3-11         FIGURE 5.3-3       RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS       5.3-13         FIGURE 5.4-1       NORCO EGG RANCH       5.4-7         FIGURE 5.11-1       NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS       5.11-7         FIGURE 5.11-2       SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-7         FIGURE 5.11-3       CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-17         FIGURE 5.11-4       OPERATIONAL NOISE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-23         FIGURE 5.11-5       OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES       5.11-27         FIGURE 5.11-5       OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATIO	FIGURE 5.1-1A	Existing Site Photos	5.1-9
FIGURE 5.1-1CEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-13FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-15FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE ROUTE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-72FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-6OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-7OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-7OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RETIONAL AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RETIONAL AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RETIONAL AND REASURES5.11-27FIGURE 7-1HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9 <td>FIGURE 5.1-1B</td> <td>Existing Site Photos</td> <td>5.1-11</td>	FIGURE 5.1-1B	Existing Site Photos	5.1-11
FIGURE 5.1-1DEXISTING SITE PHOTOS5.1-15FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 7-1HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9	FIGURE 5.1-1C	Existing Site Photos	5.1-13
FIGURE 5.1-2VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP.5.1-21FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 7-1HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9	FIGURE 5.1-1D	Existing Site Photos	5.1-15
FIGURE 5.1-2AVIEW SIMULATION5.1-23FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9	FIGURE 5.1-2	VIEW SIMULATION LOCATION MAP	5.1-21
FIGURE 5.1-2BVIEW SIMULATION5.1-25FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 7-1HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9	FIGURE 5.1-2A	VIEW SIMULATION	5.1-23
FIGURE 5.1-2CVIEW SIMULATION5.1-27FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES5.3-5FIGURE 5.3-2JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES5.3-11FIGURE 5.3-3RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS5.3-13FIGURE 5.4-1NORCO EGG RANCH5.4-7FIGURE 5.11-1NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-2SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-7FIGURE 5.11-3CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-17FIGURE 5.11-4OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS5.11-23FIGURE 5.11-5OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES5.11-27FIGURE 7-1HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN7-9	FIGURE 5.1-2B	VIEW SIMULATION	5.1-25
FIGURE 5.3-1VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	FIGURE 5.1-2C	VIEW SIMULATION	5.1-27
FIGURE 5.3-2       JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES	FIGURE 5.3-1	VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	5.3-5
FIGURE 5.3-3       RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS       5.3-13         FIGURE 5.4-1       NORCO EGG RANCH       5.4-7         FIGURE 5.11-1       NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS       5.11-7         FIGURE 5.11-2       SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-9         FIGURE 5.11-3       CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-17         FIGURE 5.11-4       OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-23         FIGURE 5.11-5       OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES       5.11-27         FIGURE 7-1       HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN       7-9	FIGURE 5.3-2	JURISDICTIONAL FEATURES	5.3-11
Figure 5.4-1       Norco Egg Ranch	FIGURE 5.3-3	RIPARIAN/RIVERINE AREAS	
Figure 5.11-1       Noise Measurement Locations       5.11-7         Figure 5.11-2       Sensitive Receiver Locations       5.11-9         Figure 5.11-3       Construction Noise Receiver Locations       5.11-17         Figure 5.11-4       Operational Noise Source And Receiver Locations       5.11-23         Figure 5.11-5       Operational Noise Mitigation Measures       5.11-27         Figure 7-1       Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan       7-9	FIGURE 5.4-1	NORCO EGG RANCH	
FIGURE 5.11-2       SENSITIVE RECEIVER LOCATIONS	FIGURE 5.11-1	NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS	
FIGURE 5.11-3       CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-17         FIGURE 5.11-4       OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS       5.11-23         FIGURE 5.11-5       OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES       5.11-27         FIGURE 7-1       HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN       7-9	FIGURE 5.11-2	Sensitive Receiver Locations	
FIGURE 5.11-4       Operational Noise Source and Receiver Locations       5.11-23         FIGURE 5.11-5       Operational Noise Mitigation Measures       5.11-27         FIGURE 7-1       HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN       7-9	FIGURE 5.11-3	CONSTRUCTION NOISE RECEIVER LOCATIONS	
FIGURE 5.11-5 OPERATIONAL NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES	FIGURE 5.11-4	OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS	
FIGURE 7-1 HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION AITERNATIVE SITE PLAN 7-9	FIGURE 5.11-5	Operational Noise Mitigation Measures	
-	FIGURE 7-1	HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN	

Table

### LIST OF TABLES

### Page

TABLE 1-1	SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	
TABLE 1-2	SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	1-7
TABLE 2-1	SUMMARY OF NOP/INITIAL STUDY COMMENT LETTERS	2-2
TABLE 3-1	Assessor Parcel Numbers	3-1
TABLE 3-2	SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	3-7
TABLE 3-3	PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BREAKDOWN	3-8
TABLE 3-4	SUMMARY OF PROPOSED GATEWAY SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT PARKING REQUIREMENTS	3-26
TABLE 3-5	CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	3-39
TABLE 5-1	CUMULATIVE PROJECT LIST	5.0-6
TABLE 5.1-1	GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH SCENIC QUALITY STANDARDS	5.1-29
TABLE 5.1-2	GATEWAY SPECIFIC PLAN CONSISTENCY WITH SCENIC QUALITY STANDARDS	5.1-30
TABLE 5.2-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards For Criteria Pollutants	5.2-2
TABLE 5.2-2	AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY 2015-2017	5.2-11
TABLE 5.2-3	ATTAINMENT STATUS OF CRITERIA POLLUTANTS IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN (SCAB)	5.2-13
TABLE 5.2-4	EXISTING EGG WAREHOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY AIR QUALITY EMISSIONS	5.2-13
TABLE 5.2-5	SCAQMD REGIONAL AIR QUALITY THRESHOLDS	5.2-14
TABLE <b>5.2-6</b>	SCAQMD LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS	5.2-15
TABLE 5.2-7	MAXIMUM PEAK CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS	5.2-18
TABLE 5.2-8	MAXIMUM PEAK CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS WITH MITIGATION	5.2-18
TABLE 5.2-9	SUMMARY OF OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS	5.2-20
TABLE 5.2-10	SUMMARY OF OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS WITH MITIGATION	5.2-20
TABLE 5.2-11	EMISSIONS FROM POTENTIAL OVERLAP OF CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION	5.2-22
TABLE 5.2-12	TRAFFIC VOLUMES FOR INTERSECTIONS EVALUATED IN 2003 AQMP	5.2-23
TABLE 5.2-13	PROPOSED PROJECT PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES	5.2-23
TABLE 5.2-14	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM PEAK CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY	5.2-24
TABLE 5.2-15	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM PEAK CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY WITH MITIGATION .	5.2-25
TABLE 5.2-16	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM OPERATION OF THE PROJECT	5.2-25
TABLE 5.3-1	POTENTIAL USACE/RWQCB AND CDFW JURISDICTION	5.3-9
TABLE 5.5-1	Estimated Construction Electricity Usage	5.5-6
TABLE 5.5-2	ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION FUEL CONSUMPTION	5.5-6
TABLE 5.5-3	ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION	5.5-7
TABLE 5.5-4	ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR FUEL CONSUMPTION (MEDIUM HIGH DUTY TRUCKS)	5.5-7
TABLE 5.5-5	ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION HAULING FUEL CONSUMPTION (HEAVY HIGH DUTY TRUCKS)	5.5-7
TABLE 5.5-6	ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONAL AUTOMOBILE FUEL CONSUMPTION	5.5-8
TABLE 5.5-7	ESTIMATED ANNUAL NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY CONSUMPTION	5.5-9
TABLE 5.7-1	EXISTING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS GENERATED AT THE PROJECT SITE	5.7-7
TABLE 5.7-2	PROJECT GENERATED GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS	
TABLE 5.7-3	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE CARB 2007 SCOPING PLAN	5.7-12
TABLE 5.7-4	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE CARB 2017 SCOPING PLAN	5.7-13
TABLE 5.9-1	PROJECTED WATER DEMAND AND SUPPLY FOR CITY OF NORCO	
TABLE 5.10-1	GATEWAY SPECIFIC PLAN PARKING REQUIREMENTS	5.10-3
TABLE 5.10-2	HOUSING ELEMENT IDENTIFIED SITES FOR LOWER INCOME RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	5.10-9
TABLE 5.10-3	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE SCAG REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN	5.10-9
TABLE 5.10-4	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN POLICIES	
TABLE 5.10-5	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE GATEWAY SPECIFIC PLAN POLICIES	
TABLE 5.11-1	CITY OF NORCO NOISE LEVEL EXPOSURE AND LAND USE COMPATIBILITY GUIDELINES	5.11-5
TABLE 5.11-2	MUNICIPAL CODE SOUND LEVEL STANDARDS	
IABLE 5.11-3	24-HOUR AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL MEASUREMENTS	
IABLE 5.11-4	CONSTRUCTION REFERENCE NOISE LEVELS	
IABLE 5.11-5	PROJECT CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVEL	
IABLE 5.11-6	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS	
TABLE 5.11-/	TEAR ZUAU PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS	
TABLE 5.11-8	UPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	
IABLE 5.11-9		

TABLE 5.11-10	MITIGATED NIGHTTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.11-29
TABLE 5.11-11	Daytime Operational Noise Level Increases	5.11-30
TABLE 5.11-12	NIGHTTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVEL INCREASES	
TABLE 5.11-13	VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	5.11-31
TABLE 5.11-14	Construction Equipment Vibration Levels	5.11-31
TABLE 5.12-1	SUMMARY OF NORCO SHERRIFF SERVICES	5.12-5
TABLE 5.13-1	Existing Hidden Villa Ranch Vehicular Trips	5.13-4
TABLE 5.13-2	Existing (2018) Intersection Conditions	5.13-5
TABLE 5.13-3	PEAK HOUR FREEWAY OFF-RAMP QUEUING OF EXISTING (2018) CONDITIONS	5.13-6
TABLE 5.13-4	BASIC FREEWAY SEGMENT EXISTING (2018) CONDITIONS	5.13-7
TABLE 5.13-5	FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION MERGE/DIVERGE EXISTING (2018) CONDITIONS	5.13-7
TABLE 5.13-6	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LOS THRESHOLDS	5.13-9
TABLE 5.13-7	Unsignalized Intersection LOS Thresholds	5.13-10
TABLE 5.13-8	DESCRIPTION OF FREEWAY MAINLINE LOS	5.13-11
TABLE 5.13-9	DESCRIPTION OF FREEWAY MERGE AND DIVERGE LOS	5.13-11
TABLE 5.13-10	PROJECT TRIP GENERATION (PCE)	5.13-13
TABLE 5.13-11	Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations	5.13-14
TABLE 5.13-12	EXISTING PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-15
TABLE 5.13-13	Existing Plus Project Off-Ramp Queuing	5.13-16
TABLE 5.13-14	Existing Plus Project Freeway Segment Operations	5.13-16
TABLE 5.13-15	EXISTING PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY MERGE/DIVERGE OPERATIONS	5.13-17
TABLE 5.13-16	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATIONS	5.13-18
TABLE 5.13-17	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-19
TABLE 5.13-18	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT OFF-RAMP QUEUING	5.13-20
TABLE 5.13-19	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY SEGMENT OPERATIONS	5.13-21
TABLE 5.13-20	OPENING YEAR (2022) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY SEGMENTS WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-21
TABLE 5.13-21	OPENING YEAR (2022) PROJECT FREEWAY MERGE/DIVERGE OPERATIONS	5.13-22
TABLE 5.13-22	OPENING YEAR (2022) PROJECT FREEWAY MERGE/DIVERGE OPERATIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS.	5.13-22
TABLE 5.13-23	HORIZON YEAR (2040) CONDITIONS PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTION OPERATIONS	5.13-23
TABLE 5.13-24	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT INTERSECTIONS OPERATIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-24
TABLE 5.13-25	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT OFF-RAMP QUEUING	5.13-26
TABLE 5.13-26	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT OFF-RAMP QUEUING WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-27
TABLE 5.13-27	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY SEGMENT OPERATIONS	5.13-27
TABLE 5.13-28	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY SEGMENTS WITH IMPROVEMENTS	5.13-28
TABLE 5.13-29	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION MERGE/DIVERGE CONDITIONS	5.13-28
TABLE 5.13-30 29	HORIZON YEAR (2040) PLUS PROJECT FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION MERGE/DIVERGE WITH IMPROV	/EMENTS 5.13-
TABLE 5.15-1	PROJECTED WATER DEMAND AND SUPPLY FOR CITY OF NORCO	5.15-6
TABLE 5.15-2	Water Demand from Buildout of the Proposed Project	5.15-8
TABLE 5.15-3	CITY OF NORCO SURPLUS SUPPLY AND PROJECT WATER DEMAND (AFY)	5.15-8
TABLE 5.15-4	SOLID WASTE DEMAND FROM BUILDOUT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	
TABLE 7-1	IMPACT COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES	
TABLE 7-2	COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES ABILITY TO MEET OBJECTIVES	
TABLE 8-1	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE TRENDS	8-3

### APPENDICES

#### Appendix Title APPENDIX A ...... INITIAL STUDY/NOP/COMMENTS APPENDIX B ......AIR QUALITY STUDY APPENDIX C ...... HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT APPENDIX D ......BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT APPENDIX F ......HISTORIC RESOURCES ANALYSIS REPORT APPENDIX G.....Cultural Report APPENDIX H ...... ENERGY ANALYSIS APPENDIX I ......GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION APPENDIX J ......PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT APPENDIX K......GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) STUDY APPENDIX L ..... PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT REPORTS APPENDIX M...... WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT APPENDIX N ...... PRELIMINARY WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN APPENDIX O...... NOISE TECHNICAL STUDY APPENDIX P ......TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

°C	degrees celsius
µg∕m³	micrograms per cubic meter
AB 52	California Assembly Bill 52
ACM	asbestos-containing material
AF	acre-feet
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
amsl	above mean sea level
AQIA	Air Quality Impact Analyses
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
ATCM	airborne toxic control measure
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BACM	best available control measure
BACT	best available control technology
Basin	South Coast Air Quality Basin
BAU	business as usual
BFE	base flood elevation
bgs	below ground surface
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAA	CAA Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CAP	Climate Action Plan of 2013
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act of 1988
CDA	Chino Desalter Authority
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CC&Rs	Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CGEU	California Gas and Electric Utilities 2016 California Gas Report
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH₄	methane
CHAPIS	Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CARB)
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Inventory System
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
	carbon dioxide
	carbon dioxide equivalent
	California Register of Historical Resources
	Clean Truck Program
CUP	Conditional Use Permit

dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibels
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FAR	floor area ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973
FMMP	Earmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
aal/day	aallons per day
GHG	areenhouse aas
GWP	global warming potential
Handbook	Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CAPR
THANGBOOK	2005)
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
НСР	Habitat Conservation Plan
HDT	Heavy Duty Trucks
HFCs	hydroflourocarbons
Hot Spots Act	Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987
HP	horsepower
HPLV	Hiah Pressure Low Volume
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning
ICU	intersection capacity utilization
	Interstate
IEUA	Inland Empire Utilities Agency
LBP	lead-based paint
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
IFFD	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
IFV	Low Emission Vehicle
	low impact development
	level of service
IST	localized significance thresholds
	maximum available control technology
	Migratory Bird Troaty Act of 1918
MCC	Migratory bird fredry Act of 1910
mee	million applications and and
mga	Mitigation Manitoring and Departing Program
	militar matrix tana
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
	metric tons
MI CO2e	metric fons of carbon dioxide equivalent
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
N <sub>2</sub> O	nifrous oxide
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NALS	numeric action levels
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
NESHAP	national emissions standards for HAPs
NH <sub>3</sub>	ammonia
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration

NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen oxide
NOx	nitrogen oxide
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	U.A. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
O3	ozone
Ph	lead
	project decign feature
	perflourocarbons
DAAo r	periodiocarbons
	particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in derodynamic diameter
<b>P</b> / <b>V</b> \10	particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in derodynamic diameter
add	parts per billion
	Plans, Programs, and Policies
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRIMP	Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan
PWS	public water supplier
REC	recognized environmental conditions
ROG	reactive organic gas
RP-5	IEUA Regional Water Recycling Plant No. 5
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SB 18	California Senate Bill 18, Ch. 905 (2004)
SC	Standard Condition
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SCE	Southern California Edison Company
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strateay
SE	sougre feet
	sybure reer
	sono nexanonae
SIF	sidie implementation plan
30 <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
3O <sub>3</sub>	sulfur frioxide
	sultates
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SO <sub>x</sub>	sultur oxides
SP	Specific Plan
SR	State Route
SRA	Source Receptor Area
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWQMP	Storm Water Quality Management Plan
SWRCB	Storm Water Resources Control Board
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
tpy	tons per year
TTCP	traditional tribal cultural places
TUA	traditional use area
USDA	United States Department of Aariculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USEWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

utility tractors
Urban Water Management Plan
velocity levels expressed in decibel notation
vehicle miles travelled
volatile organic compounds
Waste Discharge Requirements
Water Facilities Authority
California Land Conservation Act of 1965
Water Quality Certification

# 1. Executive Summary

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the construction and operation of the proposed Palomino Business Park Project (proposed Project). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with State and City of Ontario environmental policy guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The EIR is being circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 45 days in accordance with Section 15087 and Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. During the 45-day review period, the Draft EIR will be available for public review at the City's website: http://www.norco.ca.us/government/publicnotices/default.asp or the following locations:

Norco City Hall, City Clerk's	Norco Community Library	Norco Fire Station #47	
Office	3240 Hamner Avenue, Suite 101B	3902 Hillside Avenue	
2870 Clark Avenue	Norco, CA 92860	Norco, CA 92860	
Norco, CA 92860			
	Norco Senior Center		
	2690 Clark Avenue		
	Norco, CA 92860		

Written comments related to environmental issues in the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Steve King, Planning Director City of Norco Planning Department 2870 Clark Avenue Norco, CA 92860 Email: sking@ci.norco.ca.us

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was published concurrently with distribution of this document.

# 1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site consists of 65 parcels approximately 110 acres in size and is located in southwestern Riverside County within the southwestern portion of the City of Norco. The City of Norco is located approximately 40 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 20 miles west of downtown San Bernardino, and 20 miles northeast of Orange County. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15 (I-15) located 0.4 miles to the east and State Route 91 (SR-91), approximately 2.0 miles to the south. The Project site is located south of Second Street, east of Pacific Avenue, both north of and south by First Street and either west of or bisected by Mountain Avenue. In addition, the site is located within the Corona North USGS 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and can be located within Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 7 West of the San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

# **1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY**

The proposed Project would redevelop approximately 110 acres of land within the City of Norco for a new business park that would provide a mix of industrial, commercial, and office uses. The business park would include 35 light industrial buildings and 3 commercial buildings that would include commercial and office uses and would total approximately 2,050,000 square feet of new building space. The Project

would be implemented in two development phases. Phase 1, west of Mountain Avenue, would develop 21 buildings for industrial, warehouse, office, and commercial uses. Phase 2 consists of that portion of the Project site located east of Mountain Avenue and would develop the remaining 17 buildings also for industrial, warehouse, office, and commercial uses.

A 104.4-acre portion of the 110-acre Project site is located within the City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan. The Project includes an amendment to the Gateway Specific Plan to amend the parking standards for warehouse uses and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to increase the height of buildings allowed within the Industrial zoned areas by 15-feet. The Project also includes: a Tentative Tract Map (TTM), Site Plan Review, and a Development Agreement. In addition, because Phase 2 of the Project is located within the City's Housing Development Overlay (HDO), the Project would require approval of a Zone Change to remove the HDO from the Phase 2 area of the Project site. If not approved as part of the entitlements listed above, the Zone Change would be required prior to approval of a tract map for Phase 2 and development of the Phase 2 area.

### **Development Plan**

The Palomino Business Park Project would demolish the existing residential and industrial warehouse structures on the site and construct 35 industrial business park buildings totaling approximately 1,980,335 square feet, and 3 commercial buildings that would total 21,410 square feet. the proposed industrial buildings ranges from approximately 9,000 square feet to 158,000 square feet and the commercial buildings range in size from 4,000 square feet to 13,000 square feet. Table 1-1 provides a summary of the maximum proposed development.

	Buildings	Acreage	Proposed	Proposed SF	Planned
			Use		Operations
Phase 1	1-18		Business Park	1,456,075	2021-2022
	А, В, С		Industrial		
			Commercial	21,410	
Phase 2	19-36		Business Park	524,260	2022
			Industrial		
				48,255	
	TOTAL	110		<b>2,050,000</b> <sup>1</sup>	

### Table 1-1: Summary of Proposed Development

### Street and Equestrian Trail Improvements

The Project includes the following street and vehicular circulation improvements that would be completed in compliance with applicable City of Norco standards:

 Improve Pacific Avenue from the Project's northern boundary to its southern boundary at its ultimate half-section width along the Project's frontage as a local street (60-foot right-of-way). The Project will also accommodate the right-of-way for a future planned equestrian trail along the western side of Pacific Avenue.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The technical studies throughout this EIR analyze the development plan and additional square footage equivalent to 2.4% of the plan to account for technical deviations during final the final engineering stage, or about 48,255 SF.

- Improve Mountain Avenue from Second Street to the Project's southern boundary to its ultimate full-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way) and at its ultimate half-section width between the Project's southern boundary to First Street.
- Improve Second Street from the Project's western boundary to the Project's eastern boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).
- Improve First Street from the Project's western boundary to Mountain Avenue at its ultimate halfsection width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).
- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes.
- Install a traffic signal at the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Project Driveway 5.
- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and First Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes in conjunction with a southbound right turn lane.
- The Project would enhance the existing equestrian trails or construct new trails adjacent to the roadways that surround the Project site.

### **Drainage Improvements**

The Project would install new offsite drainage facilities, including: a 24-inch storm drain within Pacific Avenue, 15 and 36-inch storm drains within Second Street, a storm drain within Mountain Avenue that increases in size from 24 to 48-inches, and 18 and 24-inch storm drains within First Street. These drainage facilities are consistent with the Riverside County Flood Control's Master Drainage Study.

The Project also includes development of a series of onsite storm drains that would route storm water runoff to either a proposed infiltration basin south of First Street or one of two proposed infiltration basins at the northwest corner of the Project site adjacent to Second Street and Pacific Avenue. In addition, the Project would improve the South Norco Channel to provide a 7-foot deep 18-foot wide concrete trapezoidal channel from the existing culverts in Mountain Avenue to the existing culverts in Second Street. Concrete box culverts would be constructed under Mountain Avenue and First Street along with concrete channels for the culverts on the eastern side of Mountain Avenue and southern side of First Street. The improvements would increase the capacity of the channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan as directed by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

## **1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The Palomino Business Park site plan has been designed to meet a series of Project-specific objectives that have been carefully crafted in order to aid decision makers in their review of the proposed Project and its associated environmental impacts. The Project objectives have been refined throughout the planning and design process for the proposed Project, and are listed below:

1. To diversify the City of Norco economy with a mixed-use business park with a variety of buildings, including industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, R&D and commercial to ensure the site has a diversity of uses and long-term economic viability.

- 2. Redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure of egg ranching from California.
- 3. To create a high quality, master planned mixed-use light industrial business park development on a large underutilized area that attracts an array of businesses and provides a variety of employment opportunities in the city of Norco thereby reducing the need for members of the local workforce to commute outside the area for employment.
- 4. To provide industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, research and development and commercial uses within the Project boundaries which are compatible with surrounding uses and will also leverage the site's prime location and other regional transportation facilities to bring economic benefit to the area.
- 5. To develop a mixed-use light industrial business park with structures flexible in design to meet the needs of an ever-changing business market that implements the long term vision of the General Plan and the Gateway Specific Plan.
- 6. To provide a plan for roadways, infrastructure, and utilities to support onsite land uses and the City of Norco.
- 7. To promote sustainability by providing opportunities for water efficiency in the Project architecture and Project landscaping to promote water conservation.
- 8. To develop a Project that meets the architectural design guidelines of the Gateway Specific Plan that incorporates a quality western/southwestern/early Californian design character within the Project Area and provides enhanced.
- 9. To provide a Project with attractive and functional buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses that include a combination of walls, plantings, earth berms, equestrian trails, street trees, and varying setback depths.
- 10. Provide safe sidewalks and equestrian trails to enhance for pedestrian and equestrian access.

## **1.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES**

Section 7.0, *Alternatives*, of this EIR analyzes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project. The alternatives that are analyzed in detail in Section 7.0 are summarized below.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative. Under this alternative, the proposed Project would not be developed, and no development would occur. The existing egg processing facility, building remnants, and single-family residential uses would remain. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states that, "In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."

Accordingly, Alternative 1: No Project/No Build provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed Project in contrast to the result from not approving, or denying, the proposed Project. Thus, this alternative is intended to meet the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) for evaluation of a no project alternative.

Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity Alternative. Under this alternative, only Phase 1 of the proposed Project would occur. As shown in Table 3-2 in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, Phase 1 of the proposed Project includes 18 business park industrial buildings that include 1,456,075 square feet of space and three commercial buildings that would provide 21,410 square feet of space. Under this alternative, the proposed industrial warehousing and business park use would be reduced by a minimum of 18 buildings and a total of 572,515 square feet. This equates to a 28 percent reduction in square footage at build out of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. A proportional reduction in the amount of surface parking area would also occur by the Reduced Intensity Alternative. This alternative assumes that access to the site would be similar to the proposed Project with access from driveways on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.

Alternative 3: Historic Resource Retention Alternative. Under this alternative the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, would be retained to avoid impacts to the historical resource on the Project site. This alternative includes redesign of the Project to avoid removal of the historic resources, the stabilization of unoccupied contributing elements, and the continued use of the Norco Egg Ranch buildings for egg processing activities. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing features that convey the period of significance, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings commercial/industrial uses due to lack of demand for the older buildings. Retention of the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch would reduce the overall proposed Project by 24.4 percent. Under this alternative, the 60-foot main driveway would be redesigned and shifted south of Building 13; the other two driveways would be removed, leaving only two driveways for Phase 1. See Figure 7-1, Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan. As shown, six buildings would be removed for the Project (Building 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) and three others would be reduced in size (Building 7, 9 and 13). Street improvements along Mountain Avenue north of the northern driveway, including the horse trail, would not be possible to implement because the modern Egg Processing Building is immediate adjacent to Mountain Avenue, leaving insufficient width for improvements.

## **1.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Table 1-2 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this EIR. The level of significance of impacts after the proposed mitigation measures are applied are identified as significant and unavoidable, less than significant, and no impact. Relevant standard conditions of approval are identified, and mitigation measures are provided for all potentially significant impacts.

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation			
5.1 Aesthetics	5.1 Aesthetics						
Impact AE-1: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
<b>Impact AE-3:</b> The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
Impact AE-4: The Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
5.2 Air Quality							
<b>Impact AQ-1:</b> The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
Impact AQ-2: The Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	<ul> <li>PPP AQ-1: The following measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403 (4):</li> <li>All clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed</li> </ul>	Significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Tier 4. The construction plans and specifications shall state that construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower (>150 HP) shall comply with EPA/CARB Tier 4 emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications	Significant and Unavoidable			
result in exposure of sensitive receptors	25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust		Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Watering				

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
to substantial pollutant concentrations.	<ul> <li>emissions.</li> <li>The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.</li> <li>PPP AQ-2: The following measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of Rule 1113 (9). Only "Low-Volatile Organic Compounds" paints (no more than 100 gram/liter of VOC) and/or High Pressure Low Volume (HPLV) applications consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1113 shall be used.</li> </ul>		Actively Graded Areas. The construction plans and specifications shall state that during site preparation and grading activity all actively graded areas within the Project site shall be watered at 2.1-hour watering intervals (e.g., 4 times per day) or a movable sprinkler system shall be in place to ensure minimum soil moisture of 12% in maintained for actively graded areas. Moisture content shall be verified with use of a moisture probe by the grading contractor. Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Diesel Trucks. The construction plans and operational specifications shall state that contractors and building operators (by contract specifications) shall ensure that on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds will have a 2010 model year engine or newer or will be equipped with a particulate matter trap, as available. Mitigations. The Project plans and specifications shall include signs at loading dock facilities that include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 3 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations. Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Carpool Parking. The Project plans and specifications shall include electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building for employees and the public to use.	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Transportation Management. The Project plans and specifications shall require that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. The TMA shall advertise its services to the building occupants. The TMA shall offer transit incentives to employees and shall provide shuttle service to and from public transit, should a minimum of 5 employees request and use such service from a transit stop at the same drop-off and/or pickup time. The TMA shall distribute public transportation information to its employees. The TMA shall provide electronic message board space for coordination rides.	
Cumulative		Significant	Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, listed above.	Significant and Unavoidable
5.3 Biological Resources				
<b>Impact BIO-1:</b> The project would not 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.		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Burrowing Owl. Project construction plans and specifications shall state that a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction presence/absence survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If the species is found, the Project proponent shall immediately inform the Wildlife Agencies (CDFW, USFWS) and the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), and shall coordinate with these agencies to prepare and implement a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, prior to initiating ground disturbance. If the species is not found, no further action is needed.	Less than significant
Impact BIO-2: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Jurisdictional Areas. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for areas identified with jurisdictional	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service.			features, the Project applicant shall obtain regulatory permits from the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. Through the permitting and subject to approval by the regulatory agencies, the applicant shall compensate for Project-specific impacts at a minimum 1:1 ratio for USACE/RWQCB and CDFW unvegetated streambed, and a minimum 2:1 ratio for riparian vegetation through the purchase of rehabilitation, reestablishment, and/or establishment mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program within the San Jacinto River and/or Santa Ana River Watershed.	
Impact BIO-3: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.		No Impact	None required	No Impact
<b>Impact BIO-4:</b> The Project would not 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.		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Nesting Birds. Project construction plans and specifications shall state that as feasible, vegetation clearing should be conducted outside of the nesting season, which is generally identified as February 1 through September 15. If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to any disturbance of the site, including disking, demolition activities, and grading. The survey shall include those areas proposed for disturbance within 45 days. If additional areas are proposed for disturbance, a new nesting bird survey that	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			covers those areas shall be conducted. If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests, and the buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.	
<b>Impact BIO-6:</b> The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation. Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for areas identified as MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, the Project proponent shall obtain approval of a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) from the CDFW.	Less than significant
Cumulative		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4, listed above.	Less than significant
5.4 Cultural Resources				
Impact CUL-1: The Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.		Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historic American Buildings Survey Documentation. Prior to demolition of any structures, a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package shall be prepared for the Norco Egg Ranch Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. Large format photography shall be used for each building, with supplemental digital views of the buildings in the Field Records section of the package. Additionally, the contributing/character-defining landscape and hardscape features shall be accounted for in large format views.	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact CUL-2: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-2 Archaeological Resources. Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the applicant shall provide	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	or Plan, Program, Policy	before Mitigation	a letter to the City of Norco Building and Safety Division, from a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology as defined at 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A stating that the archeologist has been retained to provide on-call services in the event archeological resources are discovered. The archeological resources are discovered. The archeological resources surveillance. In the event a previously unrecorded archaeological deposit is encountered during construction, all activity within 50 feet of the area of discovery shall cease and the City shall be immediately notified. The archeological deposits meet the CEQA definition of historical (State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a)) and/or unique archaeological resource (Public Resources Code 21083.2(g)). If the find is considered a "resource" the archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage and treatment of the deposits. A qualified archaeologist and a Native American Monitor shall evaluate all archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities. If the resources are Native American in origin, they shall have the opportunity to consult with the City and/or project developer on appropriate treatment and curation of these resources. If unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the applicant's expense. Recovery, salvage and treatment protocols	Mitigation
			applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the archaeologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The archaeologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource. Excavation as a treatment option will be restricted to those parts of the unique archaeological resource that would be damaged or destroyed by the Project. Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Interpretive Sign or Exhibit. The project shall install on- site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family.	
Cumulative		Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL- 2 and CUL-3.	Less than significant
5.5 Energy				
<b>Impact E-1:</b> The Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact E-2:</b> The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.		No impact	None required	No impact
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
5.6 Geology and Soils				
Impact GEO-1iii: The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	<b>PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance.</b> The Project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code as included in the City's Municipal Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. California Building Code related and geologist and/or civil engineer specifications for the proposed Project shall be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of construction permit approval.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact GEO-2: The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact GEO-3: The Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.	PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact GEO-4: The Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact GEO-6:</b> The Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure PAL: Paleontological Resources. Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the City of Norco Building and Safety Division, or designee, from a paleontologist selected from the roll of qualified paleontologists maintained by Riverside County, stating that the	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			paleontologist has been retained to provide services for the Project. The paleontologist shall develop a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) to mitigate the potential impacts to unknown buried paleontological resources that may exist onsite for the review and approval by the City. The PRIMP shall require that the paleontologist be present at the pre- grading conference to establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance. The PRIMP shall require paleontological monitoring of excavation that exceeds depths of five feet. The PRIMP shall state that the Project paleontologist may re- evaluate the necessity for paleontological monitoring after 50 percent or greater of the excavations deeper than four feet have been completed.	
			In the event that paleontological resources are encountered, ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area of the discovery shall cease. The paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered.	
			Criteria for discard of specific fossil specimens will be made explicit. If a qualified paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by project planning, then recovery may be applied. Actions may include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction, monitoring work and halting construction if an important fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			specimens for curation and research purposes. Recovery, salvage and treatment shall be done at the applicant's expense. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the paleontologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The paleontologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource.	
Cumulative	PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance.	Potentially significant	Implement Mitigation Measure PAL-1.	Less than significant
5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
<b>Impact GHG-1:</b> The Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact GHG-2:</b> The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
<b>Impact HAZ-1:</b> The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	PPP HAZ-1: SCAQMD Rule 1403. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project applicant shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that an asbestos survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If asbestos is found, the Project applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	(SCAQMD) 1403. Rule 1403 regulations require that the following actions be taken: notification of SCAQMD prior to construction activity, asbestos removal in accordance with prescribed procedures, placement of collected asbestos in leak-tight containers or wrapping, and proper disposal.			
	<b>PPP HAZ-2: Lead.</b> Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project applicant shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that a lead-based paint survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If lead-based paint is found, the Project applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations for proper removal and disposal of the lead-based paint. Cal-OSHA has established limits of exposure to lead contained in dusts and fumes. Specifically, CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1 provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, and respiratory protection, and mandates good working practices by workers exposed to lead.			
	<b>PPP HAZ-3: SCAQMD Rule 461.</b> Prior to issuance of operational permits for the gas station facility, the Project applicant or proponent shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule			

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	461 has occurred. been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. Rule 461 regulations require gas station facilities to have California Air Resource Board (CARB) certified enhanced vapor recovery systems, testing and reporting, and routine maintenance and inspection protocols.			
Impact HAZ-2: The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	PPP HAZ-4: USTs. Prior to issuance of grading permits or permits related to removal of the existing diesel Underground Storage Tanks (USTs), the Project applicant or proponent shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that compliance with existing regulations, as implemented through the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health permitting process has occurred. This includes development of a work plan for removal of the existing diesel USTs and soil sampling and testing of the UST sites in accordance with Article 5 of the California Underground Storage Tank Regulations within Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, California Code of Regulations.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
	Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from			

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or larger. The Project applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.			
	<b>PPP WQ-2: WQMP.</b> Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the City Building and Safety Division. The WQMP shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design. Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.			
<b>Impact HAZ-3:</b> The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact HAZ-4:</b> The Project would not be located on a site that 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		No impact	None required	No impact

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
public or the environment.				
Impact HAZ-6: The Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative	PPP HAZ-1 through HAZ-4.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact WQ-1: The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.	<ul> <li>PPP WQ-2: A SWPPP Plan. All projects that develop one 1 acre or more of total land area or which are part of a large phased development that will disturb at least one acre of land are required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) utilizing the model form in Appendix B of the 2003 CASQA Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Handbook for Construction and submit a copy of the plan to the City Engineering Department for review. A copy of the adopted SWPPP shall be kept in the construction site office at all times during construction.</li> <li>PPP WQ-3: WQMP. Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Public Works Department. The WQMP shall be submitted using the Riverside County Stormwater Program's model form and shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design Source Control and shall</li> </ul>	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.			
<b>Impact WQ-1:</b> The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact WQ-3:</b> The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.	<b>PPP WQ-1: Hydrology Study.</b> A hydrology study and drainage analysis prepared and signed by a Civil Engineer registered in the State of California in accordance with the Riverside County Hydrology Manual and the City of Norco's Standards and Guidelines is required. Additional drainage facilities may be required as a result of the findings of this study	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact WQ-4: The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	PPP WQ-1: Hydrology Study, listed above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact WQ-5:</b> The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in	PPP WQ-1: Hydrology Study, listed above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

### Palomino Business Park

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation			
a manner which would 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.							
<b>Impact WQ-6:</b> The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows.	PPP WQ-1: Hydrology Study, listed above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
<b>Impact WQ-9:</b> The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
Cumulative	PPP WQ-1 through PPP WQ-3, listed above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
5.10 Land Use and Planning							
<b>Impact LU-2:</b> The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.		Significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1, listed above.	Significant and Unavoidable			
Cumulative		Less than significant	Mitigation Measure CUL-1, listed above.	Less than significant			
5.11 Noise							
Impact NOI-1: The Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Operational Noise Measures. If receiver location R4 represents owned and/or occupied noise- sensitive uses at the time of Project	Less than significant			
Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation			
---	--	--	--	----------------------------------			
established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.			<ul> <li>operation, then minimum 10-foot high noise barriers are required at the truck loading dock areas. Each barrier shall provide a weight of at least 4 pounds per square foot of face area with no decorative cutouts or line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the roadways, or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dBA. The barriers shall consist of a solid face from top to bottom. Unnecessary openings or decorative cutouts shall not be made. All gaps (except for weep holes) should be filled with grout or caulking. The noise barriers shall be constructed using the following materials:</li> <li>Masonry block;</li> <li>Earthen berm;</li> <li>Or any combination of construction materials capable of the minimum weight of 4 pounds per square foot or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dBA.</li> </ul>				
Impact NOI-2: The Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
5.12 Public Services							
<b>Impact PS-1:</b> The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection services.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			
<b>Impact PS-2:</b> The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant			

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police services.				
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.13 Transportation and Circulation				
<b>Impact TR-1:</b> The Project would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.		Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1: Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for the buildings that are proposed by the Project, Project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Norco toward implementation of the following traffic improvements:	Significant and Unavoidable
			Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Improvements	
			• Parkridge Avenue (West) & Second Street. (#10 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal and an eastbound left turn lane.	
			• Parkridge Avenue (East) & Second Street. (#11 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal and a westbound left turn lane.	
			• Hamner Avenue & Second Street (#25 Norco): Modify the intersection to provide a 2nd southbound left turn lane. Stripe a southbound right turn lane. Restripe the eastbound approach to provide two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one shared through-right turn lane. Restripe the westbound approach to provide two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to run the northbound and southbound left turns as lead-lag, with the southbound left turn running as lag, protect the eastbound and westbound left turns, and run the eastbound	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			<ul> <li>and westbound left turns as lead-lag, with the westbound left running as lag. As such, northbound/southbound and eastbound/westbound left turns will run separately (not concurrently).</li> <li>Hamner Avenue &amp; Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Parkway (#27 Norco): Modify the intersection to stripe a northbound right turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared left-through lane to a westbound left turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to provide overlap phasing for the northbound and westbound right turn lanes.</li> <li>I-15 Northbound Ramps &amp; Second Street (#32 Caltrans/Norco): Modify the intersection to add a northbound left turn lane.</li> </ul>	
			<ul> <li>Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Improvements</li> <li>River Road &amp; Corydon Street (#1 Norco/Corona): Modify the intersection to add a 2nd northbound left turn lane. North and southbound left turns may need to operate with lead-lag phasing in order to accommodate the future alignment of the turn lanes.</li> <li>River Road &amp; Lincoln Avenue (#3 Norco/Corona): Modify the intersection to add a 2nd southbound left turn lane and add a westbound right turn lane. The existing median may need to be removed to accommodate the 2nd southbound left turn lane.</li> <li>Pacific Avenue &amp; Second Street (#12 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal, restripe the eastbound approach to provide a left turn lane and a shared through-right lane, and</li> </ul>	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			<ul> <li>Mountain Avenue &amp; First Street (#22 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal, add a southbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lane, add a southbound right turn lane, and add a 2nd westbound through lane.</li> <li>Hamner Avenue &amp; Second Street (#25 Norco): Modify the intersection to restripe the northbound right turn lane as a</li> </ul>	
			<ul> <li>shared through-right turn lane.</li> <li>Hamner Avenue &amp; Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Parkway (#27 Norco): Restripe the intersection to provide a 3rd through lane and add a southbound right turn lane.</li> <li>Main Street &amp; Parkridge Avenue (#28 Corona): Restripe the northbound free- right turn lane as a shared through-right turn lane. Restripe the eastbound approach to provide two left turn lanes and one shared through-right turn lane.</li> <li>I-15 Southbound Ramps &amp; Second Street (#29 Caltrans/Norco): Modify the intersection to add an eastbound right turn lane.</li> </ul>	
Impact TR-3: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact TR-6: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Significant	Mitigation Measure TR-1, listed above.	Significant and Unavoidable
5.14 Tribal Cultural Resources				
Impact TCR-1: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

#### Palomino Business Park

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
the significance of a tribal cultural resource 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: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of 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, that considers the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		Potentially significant	<ul> <li>Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Native American Human Remains</li> <li>Prior to the start of ground disturbing activities, the project developer shall designate a location within the footprint of the project site for the respectful reburial of Native American human remains and/or ceremonial objects. All human skeletal material discoveries shall be reported immediately to the County Coroner. The Native American Monitor shall immediately divert work a minimum of 50 feet from the discovery site and place an exclusion zone around the burial. The Native American Monitor shall construction manager who shall contact the Riverside County Coroner. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, all construction activity shall be diverted while the Riverside County Coroner determines if the remains are Native American.</li> <li>If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains represent a historic non-Native American burial, the burial shall be treated in the same manner of respect with agreement of the Riverside County Coroner. Reburial will be in an appropriate setting. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be modern, the Riverside County Coroner shall take custody of the remains.</li> </ul>	Less than significant

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			If Native American, the Riverside County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as mandated by state law who will then appoint a Most Likely Descendent. The discovery shall be confidential and secure to prevent further disturbance. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be documented and recovered on the same day, the remains shall be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard shall be posted outside working hours. The Native American Tribe of Gabrieleño Ancestry shall make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keep the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be taken, which includes at a minimum, detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Tribe for data recovery purposes. No scientific study or the utilization of any invasive diagnostics shall be allowed to any Native American human remains. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or means necessary to ensure complete recovery of all material. If the discovery of human remains includes four (4) or more burials, the location is considered a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created. The project developer shall consult with the Tribe regarding avoidance of all cemetery sites.	

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	of Significance Mitigation Measures ore Mitigation	
			associated funerary objects shall be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony shall be removed to a secure container onsite if possible. These items shall be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site, but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the developer and protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered. Once complete, a final report of all activities shall be submitted to the NAHC. Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Resources (As provided in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources.)	
Cumulative		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measure TCR-1 and CUL-2, listed above.	Less than significant
5.15 Utilities and Service Systems				
<b>Impact UT-1:</b> The Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.		No impact	None required	No impact
<b>Impact UT-2:</b> The Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-3: The Project would not		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

#### Palomino Business Park

Impact	Applicable Standard Conditions or Plan, Program, Policy	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.				
<b>Impact UT-4:</b> There are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact UT-5:</b> The Project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact UT-6:</b> The Project would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact UT-7:</b> The Project would not 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.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
<b>Impact UT-8:</b> The Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.		No impact	None required	No impact
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

End of Table 1-2.

# 2. Introduction

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the construction and operation of the proposed Project. This EIR has been prepared by the City of Norco in its capacity as Lead Agency, as that term is defined in Section 15367 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) and in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.). This EIR has been prepared to identify, analyze, and mitigate the significant environmental effects of the proposed Project. The Project, as articulated in Section 3, *Project Description*, involves development of the proposed Project area in conformance with the General Plan land use and zoning designations of the area, and also includes design guidelines to provide for a unified and coordinated development.

CEQA requires each EIR to reflect the independent judgment of the Lead Agency, including but not limited to the thresholds of significance used to analyze Project impacts, analyses and conclusions regarding the level of significance of impacts both before and after mitigation, the identification and application of mitigation measures to avoid or reduce Project-related impacts, and the consideration of alternatives to the proposed Project. In preparing this EIR, the City of Norco has employed CEQA and environmental technical specialists; however, the analyses and conclusions set forth in this EIR reflect the independent judgment of the City as Lead Agency.

## 2.1 PURPOSE OF AN EIR

CEQA requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority prior to taking action on those projects. Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a), this EIR is intended as an informational document to inform public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of the proposed Project, identify possible ways to avoid or minimize those significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the Project that might avoid or lessen significant environmental effects. Thus, this EIR is intended to aid the review and decision-making process.

The CEQA Guidelines provide the following information regarding the purpose of an EIR:

- Project Information and Environmental Effects. An EIR is an informational document that will inform
  public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect(s)
  of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable
  alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with
  other information that may be presented to the agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a)).
- Standards for Adequacy of an EIR. An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to enable decision makers to make an intelligent decision that takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed Project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure (CEQA Guidelines Section 15151).

As a public disclosure document, the purpose of an EIR is not to recommend either approval or denial of a project, but to provide information regarding the physical environmental changes that would result from an action being considered by a public agency to aid in the agency's decision-making process.

## 2.2 EIR PROCESS

#### Notice of Preparation/Initial Study

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the City of Norco, as Lead Agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP)/Initial Study for the proposed Project, which was distributed on March 22, 2019 for a 30-day public review and comment period that ended on April 22, 2019. The NOP/Initial Study requested members of the public and public agencies to provide input on the scope and content of environmental impacts that should be included in the EIR being prepared. Comments received on the NOP/Initial Study are included in Appendix A and summarized in Table 2-1, which also includes a reference to the EIR section(s) in which issues raised in the comment letters are addressed.

#### Table 2-1: Summary of NOP/Initial Study Comment Letters

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant EIR Section
South Coast Air Quality Management District, April 16, 2019	
This letter references the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and recommends using the methodologies therein to evaluate impacts of the Project, including use of the CalEEMod model, recommended regional significance thresholds, and localized significance thresholds or dispersion modeling. Copies of the analysis including technical documents showing emissions calculations, assumptions and modeling files are requested. A mobile health risk assessment is recommended, as is use of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) land use compatibility guidance. Impacts associated with implementing mitigation measures are also recommended.	5.2 Air Quality 5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, March 26, 2019	·
This letter requests that the ALUC is submitted the project's specific plan amendment to ensure the project remains consistent with the General Plan. The project is located within Compatibility Zone E of Corona Municipal Airport Influence Area and Utilities Code Section 21676 gives ALUC the power to review projects that potentially impact General Plan Consistency	5.10 Land Use and Planning
Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, April 9, 20	019
This letter states that the Project may need to obtain an applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit coverage from the State Water Resources Control Board or the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. This permit must be obtained before clearance for grading, recordation, or other final approval. It is also stated that if the site is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, then the applicant would need to provide all studies, calculations, plans, and other information required to meet FEMA requirements. The Project would also require a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) prior to grading, recordation, or other final approval. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) is required before occupancy. If the project impacts a natural water course or mapped floodplain, consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S Army Corps of Engineers, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for the appropriate permits.	5.10 Hydrology / Water Quality

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant EIR Section
Connie Muckenthaler, April 22, 2019	•
This letter states concerns for the facilities size and impacts on traffic and air quality in the local area. The letter requests that the EIR consider those two impacts and take steps to mitigate the impact.	5.2 Air Quality 5.13 Transportation
Danny Palmer, March 26, 2019	
The letter asks when construction is estimated to start so he can relocate his family in a timely matter.	3.0 Project Description
Erin Southerland, April 22,2019	
The letter raises concerns about traffic impacts as well as noise, air quality, and aesthetics. The letter states that traffic on Second Street and Hamner Avenue is already horrible and adding more traffic, especially trucks, will make the problem worse. The 24/7 hours of operation also is concerning as it pertains to noise levels at night and local air quality. Finally, the 50-foot height of the building would be considered unsightly. The letter requests the scope be reconsidered to be less intensive and less industrial. <b>Greaor and Barbara Dellenbach, April 22, 2019</b>	5.1 Aesthetics 5.2 Air Quality 5.11 Noise 5.13 Transportation
This latter describes the existing conditions including the surrent buildings	51 April 1
This lefter describes the existing conditions, including the current buildings, wildlife and vegetation, slopes and soil, wetland habitat, horse riding recreational activities, and a night sky with a lack of light pollution. The letter includes a request to be notified about the Project, as well as requesting to have the EIR look into the impact of: their scenic views, the air quality and noise impacts from construction and operation, the impact of increased traffic and the impacts of widening second street, the impact of narrowing the horse trails from 10 feet to 5 feet, the impact of a taller than five foot chain linked fence around their property, the effect of lights on the night sky views, the impacts of ground vibrations, the resale value of the surrounding properties, the disturbance of soil and wildlife, soil erosion, water quality and retention, the impact to fossils or artifacts, bike and walking on second street, the compatibility to the General Plan and zoning, the removal of trees impacts and the hazardous material associated with them, the ecosystem impacts, an analysis on the alternatives. Finally, the letter requests that once the four residential homes are sold and the current residents have moved out to revise the land use to match the new zoning for the Gateway Specific Plan.	<ul> <li>5.1 Aesthetics</li> <li>5.2 Air Quality</li> <li>5.3 Biological Resources</li> <li>5.4 Cultural Resources</li> <li>5.6 Geology / Soils</li> <li>5.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</li> <li>5.8 Hazards and Hazardous</li> <li>Materials</li> <li>5.9 Hydrology / Water Quality</li> <li>5.10 Land Use / Planning</li> <li>5.11 Noise</li> <li>5.13 Transportation</li> </ul>
Ismael Gonzalez, March 25, 2019	
This letter asks how to change the zoning of his property. It is currently zoned for single-family residential and due to the impacts of aesthetics and quality of life it will make a house on that property unappealing.	5.1 Aesthetics 5.2 Air Quality 5.11 Noise
	200.000
not made available 5 days after its stated date, so the comment period should be extended five days to make up it. Concerning the Project, the letter includes questions about the retention basin and states that the zoning south of first street should remain the same. The letter also states that the noise and traffic from the Project will greatly impact the quality of life.	5.13 Transportation
Nicholas Whipps, April 4, 2019	
Requests to be put on the mailing list and be notified of anything related to the Project including upcoming hearings and availability of future environmental review documents.	N/A

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant EIR Section
Alan and Rozanne Schuetz	I
This letter expresses concern with the Project's impact on the community. The concerns include traffic impacts, air quality impacts including asthma in children, the disturbance of noise and light from trucks and construction, the lack of police presence and growing need for one, and finally the displacement of 36 homes.	5.1 Aesthetics 5.2 Air Quality 5.11 Noise 5.12 Public Services 5.13 Transportation
Larry Hawk	
This letter states that the area has turned into a slum cutting the property value in half. Also, the letter states that during the summer the property becomes a major fire hazard.	5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Project Description has been revised since the Notice of Preparation (NOP)/Initial Study that was distributed on March 22, 2019 for a 30-day public review. The changes include the addition of 7 acres to the Project site, which provide an additional 150,000 square feet of building space, and clarification that the Project is located within the City's Housing Development Overlay (HDO) and would require approval of a Zone Change to remove the HDO from the Phase 2 area of the Project site.

#### Public Scoping Meeting

Pursuant to Section 15082(c)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Norco hosted a public scoping meeting for members of the public and public agencies to provide input as to the scope and content of the environmental information and analysis to be included in the EIR for the proposed Project. The scoping meeting was held on April 18, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. in the City Hall located at 2870 Clark Avenue, Conference Rooms A and B.

#### Scope of this EIR

**Impacts Found Not to Be Significant.** Based upon the Initial Study, the City of Norco determined that an EIR should be prepared for the proposed Project. The scope of the EIR was determined based upon the Initial Study, and comments received in response to the NOP/Initial Study, as previously listed. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states that "[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant effects on the environment", and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a)) allows the use of an Initial Study to document Project effects that are less than significant. Furthermore, CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.

The NOP/Initial Study (included as Appendix A) prepared for the proposed Project determined that the Project would have no impact or have a less than significant impact on the following environmental topic areas:

- Agriculture & Forest Resources
- Population and Housing
- Schools and Other Public Facilities
- Mineral Resources
- Parks and Recreation
- Wildfire

Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Appendix A of this EIR for a detailed explanation of the basis of these conclusions.

**Impacts Found to Be Potentially Significant.** Fifteen environmental factors have been identified as potentially significant impacts if the proposed Project is implemented. Each of the following factors are described and evaluated in Section 5.0:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Police and Fire Services
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

#### Public Review of the Draft EIR

The City of Norco filed a Notice of Completion with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, indicating that this EIR has been completed and is available for review. A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was published concurrently with distribution of this document. The Draft EIR is being circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 45 days in accordance with Section 15087 and Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines. During the 45-day review period, the Draft EIR will be available for public review at the City's website: http://www.norco.ca.us/government/publicnotices/default.asp or the following locations:

Norco City Hall, City Clerk's	Norco Community Library	Norco Fire Station #47
Office	3240 Hamner Avenue, Suite 101B	3902 Hillside Avenue
2870 Clark Avenue	Norco, CA 92860	Norco, CA 92860
Norco, CA 92860		
	Norco Senior Center	
	2690 Clark Avenue	
	Norco, CA 92860	

Written comments related to environmental issues in the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Steve King, Planning Director City of Norco Planning Department 2870 Clark Avenue Norco, CA 92860 Email: sking@ci.norco.ca.us

#### Final EIR

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, written responses to all comments related to the environmental issues in the Draft EIR will be prepared and incorporated into a Final EIR. The written responses to comments will be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered. These comments, and their responses, will be included in the Final EIR for consideration by the City, as well as other responsible agencies per CEQA. The Final EIR may also contain corrections and additions to the Draft EIR, and other information relevant to the environmental issues associated with the Project. The Final EIR will be available for public review prior to its certification by the City. Notice of the availability of the Final EIR will be sent to all who responded to the Notice of Preparation.

## 2.3 ORGANIZATION OF THIS DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR is organized into the following Sections. To help the reader locate information of interest, a brief summary of the contents of each chapter of this Draft EIR is provided.

- Section 1 Executive Summary: This section provides a brief summary of the Project area, the proposed Project, and alternatives. The section also provides a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures that lists each identified environmental impact, applicable Project design features, standard conditions, proposed mitigation measure(s) (if any), and the level of significance after implementation of the mitigation measure. The level of significance after implementation of the mitigation measure(s) will be characterized as either less than significant or significant and unavoidable.
- Section 2 Introduction: This section provides an overview of the purpose and use of the EIR, the scope of this EIR, a summary of the legal authority for the EIR, a summary of the environmental review process, and the general format of the document.
- Section 3 Project Description: This section provides a detailed description of the proposed Project, its objectives, and a list of Project-related discretionary actions.
- Section 4 Environmental Setting: This section provides a discussion of the existing conditions within the Project area.
- Section 5 Environmental Impact Analysis: This section includes a summary of the existing statutes, ordinances and regulations that apply to the environmental impact area being discussed; the analysis of the Project's direct and indirect environmental impacts on the environment, including potential cumulative impacts that could result from the proposed Project; any applicable Project design features; standard conditions and plans, policies, and programs that could reduce potential impacts; and the feasible mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the significant adverse impacts identified. Impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant are identified as significant and unavoidable.
- Section 6 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts and Effects Found Not to be Significant: This section summarizes the significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project. In addition, this section provides a summary of the environmental effects of the implementation of the proposed Project that were found not to be significant.
- Section 7 Alternatives: This section describes and analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project. The CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative is included along with

alternatives that would reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed Project. As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the environmentally superior alternative is also identified.

- Section 8 CEQA Mandated Considerations: This section provides a discussion of various CEQAmandated considerations including growth-inducing impacts and the identification of significant irreversible changes that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.
- Section 9 Report Preparation: This section lists authors of the Draft EIR and City staff that assisted with the preparation and review of this document.

## 2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

In accordance with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines and to reduce the size of the report, the following documents are hereby incorporated by reference into this EIR and are available for public review on the City's website (www.norco.ca.us) and at the City of Norco Planning Department, 2870 Clark Avenue, Norco, CA 2860. A brief summary of the scope and content of these documents is provided below.

**City of Norco General Plan:** The City's General Plan provides a framework to shape the City of Norco for the future. The General Plan consists of seven Elements, including: Circulation Element, Conservation Element, Housing Element, Land Use Element, Noise Element, Open Space Element, and Safety Element.

**City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan:** The City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan establishes the zoning ordinance for the lands within its boundaries. The Gateway Specific Plan serves as both a policy function and a regulatory function, and is the device used for implementing the long-term goals and objectives of the City of Norco General Plan within the Gateway Specific Plan area.

**City of Norco Municipal Code:** The City has adopted a Municipal Code to aid in implementation of federal and state planning, zoning, development, subdivision, and environmental laws; and to guide the orderly development of the City in a manner that promotes and protects the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and welfare of its inhabitants. The Municipal Code guides the land uses, in compliance with General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. The Municipal Code is referenced throughout this document as regulations governing development and land use activities within the City.

# 3. Project Description

## 3.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is located in southwestern Riverside County within the southwestern portion of the City of Norco. The City of Norco is located approximately 40 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 20 miles west of downtown San Bernardino, and 20 miles northeast of Orange County. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15 (I-15) located 0.4 miles to the east and State Route 91 (SR-91), approximately 2.0 miles to the south. The site is located within the Corona North USGS 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and can be located within Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 7 West of the San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian.

The Project site is located south of Second Street, east of Pacific Avenue, both north of and south by First Street and either west of or bisected by Mountain Avenue. The Project site consists of 65 parcels approximately 110 acres in size with the Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) by Development Phase listed in Table 3-1, below. Regional location and local vicinity maps are provided in Figure 3-1, *Regional Location and Figure 3-2, Local Vicinity* respectively.

Tuble 3-1. Assessor Fulcer Normbers by Filuse					
Phase 1 APNs (49 Parcels)					
122-030-011	122-030-016	122-030-017	122-030-018		
126-170-001	126-170-002	126-170-003	126-170-004		
126-170-005	126-170-008	126-170-009	126-170-010		
126-170-011	126-170-012	126-170-013	126-170-014		
126-170-015	126-170-017	126-170-018	126-170-019		
126-170-033	126-170-034	126-180-001	126-180-002		
126-180-003	126-180-004	126-180-005	126-180-006		
126-180-007	126-190-001	126-190-002	126-190-003		
126-200-002	126-200-003	126-200-004	126-200-006		
126-200-013	126-200-015	126-200-016	126-200-017		
126-200-018	126-200-019	126-200-020	126-200-021		
126-200-022	126-200-023	126-200-024	126-200-025		
126-200-026	-	-	-		
Phase 2 APNs (16 Parcels)					
126-210-001	126-210-003	126-210-004	126-210-005		
126-210-006	126-210-007	126-210-008	126-210-009		
126-210-010	126-240-001	126-240-002	126-240-0013		
126-240-004	126-240-005	126-240-006	126-240-007		

#### Table 3-1: Assessor Parcel Numbers by Phase

## 3.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Project site is located within the City's Gateway Specific Plan area. The Project site has historically been used for agricultural production and residential purposes. The site contains 36 existing single-family residential structures and industrial buildings that were used for chicken egg storage and distribution. The existing land uses and conditions of the Project site are described in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting.

## 3.3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Palomino Business Park site plan has been designed to meet a series of Project-specific objectives that have been carefully crafted in order to aid decision makers in their review of the proposed Project and its

associated environmental impacts. The Project objectives have been refined throughout the planning and design process for the proposed Project, and are listed below:

- 1. To diversify the City of Norco economy with a mixed-use business park with a variety of buildings, including industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, R&D and commercial to ensure the site has a diversity of uses and long-term economic viability.
- 2. Redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure of egg ranching from California.
- 3. To create a high quality, master planned mixed-use light industrial business park development on a large underutilized area that attracts an array of businesses and provides a variety of employment opportunities in the city of Norco thereby reducing the need for members of the local workforce to commute outside the area for employment.
- 4. To provide industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, research and development and commercial uses within the Project boundaries which are compatible with surrounding uses and will also leverage the site's prime location and other regional transportation facilities to bring economic benefit to the area.
- 5. To develop a mixed-use light industrial business park with structures flexible in design to meet the needs of an ever-changing business market that implements the long term vision of the General Plan and the Gateway Specific Plan.
- 6. To provide a plan for roadways, infrastructure, and utilities to support onsite land uses and the City of Norco.
- 7. To promote sustainability by providing opportunities for water efficiency in the Project architecture and Project landscaping to promote water conservation.
- 8. To develop a Project that meets the architectural design guidelines of the Gateway Specific Plan that incorporates a quality western/southwestern/early Californian design character within the Project Area and provides enhanced.
- 9. To provide a Project with attractive and functional buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses that include a combination of walls, plantings, earth berms, equestrian trails, street trees, and varying setback depths.
- 10. Provide safe sidewalks and equestrian trails to enhance for pedestrian and equestrian access.

## **3.4 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

"Project," as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines, means:

the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and that is any of the following: (1)...enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, and the adoption and amendment of local General Plans or elements thereof pursuant to Government Code Sections 65100–65700." (14 Cal. Code of Reg. § 15378(a).)

The project analyzed in this EIR is the Palomino Business Park Project that would be developed in two phases that would be constructed over 24-months. The EIR analyzes buildout at a project level of detail, based upon the entitlement applications that are being considered by the City, compared to the existing conditions.

# **Regional Location**





# **Local Vicinity**



## 3.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Palomino Business Park ("Project") would redevelop approximately 110 acres of land within the City of Norco for a new business park that would provide a mix of industrial, commercial, and office uses. The business park would include 35 light industrial buildings and 3 commercial buildings that would include commercial and office uses. The Project includes construction of approximately 2,050,000 square feet of new building space and related on- and offsite improvements. The Project would be implemented in two development phases. Phase 1, west of Mountain Avenue, would develop 21 buildings for industrial, warehouse, office, and commercial uses. Phase 2 consists of that portion of the Project site located east of Mountain Avenue and would develop the remaining 17 buildings also for industrial, warehouse, office, and commercial uses are shown in Figure 3-3, Conceptual Development Phases.

A 104.4-acre portion of the 110-acre Project site is located within the City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan. The Project includes an amendment to the Gateway Specific Plan to amend the parking standards for warehouse uses and to allow buildings up to 50-feet in height in the Industrial zone. The Project also includes: a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), a Tentative Tract Map (TTM), Site Plan Review, and a Development Agreement. In addition, because Phase 2 of the Project is located within the City's Housing Development Overlay (HDO), the Project would require approval of a Zone Change to remove the HDO from the Phase 2 area of the Project site. If not approved as part of the entitlements listed above, the Zone Change would be required prior to approval of a tract map for Phase 2 and development of the Phase 2 area.

### **Development Plan**

The Palomino Business Park Project would demolish the existing residential and industrial warehouse structures on the site and construct 35 industrial business park buildings totaling approximately 1,980,335 square feet, and 3 commercial buildings that would total 21,410 square feet. Table 3-2 provides a summary of the maximum proposed development.

	Buildings	Acreage	Proposed Use	Proposed SF	Planned Operations
Phase 1	1-18		Business Park Industrial	1,456,075	2021-2022
	А, В, С		Commercial	21,410	
Phase 2	19-36		Business Park Industrial	524,260	2022
				48,255	
	TOTAL	110	•	<b>2,050,000</b> <sup>1</sup>	

Table 3-2: Summary of Proposed Development

As shown in Figure 3-4, Conceptual Site Plan, the estimated size of the proposed industrial buildings ranges from approximately 9,000 square feet to 158,000 square feet and the commercial buildings range in size from 4,000 square feet to 13,000 square feet. A summary of building square footages is provided in Table 3-3. See also Figure 3-5, Tentative Tract Map, Phase 1 and Figure 3-6, Tentative Tract Map, Phase 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The technical studies throughout this EIR analyze the development plan and additional square footage equivalent to 2.4% of the plan to account for technical deviations during final the final engineering stage, or about 48,255 SF.

Proposed Industrial				
Building No.	Total Building Area (SF)	Building No.	Total Building Area (SF)	
1	38,400	19	43,600	
2	38,400	20	26,460	
3	38,400	21	55,570	
4	38,400	22	36,320	
5	120,075	23	28,020	
6	160,275	24	48,800	
7	160,275	25	41,000	
8	72,230	26	59,600	
9	66,770	27	9,240	
10	44,300	28	11,040	
11	89,340	29	12,840	
12	91,810	30	12,840	
13	136,480	31	12,840	
14	145,100	32	12,840	
15	63,790	33	33,200	
16	63,790	34	33,200	
17	50,880	35	46,850	
18	37,360	Total Industrial	1,980,335	
Proposed Commercial				
А	13,040	-	-	
В	4,095	-	-	
С	4,275	-	-	
	-	Total Commercial	21,410	
Analytical Buffer 48,255				
PROJECT TOTAL 2,050,000 SF				

	Table	3-3:	Project	Development	Breakdown
--	-------	------	---------	-------------	-----------

The industrial buildings would have a maximum height ranging from 35 feet to 50-feet. The Project includes a Specific Plan Amendment to provide a 15-foot height increase to allow for flexibility in final building design for the larger buildings, located in the interior of the site, and to accommodate architectural treatments such as roof parapets. See Figure 3-7A, Pacific Avenue Building Elevations, Figure 3-7B, Mountain Avenue Elevations, and Figure 3-7C Second Street Elevations.

Three commercial buildings are proposed on the northwest corner of First Street and Mountain Avenue. As show in Figure 3-8, Conceptual Commercial Buildings Site Plan the commercial buildings would include 13,040 square feet of retail, including 6,520 square feet of fast-food restaurant uses without drive-through window and 4,275 square feet of fast-food restaurant with drive-through window. In addition, a



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Conceptual Development Phases**



Palomino Buisness Park, Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Conceptual Site Plan**

# Tentative Tract Map 37681 (Phase 1)



Source: Michael Baker International

Project Site

Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco



Source: Michael Baker International

Project Site

Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# Tentative Tract Map 37804 (Phase 2)









Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# Pacific Avenue Building Elevations

# Mountain Avenue Building Elevations



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco


-0 



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# Second Street Building Elevations







3. Project Description

# **Conceptual Commercial Buildings Site Plan**



Palomino Business Park Norco, California

12-vehicle fueling position gas station with a 4,095 square foot convenience market is proposed. The commercial buildings would have a maximum height of 35 feet.

The Project is proposing architectural features such as rustic metal shed roofs, siding, barn doors and balconies reminiscent of the old west. Individual windows are proposed with framed openings in lieu of storefront glazing. The windows will be recessed to create more depth and shadow. The entry panels will be more prominent and will be taller, have cornices and accent color. The overhangs of the balconies and shed roofs are designed to provide shade and visual interest and the feel of the covered walkway so common in western architecture. A rustic style water tower is proposed at the city entry near Pacific Avenue and First Street.

This EIR analyzes 602,130 square feet of warehousing/distribution, 1,426,460 square feet of industrial park, with refrigeration and 21,410 of commercial uses. Although Phase I will precede Phase 2 in terms of construction, for purposes of impact analysis, the EIR conservatively assumes the buildout of Phase 1 and Phase 2 would occur concurrently and assumes both Phases would be developed and operational by 2022.

### **Circulation and Street Improvements**

### Site Access

Mountain Avenue is a north-south roadway that bisects the Project site. Access to the Project site would be provided by 11 driveways along Mountain Avenue. Five driveways would provide access to Phase I on the west side of Mountain Avenue and four driveways would provide access to Phase 2, on the east side of Mountain Avenue. Two driveways are proposed on First Street and one driveway that provides right-in, right-out access for passenger cars only, is located on Second Street, on the east side of Mountain Avenue. There are no driveways and there is no vehicle access from the Project site to Pacific Avenue.

Driveway locations are depicted in Figure 3-9, Conceptual Circulation Plan.

### Street and Equestrian Trail Improvements

The Project includes the following street and vehicular circulation improvements (project design features) that would be completed in compliance with applicable City of Norco standards:

- Improve Pacific Avenue from the Project's northern boundary to its southern boundary at its ultimate half-section width along the Project's frontage as a local street (60-foot right-of-way). The Project will also accommodate the right-of-way for a future planned equestrian trail along the western side of Pacific Avenue.
- Improve Mountain Avenue from Second Street to the Project's southern boundary to its ultimate full-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way) and at its ultimate half-section width between the Project's southern boundary to First Street.
- Improve Second Street from the Project's western boundary to the Project's eastern boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).
- Improve First Street from the Project's western boundary to Mountain Avenue at its ultimate halfsection width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).
- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes.
- Install a traffic signal at the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Project Driveway 5.

- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and First Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes in conjunction with a southbound right turn lane.
- The Project would enhance the existing equestrian trails or construct new trails adjacent to the roadways that surround the Project site.

### Parking

The Project proposes approximately 1,800 parking spaces. The Project is seeking an amendment to update the Gateway Specific Plan's warehouse parking requirements to reflect the expected parking demands of a contemporary light industrial business park with commercial and office uses. Parking and loading dock facilities would be located at each building and the proposed changes to parking requirements are listed in Table 3.4.

Existing Specific Plan Parking Requirements		Proposed Specific Plan Parking Requirements	
Land Use	Parking Requirement	Land Use	Parking Requirement
Light Manufacturing & Light Industrial	1 space/400 square feet of gross floor area devoted to manufacturing plus 1 space for every 250 square feet of office floor area	Light Manufacturing & Light Industrial (assumes 15% max. GFA for office)	1 space/500 square feet of gross floor area; plus 1 tractor trailer space per 4 dock high doors
Warehouse	1 space for every 750 square feet of warehouse or storage floor area	Warehouse/Distribution Facility (assumes 15% max. GFA for office)	<ul> <li>1 space/1,000 square feet of gross floor area for the first 20,000 sf</li> <li>1 space/2,000 square feet of gross floor area for that portion between 20,001 sf to 40,000 sf</li> <li>1 space/4,000 sf of gross floor area over 40,001 sf; plus 1 tractor-trailer space per 4 dock high doors</li> </ul>
n/a	n/a	Multi-tenant Industrial Park (assumes 15% max. GFA for office)	<ol> <li>space/400 square feet</li> <li>of gross floor area; plus</li> <li>tractor trailer space per</li> <li>dock high doors</li> </ol>

### Table 3-4: Summary of Proposed Gateway Specific Plan Amendment Parking Requirements

GFA= Gross Floor Area

The Project includes installation of traffic signals at the intersections of First Street and Mountain Avenue, Second Street and Mountain Avenue, and at the main entrance on Mountain Avenue. In addition, the Project would provide half-width improvements along the roadways surrounding the Project site, which include replacement of the pavement, curb, and gutters. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. See Figure 3-4, Conceptual Site Plan.



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Conceptual Circulation Plan**

3. Project Description

## Landscaping

The conceptual landscape plan for the proposed Project is illustrated on Figure 3-10, Conceptual Landscape Plan. Landscaping would utilize a drought tolerant landscape palette with 14 types of trees, more than 12 varieties of shrubs and groundcover and dozens of accent plants.

The Project includes a minimum landscaped setback of 15-feet along First Street, 25-feet along Second Street, 28-foot landscape setbacks along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-feet along Mountain Avenue. In addition to plants, these landscaped setbacks would include a set of berms that would be 6-feet high on Pacific Avenue, and 3-feet high on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. The varying setback depths and berms serve as buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses and include a combination of walls, plantings, earthen berms, and trees. As shown on Figure 3-10, enhanced landscaping including larger trees and denser groundcover are proposed on the periphery of the Project site along Mountain Avenue, Pacific Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. Enhanced landscaping would also be located at building entries and in and around automobile parking areas to create a buffer between the Project site and adjacent areas. The Project also includes decorative crosswalks, paving, street trees, and 12-foot wide equestrian trails with wood or vinyl lodge post fencing, as shown in Figure 3-11, Street Landscape Sections.

### Infrastructure Improvements

### Water

The Project would be served by existing water infrastructure located in the surrounding right-of-way. Second Street contains a 12-inch water line and First Street, Pacific Avenue, and Mountain Avenue contain 6-inch water lines. The Project would provide offsite improvements by replacing the existing 6-inch water lines in Mountain Avenue and First Street with 12-inch water lines. In addition, a public 12-inch water line would bisect the Project site and connect to the existing lines in First Street and Second Street to provide a looped fire water system. See Figure 3-12, Water, Sewer and Drainage Plan.

### Sewer

The City's wastewater system flows north to south and an existing 24-inch transmission sewer main runs through the middle of the Project site. This sewer main would be protected in place and would not be used to serve the Project. The Project would connect to and be served by the existing 8-inch sewer lines that are located within Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. The three commercial buildings would connect to an existing 18-inch sewer line that is located northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection. Figure 3-12, Water and Sewer Plan.

### Drainage

Existing offsite stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and three 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. The existing drains in Mountain Avenue and First Street convey stormwater from the Riverside County South Norco Channel, which flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction.

The Project would install new offsite drainage facilities, including: a 24-inch storm drain within Pacific Avenue, 15 and 36-inch storm drains within Second Street, a storm drain within Mountain Avenue that increases in size from 24 to 48-inches, and 18 and 24-inch storm drains within First Street. These drainage facilities are consistent with the Riverside County Flood Control's Master Drainage Study.

The Project also includes development of a series of onsite storm drains that would route storm water runoff to either a proposed infiltration basin south of First Street or one of two proposed infiltration basins at the northwest corner of the Project site adjacent to Second Street and Pacific Avenue. In addition, the Project would improve the South Norco Channel to provide a 7-foot deep 18-foot wide concrete trapezoidal channel from the existing culverts in Mountain Avenue to the existing culverts in Second Street. Concrete box culverts would be constructed under Mountain Avenue and First Street along with concrete channels for the culverts on the eastern side of Mountain Avenue and southern side of First Street. The improvements would increase the capacity of the channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan as directed by the Riverside County Flood Control District. See Figure 3-13, *Preliminary Storm Drain Plan*.

## Sustainable Design Features

The Project would implement sustainable design features with the goal of reducing the energy needs of the Project and related greenhouse gas emissions. These features and programs would be incorporated into all of the facilities developed by the Project and would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code ([CALGreen]; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11) as implemented by the City of Norco.

- Install drought-tolerant plants for landscaping.
- Install water-efficient irrigation systems, such as weather-based and soil-moisture-based irrigation controllers and sensors, for landscaping according to the California Department of Water Resources Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
- Buildings will be designed to provide CALGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design features for potential certification and will employ energy and water conservation measures in accordance with such standards. This includes design considerations related to the building envelope; heating, ventilating, and air conditioning; lighting; and power systems.
- Surface parking lots will be well landscaped to reduce heat island effect. Parking lot landscaping will be planted with 15-gallon trees, at a rate of one per every four parking stalls. The trees may be clustered, but a minimum of one cluster will be provided for each 100 feet of parking row. Trees will be selected and placed to provide canopy and shade for the parking lots.
- The Project shall implement a recycling program in order to meet a 50 percent minimum waste diversion goal.
- Choose construction materials and interior finish products with zero or low emissions to improve indoor air quality;
- Provide adequate ventilation and high-efficiency in-duct filtration system;
- Use low or moderate water use plants, including native plant materials where appropriate; minimize turf areas;
- Use low volatile organic compound paints and wallpapers;
- Electrical outlets will be provided in loading dock areas to provide power for trucks.; and
- All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) would be powered by non-diesel fueled engines and all indoor forklifts would be powered by electricity.

### PLANTING LEGEND

SHRUBS

SYMBOL

0000

0000

SPECIES THAT WHE BE LITHUZED THROUGHOUT THE PROJECT

WESTRINGIA FRUTICOSA, COAST ROSEMARY 5 GAL. SIZE

LIGUSTRUM TEXANUM. TEXAS PRIVET

SHRUB NAME

5 GAL, SIZE

5 GAL. SIZE

5 GAL. SIZE

RIDING TRAIL

JUNCUS PATENS

CAREX TUMULICOLA MUHLENBERGIA RIGENS

00000

SYMBOL TREE NAME		
$\otimes$	STREET TREE ALONG PACIFIC AVE & MOUNTAIN AVE. PLATANUS X ACERIFOLIA, LONDON PLANE TREE 36" BOX SIZE @ 35'-0" O.C.	
$\bigotimes$	STREET TREE ALONG PACIFIC AVE. @ 35'-0" O.C. CINNAMOMUM CAMPHORA, CAMPHOR TREE 36" BOX SIZE @ 35'-0" O.C.	
$\bigotimes$	STREET TREE ALONG SECOND ST. & FIRST ST. KOELREUTERIA PANICULATA, GOLDEN RAIN TREE 24" BOX SIZE @ 35'-0" O.C.	
(	STREET TREE ALONG SECOND ST. KOELREUTERIA BIPINNATA, CHINESE FLAME TREE 24" BOX SIZE @ 35'-0" O.C.	
	STREET TREE ALONG PALOMINO WAY SCHINUS MOLLE, CALIFORNIA PEPPER TREE 24" BOX SIZE @ 35'-0" O.C.	
$\odot$	PARKING LOT SHADE TREE ULMUS PARVIFOLIA, CHINESE ELM 24" BOX SIZE	
$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$	SECONDARY PARKING LOT TREE BRACHYCHITON POPULNEUS, BOTTLE TREE 15 GAL. SIZE	
$\odot$	VERTICAL TREE ALONG BUILDING PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR, FERN PINE 15 GAL. SIZE	
$\oslash$	VERTICAL TREE ALONG BUILDING TRISTANIA LAURINA 15 GAL. SIZE	
R	FLOWERING ACCENT TREE LAGERSTROEMIA I. 'WATERMELON RED', CRAPE MYRTLE 36" BOX SIZE	
R	SPECIMEN SIZE ACCENT TREE QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA, COAST LIVE OAK 48° BOX SIZE	
$\mathfrak{O}$	EVERGREEN SCREEN TREE PINUS ELDARICA, MONDELL PINE 24" BOX SIZE	
+	TREE ALONG SLOPES OF DETENTION BASINS PLATANUS RACEMOSA, CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE 15 GAL. SIZE	
$\bigcirc$	LARGE FLOWERING ACCENT TREE CERCIDIUM F. 'DESERT MUSEUM', PALO VERDE 36° BOX SIZE	



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Conceptual Landscape Plan**

Figure 3-10

3. Project Description

## **Street Landscape Sections**

2.

6.

SECTION 'A-A' KEY NOTES:

(3.) LANDSCAPE PARKWAY (4) 6" CURB & GUTTER PER CIVIL DWGS. 5. 12'-0" WIDE D.G. EQUESTRIAN TRAIL

9. VINYL FENCE () CREATE 6 FT. HIGH BERM

(1) NEW STREET TREE PER LEGEND WOOD LODGE POLE FENCING PER STD. DWG. NO. 705

SECONDARY PARKING LOT TREE PER LEGEND

⑦ DROUGHT TOLERANT GROUND COVER FOR 2:1 SLOPE (BERM)

(8) PARKING LOT SHADE TREE PER LEGEND



### SECTION 'A-A' - PROPOSED PACIFIC AVENUE



- SECTION 'B-B' KEY NOTES:
- 1. NEW STREET TREE PER LEGEND
- (2) WOOD LODGE POLE FENCING PER STD. DWG. NO. 705
- 3. LANDSCAPE PARKWAY
- (4) 6" CURB & GUTTER PER CIVIL DWGS.
- 5) 12'-0" WIDE D.G. EQUESTRIAN TRAIL
- DROUGHT TOLERANT GROUND COVER FOR 2:1 SLOPE (BERM) 6.
- 7. VINYL FENCE
- (8) CREATE 3 FT. HIGH BERM
- (9) FOUNDATION SHRUB ALONG BUILDING

#### SECTION 'A-A' - PROPOSED SECOND STREET SCALE: 1" = 10'-0



SECTION 'C-C' KEY NOTES:

- 1. NEW STREET TREE PER LEGEND
- WOOD LODGE POLE FENCING PER STD. DWG. NO. 705 2)
- 3. LANDSCAPE PARKWAY
- (4) 6" CURB & GUTTER PER CIVIL DWGS.
- 5 12'-0" WIDE D.G. EQUESTRIAN TRAIL
- SECONDARY PARKING LOT TREE PER LEGEND 6.
- ⑦ DROUGHT TOLERANT GROUND COVER FOR 2:1 SLOPE (BERM)
- (8) PARKING LOT SHADE TREE PER LEGEND
- (9) VINYL FENCE
- (1) CREATE 3 FT. HIGH BERM

### SECTION 'C-C' - PROPOSED MOUNTAIN AVENUE

SCALE: 1" = 10'-0'



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY

EXISTING CURB & GUTTER

EXISTING SEWER MAIN

EXISTING WATER MAIN

EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT

EXISTING STORM DRAIN

EXISTING PROPERTY LINE

PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY

PROPOSED STREET CENTERLINE

PROPOSED STORM DRAIN CURB INLET

PROPOSED RCP STORM DRAIN

PROPOSED LOT LINE

EXISTING CONTOUR

EXISTING STORM DRAIN CURB INLET

# Water and Sewer Plan

Figure 3-12

3. Project Description



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Preliminary Storm Drain Plan**

3. Project Description

## Operations

Although individual users have not been identified, the proposed light industrial business park is anticipated to operate up to 7 days a week. The industrial/warehousing uses could include multiple shifts with operational activities 24 hours per day. Operations would primarily be conducted within the enclosed buildings, except for traffic movement, parking, and the loading and unloading of trucks at designated loading bays. The commercial uses are anticipated to work up to 7 days a week. The gas station and convenience store would operate up to 24 hours per day, and retail and restaurant uses are anticipated to operate use- dependent standard business hours.

### Construction

Project construction would take approximately 24 months and includes the demolition of all existing structures onsite, grading in one phase, construction of backbone infrastructure, followed by building construction, pavement, and then architectural coatings. Construction of Phase 1 is anticipated to start in the first quarter of 2020 and be completed by fourth quarter 2022. Phase 2 is anticipated to commence first quarter of 2021 and estimated to be completed by fourth quarter 2022.

Construction activities would occur pursuant to the requirements of the Norco Municipal Code Section 15.30.020 (Hours of Construction Activity), which states that construction activity, including equipment startup and use, and the loading, unloading and handling of materials, shall not commence before 6:30 a.m., or continue beyond 7:00 p.m., on weekdays. No construction activity is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or national holidays.

The Project construction includes: demolition of all existing structures onsite (approximately 80,500 building square feet), grading, construction of backbone infrastructure, followed by building construction. Onsite soils would be excavated to a minimum of 5 feet below the bottom of the building foundations, and 5 feet beyond the building perimeters, reconditioned to maintain moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum, and recompacted as engineered fill to support the proposed building structures. The compaction of fill would be in compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) regulations.

Project grading is anticipated to include approximately 230,000 cubic yards of imported soils. Approximately 52,000 cubic yards of the import soil would come from the proposed detention basin to the south of First Street. Figure 3-14, *Preliminary Grading Plan*. Table 3-5 provides the anticipated construction schedule.

Construction Activity	Work Days
Demolition	40
Site Preparation	80
Grading	80
Building Construction	300
Architectural Coating	150
Paving	40

### **Table 3-5: Construction Schedule**



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

# **Preliminary Grading Plan**



#### LEGEND: EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS

EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY EXISTING CURB & GUTTER EXISTING SEWER MAIN EXISTING SHER HAIN EXISTING STORM DRAIN EXISTING STORM DRAIN EXISTING STORM DRAIN EXISTING STORM DRAIN CURB INLET EXISTING CONTOUR

#### LEGEND: SITE SURFACES

EXISTING STRUCTURE EXISTING CONCRETE PAVEMENT PROPOSED ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT PROPOSED PARKWAY/EQUESTRIAN TRAIL

#### LEGEND: PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

EXISTING PROPERTY LINE PROPOSED RIGHT OF WAY PROPOSED LOT LINE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY LINE LIMITS OF PROJECT IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED STREET CENTERLINE DROPOSED STREET CENTERLINE PROPOSED RCP STORM DRAIN (18" OR LARGER

PROPOSED STORM DRAIN LATERAL (12" OR SMALLER) PROPOSED STORM DRAIN CURB INLET PROPOSED STORM DRAIN HEADWALL PROPOSED CONTOUR

CUT SLOPE (2:1 MAX)

FILL SLOPE (2:1 MAX)

PROPOSED FIRE WATER LINE PROPOSED DOMESTIC WATER LINE PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER LINE PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE

#### DEVELOPER:

CAP ROCK PARINERS 1800 DOVE STREET NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660 CONTACT: RUSSELL FENTON TEL: (949)-342-800

## CIVIL ENGINEER:

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL 5 HUTTON CENTRE, SUITE 500 SANTA ANA, CA 92660 CONTACT: ANDY TORRES TEL: (949)-855-3611

BASIS OF BEARING: BEING THE CENTERLINE OF FIRST STREET BETWEEN MOUNTIAN AVENUE AND HAMNER AVENUE AS SHOWN OP PARCEL MAP NO 31359, RECORDED IN BOOK 207, PGS 96–99. A BEARING OF NB95210°E.

#### BENCHMARK INFORMATION:

THE OFF. STEED SHORT WITH TO INVERTIGATION OF THE OFF. STEED SHORT WITH TO STEED SHORT AND THE SHORT WITH THE SHORT SHORT SHORT STATES THE STATES SHORT STATES THE STATES SHORT STATES THE STATES STATES SHORT STATES STATE

(NOTE: ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE IN TERMS OF NATIONAL GEODETIC VERTICAL DATUM 1929)







PROJECT ARCHITECT CARLILE COATSWORTH ARCHITECTS 2495 CAMPUS DRIVE, SECOND FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92612 CONTACT: DEBRA SANDS TEL: (949)-833-1930

s

3. Project Description

## 3.6 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES AND STANDARD CONDITIONS/EXISTING PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

Throughout the impact analysis in this EIR, reference is made to existing Standard Conditions (SCs) applied to all development on the basis of federal, state, or local law, and Existing Plans, Programs, or Policies (PPPs) currently in place which effectively reduce environmental impacts. Where applicable, SCs and PPPs are listed to show their effect in reducing potential environmental impacts. The Project proponent has also incorporated into the Project various measures which serve to reduce potentially significant impacts. These voluntary measures are referred to as Project Design Features (PDFs) and are identified and discussed in the impact analysis. Where the application of these measures does not reduce an impact to below a level of significance, Project-specific mitigation is introduced. The City will include these SCs, PPPs, and PDFs along with mitigation measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project to ensure their implementation.

## 3.7 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS AND PERMITS

As part of the proposed Project, the following discretionary actions are being requested by the Project proponent:

- Gateway Specific Plan Amendment. The Gateway Specific Plan was adopted in 1991 and has been amended 10 times since then. The Project is seeking an amendment to 1) update the Gateway Specific Plan's parking requirements to reduce the parking spaces required for warehouse uses to reflect the expected parking demands of a contemporary light industrial business park.
- Development Agreement. The proposed Development Agreement would provide methods for financing, acquisition, and construction of infrastructure to implement the proposed Project, and providing vested rights to develop the Project pursuant to the approved development entitlements.
- Conditional Use Permit. The Project is seeking approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to the Gateway Specific Plan and Chapter 18.45 of the Norco Municipal Code to increase the maximum allowable building height from 35 feet to 50 feet for approximately 50 percent of the site. The applicant is requesting a 15-foot height increase to allow for flexibility in final building design for the larger buildings in the interior of the site and to accommodate architectural treatments such as roof parapets.
- Site Plan Review. The proposed site plan review would approve the site plan, overall site design, Project site layout, architectural quality and would ensure the Project is consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan.
- Tentative Tract Map(s). One of more tentative tract maps are proposed to subdivide the Project site.
- Zone Change: Phase 2 of the Project site is located within the City's Housing Development Overlay (HDO). In order to develop Phase 2, a Zone Change to remove the HDO will be required. This zone change may be processed concurrently with the entitlements for Phase 1 or may be considered by the City in a future action. Nevertheless, the potential zone change will be analyzed as part of the Draft EIR and is required to occur prior to approval of the tentative map and construction on the Phase 2 area.

In addition, Project development will require a number of ministerial approvals, including the following:

Issuance of demolition permit

- Issuance of grading permit
- Issuance of building permits
- Issuance of encroachment permits
- Lot Line Adjustment

The following approvals are anticipated from responsible agencies:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - Issuance of a Section 404 permit
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
  - Issuance of Air Quality permits for demolition
  - Issuance of Air Quality permits for construction
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - Issuance of a 401Water Quality Certification permit
  - Issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
  - Issuance of a Construction General Permit
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife

   Approval of a Streambed Alteration Agreement
- County of Riverside Flood Control District

   Approval of a triparty flood control cooperative agreement
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
  - Issuance of Conditional Letter of Map Revision and Letter of Map Revision to the Flood Insurance Rate Map

# 4. Environmental Setting

The purpose of this section is to provide a "description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the Project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published, from both a local and a regional perspective" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a). In addition to the summary below, detailed environmental setting descriptions are provided in each subsection of Section 5 of this Draft EIR.

## 4.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is located in southwestern Riverside County within the southwestern portion of the City of Norco. The City of Norco is located approximately 40 miles east of downtown Los Angeles, 20 miles west of downtown San Bernardino, and 20 miles northeast of Orange County. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15 (I-15) located 0.4 miles to the east and State Route 91 (SR-91), approximately 2.0 miles to the south. The site is located within the Corona North USGS 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and can be located within Section 13, Township 3 South, Range 7 West of the San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian. An aerial view of the site is shown in Figure 4-1, Aerial Photograph.

The Project site consists of 65 parcels approximately 110 acres in size, and is located south of Second Street, east of Pacific Avenue, both north of and south by First Street and either west of or bisected by Mountain Avenue (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2 in Section 3.0, *Project Description*).

## 4.2 AESTHETICS

**Scenic Vistas:** The Project site does not contain nor is adjacent to a scenic vista. However, long-distance views of the Santa Ana mountains to the south of the Project site and the San Gabriel Mountains to the north of the site are available from north-south roadways, such as Mountain Avenue and Pacific Avenue. Also, views of the Norco Hills to the east of the site and the Chino Hills to the west of the site are available along east-west roadways, including First Street and Second Street.

**Visual Character of Project Site:** The existing visual character of the Project site and surrounding area is neither unique nor of special aesthetic value or quality. The Project site consists of 65 parcels that are currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility for Hidden Villa Ranch.

Residential structures are located along First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue, many of which are vacant and have boarded up windows. Several of the occupied residences have exterior areas for chickens, horses, goats, ponies, and dogs; however, none are commercial agricultural operations. The residential structures generally consist of single-story ranch style structures on concrete foundations and pitched roofs with composition shingles and detached garages. However, there are several two-story residences also. The residential areas have limited ornamental landscaping and many of the residential properties are surrounded by chain link fencing.

The Hidden Villa Ranch facility is located on the northern central portion of the site on the west side of Mountain Avenue and south of Second Street with a parking lot on the east side Mountain Avenue. The facility includes a residence and garage, the original egg processing building that is a wood and corrugated metal structure in a state of deterioration, and the modern 65,000 square foot two-story egg

processing building. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility area also includes 10 foundations that demarcate the location of previous chicken houses that have been removed.

Tall ornamental trees and concrete walls line Mountain Avenue near the Hidden Villa Ranch facility, which screen some of the existing onsite structures. However, the large two-story industrial modern egg processing building is directly adjacent to Mountain Avenue. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility parking lot that is located on the east side of Mountain Avenue is fenced partially with chain linked fencing and partially with 6-foot high tubular steel fencing. The asphalt parking lot is degraded with weeds breaking through the pavement. In addition, Mountain Avenue is lined with above ground power lines. Views of the Hidden Villa Ranch facility from Second Street include 6-foot high walls, truck parking and loading areas, and the 2-story modern egg processing building.

A large area of the central portion of the Project site consists of undeveloped vacant land that is covered with regularly mowed ruderal vegetation. In addition, an earthen drainage channel passes through the southeastern portion of the site, to the northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection.

**Visual Character of Surrounding Area:** The Project site is located within a partially urbanized area that is surrounded by roadways. Second Street is the northern boundary of the site. Single-family residences are located to the north of Second Street. Pacific Avenue forms the western boundary of the site and single-family residences are located across Pacific Avenue from the site. Areas adjacent to First street and south of the Project site consist of industrial and residential uses. Additionally, areas to the west of the site are mostly developed for two-story industrial uses, except for a small area of single-family residential that is located near First Street.

**Nighttime Lighting.** The Project site is located within a partially urbanized area that generates the majority of light from vehicular traffic on local streets, street lighting, signage, residential interiors, and exterior security lighting. The existing residences and industrial uses on the Project site do not generate substantial light given their limited size, number, and functionality. Light generated by vehicular traffic primarily exists on arterial roadways such as Second Street, which borders the Project site to the north, and First Street, which borders the Project to the south. Existing street lighting is located along Mountain Avenue and First Street.

## 4.3 AIR QUALITY

The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, and all of Orange County.

The ambient concentrations of air pollutants are determined by the amount of emissions released by sources and the atmosphere's ability to transport and dilute such emissions. Natural factors that affect transport and dilution include terrain, wind, atmospheric stability, and sunlight. Therefore, existing air quality conditions in the area are determined by such natural factors as topography, meteorology, and climate, in addition to the amount of emissions released by existing air pollutant sources.

The topography and climate of Southern California combine to make the Basin an area of high air pollution potential. The Basin is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and high mountains around the rest of the perimeter. The general region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific, resulting in a mild climate tempered by cool sea breezes with light average wind speeds. The usually mild climatological pattern is disrupted occasionally by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana winds. During the summer

# **Aerial Photograph**



Project Site

N

Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

months, a warm air mass frequently descends over the cool, moist marine layer produced by the interaction between the ocean's surface and the lowest layer of the atmosphere. The warm upper layer forms a cap over the cool marine layer and inhibits the pollutants in the marine layer from dispersing upward. In addition, light winds during the summer further limit ventilation. Furthermore, sunlight triggers the photochemical reactions which produce ozone.

SCAQMD maintains monitoring stations that monitor air quality and compliance with associated ambient standards. In 2017, the federal and state ambient air quality standards (NAAQS and CAAQS) were exceeded on one or more days for ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> at most monitoring locations.

## 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Project site is generally devoid of natural vegetation communities, except for a small patch of riparian habitat that is 0.02 acre. In addition, two drainage courses flow through the southern and southeastern portion of the Project site. The vegetation/land use types on the site is described below.

**Developed.** The Project site includes approximately 47.44 acres of developed land. These areas consist of existing and utilized roads, residential lots, commercial buildings, and parking areas. While ornamental plantings are occasionally present within the developed areas, these areas are generally devoid of natural vegetation.

**Disturbed.** The Project site includes approximately 19.92 acres of disturbed land. These areas consist of undeveloped areas that are routinely maintained and/or have been subject to ongoing disturbance in the form of stockpiling debris and unpaved vehicular access roads. Dominant plant species observed in the disturbed areas included primarily non-native species such as stinknet (Oncosiphon piluliferum), red-stemmed filaree (Erodium cicutarium), London rocket (Sisymbrium irio), summer mustard (Hirschfeldia incana), Mediterranean grass (Schismus barbatus), and foxtail barley (Hordeum murinum).

The central portion of the Project site contains abandoned egg-farm infrastructure which, although it was developed in the past, is also considered disturbed as it has become overtaken by these non-native species.

**Ruderal.** The Project site includes approximately 47 acres of land that is dominated by ruderal species. These areas are routinely mowed/maintained. Dominant plant species observed include primarily nonnative grasses and herbs such as cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), common fiddleneck (*Amsinckia intermedia*), ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), foxtail barley (*Hordeum murinum*), and London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*).

**Ornamental.** The Project site includes approximately 1.6 acres of land that is covered with ornamental plantings such as Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.) and Peruvian pepper (*Schinus molle*) trees which are associated with the developed areas. While ornamental trees are scattered throughout the Project site within the developed and disturbed areas, this ornamental vegetation cover exhibits a dense canopy with multiple individuals in close proximity.

**Riparian.** The Project site contains approximately 0.02 acre of riparian habitat which consists of approximately two mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) individuals. This vegetation type occurs within an earthen, ephemeral drainage in the southern portion of the Project site and is surrounded by ruderal species that are regularly maintained.

**Jurisdictional Areas:** Two earthen ephemeral drainage features occur within the Project site. Drainage 1 is 1,098 linear feet. The USACE jurisdiction associated with Drainage 1 totals approximately 0.08 acre, all

of which consists of non-wetland waters; and the CDFW jurisdiction associated with Drainage 1 totals approximately 0.14 acre, none of which consists of riparian vegetation (JD 2019). Drainage 2 is the South Norco Channel. USACE jurisdiction associated with Drainage 2 totals approximately 0.71 acre, all of which consists of non-wetland waters (JD 2019). In addition, CDFW jurisdiction associated with Drainage 2 totals approximately 0.87 acre, of which 0.02 acre consists of riparian vegetation.

## 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Historic.** The Project site includes 35 parcels with historic-era (at least 45 years of age) improvements that include:

- 28 industrial parcels dating to 1915-1972,
- Three agricultural parcels dating to 1925, 1947, and 1953,
- Three residential parcels dating to 1915 and 1958, and
- One commercial parcel dating to 1955.

Of these parcels that include historic-era improvements, the Norco Egg Ranch property meets the definition of a historical resource and remains locally eligible for designation under the Norco Municipal Code Title 20 and under the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The Norco Egg Ranch, located at 1658 Mountain Avenue, is comprised of four contributing buildings: the Eisen Residence, the Eisen Residence Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building ("Contributing Structures").

The residence is a very modest Ranch style dwelling. It has a concrete foundation and a moderatelypitched hipped roof with composition shingles. It has narrow eaves and the exterior walls are clad with stucco. The east-facing facade has a door with a metal security screen and a large ribbon window with diamond paned double-hung flanking a fixed window. Other fenestration consists of wood-framed double-hung and fixed windows and vinyl-framed casement windows (south elevation). The wood-framed detached garage has a low-pitched roof and is located south of the residence. The residence and garage are in good condition and retain a moderate degree of integrity.

In addition, 11 non-contributing structures are located within the boundaries of the Norco Egg Ranch; these non-contributing structures include circa 1980-2000 additions to the modern Egg Processing Building and 10 foundations that demarcate the location of chicken houses that have been removed from the site.

Although the Norco Egg Ranch property contains both the Contributing Structures and non-contributing structures, the property retains a sufficient degree of integrity to physically convey its identified significance under the CRHR Criterion 1 for an association with poultry farming in Norco and under the CRHR Criterion 2 for an association with Harry and Hilda Eisen, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors (Urbana 2019).

**Archaeological.** Most researchers agree that the earliest occupation for the western Riverside County area dates to the early Holocene (11,000 to 8,000 years ago). The material culture related to this time included scrapers, hammer stones, large flaked cores, drills, and choppers, which were used to process food and raw materials.

Around 8,000 years ago, subsistence patterns changed, resulting in a material complex consisting of an abundance of milling stones (for grinding food items) with a decrease in the number of chipped stone tools. The material culture from this time period includes large, bifacially worked dart points and grinding stones, handstones and metates. This Encinitas Tradition includes the Sayles or Pauma cultures that were located in

inland San Diego County and western Riverside County, where the Project is located. At approximately 3,500 years ago, Pauma groups in the general vicinity of the Project area adopted new cultural traits which transformed the archaeological site characteristics - including mortar and pestle technology. This indicated the development of food storage, largely acorns, which could be processed and saved for the leaner, cooler months of the year.

At approximately 1,500 years ago, bow and arrow technology started to emerge, and the Palomar Tradition is attributed to this time. The Palomar Tradition is characterized by soapstone bowls, arrowhead projectile points, pottery vessels, rock paintings, and cremation sites. The shift in material culture assemblages is largely attributed to the emergence of Shoshonean (Takic-speaking) people who entered California from the east.

There is a long history of human occupation in the Norco area. The Cultural Resources Assessment completed records searches and field surveys of the Project site, which identified 8 prehistoric resources within one mile of the Project area. The prehistoric sites consist of bedrock milling features with little to no associated artifacts (MCC 2019).

## 4.6 ENERGY

**Electricity.** The Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is the electrical purveyor in the City of Norco. SCE provides electricity service to more than 14 million people in a 50,000 square-mile area of central, coastal and Southern California. SCE is in the process of implementing infrastructure upgrades to ensure the ability to meet future demands. In the project region, SCE is currently implementing the following infrastructure projects:

- Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Sub-transmission Project that will serve the Cities of Norco, Ontario, Corona, Chino, and Eastvale. The project would construct a 66 kV sub-transmission line approximately 10.7 miles in length. A combination of both overhead and underground construction, it would be constructed from the existing Mira Loma Substation in Ontario to an existing substation in Corona (SCE 2019).
- Riverside Transmission Reliability Project that will provide additional transmission capacity to serve existing and projected electrical demand, to provide for long-term system capacity for load growth, and to provide needed system reliability (SCE 2019).

**Natural Gas.** The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the natural gas purveyor in the City of Norco and is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California. SoCalGas estimates that gas demand will decline at an annual rate of 0.5 percent from 2018 to 2035 due to modest economic growth, mandated energy efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity goals, and conservation savings linked to advanced metering infrastructure (CGEU 2018). The gas supply available to SoCalGas is regionally diverse and includes supplies from California sources (onshore and offshore), Southwestern U.S. supply sources, the Rocky Mountains, and Canada (CGEU 2018). SoCalGas designs its facilities and supplies to provide continuous service during extreme peak demands and has identified the ability to meet peak demands through 2035 in its 2018 report (CGEU 2018).

## 4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

**Regional Setting.** The site is within the Corona North quadrangle, which is at the northern end of the Peninsular Ranges Province, located almost completely in the Perris Block, with the southwestern tip located in the Chino fault zone. The Perris Block is a structurally stable, internally cohesive mass of crustal rocks

bounded on the east by the San Jacinto fault zone, bounded on the west by the Elsinore and Chino fault zones, on the north by the Cucamonga fault zone, and on the south by a series of sedimentary basins. The Project area is mapped as within an area of Quaternary alluvium Pliocene to Holocene aged alluvial deposits that typically consists of gravel, sand, and silt. (GEO 2019).

**Faults and Groundshaking.** There are no active faults known to occur within or adjacent to the Project area (GEO 2019). However, all of southern California is seismically active. The amount of motion expected at a building site can vary from none to forceful depending upon the distance to the fault, the magnitude of the earthquake, and the local geology. Greater movement can be expected at sites located on poorly consolidated material such as alluvium located near the source of the earthquake epicenter or in response to an earthquake of great magnitude. The closest active fault is the Chino/Elsinore zone, which is located 3 miles from the Project site. The proximity of the site to the active fault will result in ground shaking during moderate to severe seismic events along the Chino/Elsinore zone.

**Soils.** The Geotechnical Investigation identified artificial fill soils extending to a depth of 2.5 feet below the existing grade. Alluvial soils underly the artificial fill to the maximum depth explored of 50 feet below the existing grade. The alluvial soils generally consist of loose to medium dense silty sand, clayey sands, and fine sandy silts. However, several areas of medium stiff to stiff clayey silts and silty clays are present. At depths greater than 12 feet, the soils consist of medium dense to very dense fine to medium sands and fine to coarse sands with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel. At these depths, several strata of stiff to very stiff clayey silts, silty clays, and sandy clays were also encountered (GEO 2019).

**Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, Settlement, and Subsidence.** The Geotechnical Investigation identifies that the Project site is located within an area mapped as having a medium to high liquefaction susceptibility. In addition, the depth of groundwater is in the range of 21 to 34 feet below ground surface (bgs) (GEO 2019).

The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 600 feet above mean sea level in the northeast corner of the site to approximately 582 feet above mean sea level in the south area of the site adjacent to 1st Street. The site slopes down to the south at less than a one percent gradient. There is approximately 18 feet of elevation differential across the subject site (GEO 2019).

Ground subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of the ground surface with little or no horizontal movement, and occur in areas with subterranean oil, gas, or groundwater. As detailed previously, the depth of groundwater is in the range of 21 to 34 feet bgs and the Geotechnical Investigation describes that minor ground subsidence of 1.2 inches has the potential to occur on the site (GEO 2019).

**Expansive Soils.** The soils within the Project site consist of variable materials ranging from sands and silty sands to clayey silts and silty clays. The Geotechnical Investigation conducted expansion index testing, which indicated that the soils possess very low to medium expansion potentials (GEO 2019).

**Paleontological Resources.** The Riverside County General Plan and the Riverside County Land Information System identifies that the project area has a "High A" potential for paleontological resources. These units include, but are not limited to, sedimentary formations which contain significant non-renewable paleontological resources and sedimentary rock units that have the potential for the preservation of fossils. High sensitivity includes not only the potential for yielding abundant vertebrate fossils, but also for production of a few significant fossils that may provide new and significant (taxonomic, phylogenetic, ecologic, and/or stratigraphic) data.

The paleontological records search conducted for the project listed previously identified that the Project is underlain by Pleistocene-aged alluvial deposits. The closest vertebrate fossil was located 1 mile southwest

of the Project site; west of Cota Street between Railroad Street and Harrington Street. The next closest fossil was located 4.5 miles north-northwest of the Project site, along Sumner Avenue north of Cloverdale Road (MCC 2019).

## 4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHGs). The major concern with GHGs is that increases in their concentrations are contributing to global climate change. Global climate change is a change in the average weather on Earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the rate of global climate change and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most in the scientific community agree that there is a direct link between increased emissions of GHGs and long-term global temperature increases.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). The Project site for is currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse distribution facility. Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the existing chicken egg warehouse distribution facility is approximately 4,689.84 as detailed in Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

## 4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

**Underground Storage Tanks.** The Project site historically operated five onsite USTs, which were previously excavated and removed. After their removal soil and groundwater sampling was conducted in 2011, which did not reveal any evidence of releases from the USTs and a closure letter was issued by Riverside County Department of Environmental Health. Based on the removal of the tanks, the analytical results, and the regulatory closure, the areas where the former USTs existed does not contain hazardous materials that could result an impact (Partner 2017).

The Project site currently has two 20,000-gallon USTs and one 10,000-gallon UST installed that contain diesel fuel. The USTs are located to the northwest of the Hidden Villa Ranch facility and were installed in 1999 and 1993. Soil borings were advanced in the area around the existing USTs in 2011 and groundwater samples were collected which did not identify any hazardous leaks. In addition, tank integrity testing completed in November of 2016 indicates the USTs remain sealed (Partner 2017; Hillman 2019).

Asbestos. Asbestos and asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) are considered both a hazardous air pollutant and a human health hazard. The risk to human health is from inhalation of airborne asbestos, which commonly occurs when ACMs are disturbed during such activities as demolition and renovation. The buildings within the Project site were constructed from the 1920s through the 1980s when asbestos containing materials were commonly used and the Phase I identified suspected asbestos containing material throughout the Hidden Villa Ranch facility.

**Lead.** Lead-based paints were commonly used in buildings built prior to 1970s; thus, due to the age of the onsite buildings, it is possible that lead-based paint and other lead containing materials are present in the buildings on the Project site.

## 4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

**Regional Hydrology.** The City of Norco is located within the Santa Ana River Basin, a 2,700-square-mile area in the Coastal Range Province of Southern California located roughly between Los Angeles and San

Diego. In addition, the City of Norco is in the Santa Ana Watershed, which is southern California's largest watershed, covering nearly 3,000 square miles of mountains, foothills and valleys. This watershed area contains portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange counties. The flow of the Santa Ana River begins in the San Bernardino Mountains and discharges into the ocean at Huntington Beach.

**Groundwater Basin.** The majority of the City of Norco, including the Project area overlies the Temescal Groundwater Basin. The Temescal basin encompasses an area of approximately 26 square miles bound by the Santa Ana River, La Sierra Hills, El Sobrante Hills and the Santa Ana Mountains. Typical depths for the City's wells in the Temescal basin range from 180 to 1,100 feet.

**Water Quality.** Elevated nitrate concentrations have been documented in the Temescal basin since at least the 1950s. Groundwater quality from City wells in the Temescal basin typically does not meet the EPA and Division of Drinking Water (DDW) maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for nitrate (45 mg/L), fluoride (2 mg/L), arsenic, and secondary standards for iron and manganese. Therefore, the groundwater requires treatment prior to distribution for potable uses (UWMP 2015).

Stormwater in the City of Norco includes a variety of common contaminants including primarily suspended sediments, fertilizers, pesticides, animal waste, and contaminants that are commonly associated with automobiles (e.g., petroleum compounds such as oil, grease, and hydrocarbons). Temescal Creek, Reach 1, to which the Project area drains to is currently listed as impaired (303(d) list) for high pH levels; and the Santa Ana River Reaches 2 and 3, to which the Project area ultimately drains into, is currently listed as impaired (303(d) list) for indicator bacteria and high copper, lead, pathogens levels (WQMP 2019).

**Water Supply and Groundwater.** The City's local groundwater provides approximately 38 percent of the City's water demands and imported water from the Municipal Water District of Southern California (MWD) accounting for the remaining 62 percent of the water demand. During 2017, groundwater supplied in the City of Norco was approximately 84.1 percent purchased treated groundwater and 15.9 percent groundwater from Norco's Temescal groundwater basin wells (WSA 2019).

**Storm Drainage Facilities.** The existing topography of the Project site is relatively flat and generally drains in a northeast to southwest direction. Currently, the Project conveys stormwater flows through a series of earthen ditches and drainage facilities that include pipes and concrete ditches. Several existing drainage features are adjacent to the Project area. Existing stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. In addition, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. Off-site flows enter the Project site from the culverts on Mountain Avenue to the culvert crossings on First Street. The channel meanders through the site as an unimproved, natural channel. Most of the Project site (approximately 90 to 95 percent) is tributary to the South Norco Channel. The remaining area flows to the north and is tributary to the North Norco Channel.

## 4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

**General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations.** A 104.4-acre portion of the 110-acre Project site is designated by the General Plan as Specific Plan (SP). The remaining 4-parcel, 5.6-acre area located south of First Street that is not within the Gateway Specific Plan is designated by the General Plan for Residential Agricultural (RA) development and has a zoning designation of Agricultural – Low Density

20,000 square feet (A-1-20) as shown in Figures 4-2, General Plan Designations and Figure 4-3, Existing Zoning Designations Within Project Site.

The RA land use designation is intended to provide for development of agriculturally oriented low-density living. Similarly, the A-1-20 zoning designation allows for detached single-family dwellings and agricultural uses on lots that are a minimum of 20,000-square-feet.

**Gateway Specific Plan Designations.** A 104.4-acre portion of the Project site is within the Gateway Specific Plan. As shown on Figure 4-2, the majority of the Project site is within the Industrial District. However, a approximately 2.6 acre area of Commercial District is on the northwest corner of Mountain Avenue and First Street, and a 3 acre area of Residential District is located in the northwestern portion of the site on Second Street to the east of Pacific Avenue.

**Housing Overlay.** The Norco General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan designates a portion of the Project site that is designated for industrial uses, east of Mountain Avenue, as a Housing Development Overlay area (shown on Figure 4-2). Residential development allowed within this overlay may include development of housing at a density of 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre, including single-family, multi-family homes, condominiums, townhomes, and courtyard residential projects.

**Corona Municipal Airport Influence Area.** Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Project site. The western portion of the Project site is located within the Influence Area of the Corona Municipal Airport. The Riverside County ALUCP designates various Compatibility Zones within the Airport Influence Area. The western portion of the Project site is within Compatibility Zone E, which is identified as an area that has occasional overflights but is beyond the Airport's 55 CNEL noise contour. The safety risk within Compatibility Zone E is low (RIV ALUC 2004a). This zone does not require airspace review or provide limitations on the heights of structures or types of land uses.

## 4.12 NOISE

**Noise:** The primary sources of noise in the City include those related to urban development, such as vehicles on roadways and noise from commercial, industrial, residential land uses. In the Project area, current onsite noise levels are generated by vehicles and low-density residential uses. Ambient noise measurements identify that existing noise levels on and adjacent to the Project site are between 57.5 dBA CNEL and 72.3 dBA CNEL.

As described previously in Section 4.11, Land Use and Planning, the western portion of the Project site is within the Corona Municipal Airport Compatibility Zone E, which is identified as an area that has occasional overflights; however, it is beyond the Airport's 55 CNEL noise contour.

**Vibration:** Aside from periodic construction work that may occur in the vicinity of the Project area, other sources of groundborne vibration include heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks and delivery trucks) on area roadways. Trucks traveling at a distance of 50 feet typically generate groundborne vibration velocity levels of around 63 VdB (approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV) and could reach 72 VdB (approximately 0.016 in/sec PPV) when trucks pass over bumps in the road.

## 4.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

### Fire

The City of Norco contracts with the Riverside County Fire Dept/Cal Fire for all City fire services, which includes fire station operation, fire suppression and prevention, emergency medical response, hazardous materials response, fire investigations, and other related services.

The Riverside County Fire Department is a regional fire protection department that provides fire, EMS, technical rescue, and hazardous materials response to approximately 1.6 million residents in the unincorporated Riverside County area, in 20 partner fire cities (including Norco) and one community services district. The Fire Department has 95 fire stations, approximately 1,050 firefighters, 276 administrative and support personnel, and about 150 reserve volunteer firefighters.

The closest existing fire stations to the Project site include the following:

- Station 14 is located at 1511 Hamner Avenue, which is 0.7 mile from the Project site;
- Station 47 is located at 3902 Hillside Avenue, which is 3.5 miles from the Project site; and
- Station 31 is located at 14491 Chandler Street in Corona, which is 4.4 miles from the Project site.

These stations are staffed 24 hours per day/7 days per week with a minimum 3 person crew, including a paramedic, operating "Type-1" structural fire-fighting apparatus.

### Law Enforcement

The City of Norco contracts with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department for all City law enforcement services. Services to Norco are generally provided from the Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station, which is located at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Jurupa Valley, approximately 13.5 miles from the Project site. The Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station serves an area of approximately 94 square miles, which includes the Cities of Norco and Eastvale.

Additionally, a Sheriff's Department substation is located in the City Hall building (at 2870 Clark Avenue), which is 1.4 miles from the project site. However, the substation has limited hours of operation of 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.
## **General Plan Designations**



## **Existing Zoning Designations Within Project Site**



### 4.14 TRANSPORTATION

**Roadways.** The City's circulation system includes freeways, a system of arterial and local streets, and transit facilities. Freeway access is provided by I-15, providing north south circulation and SR-91, providing east-west circulation. The roadways in the vicinity of the Project site include the following east-west roadways: Hidden Valley Parkway, First Street, and Second Street. The roadways providing north-south circulation include the following: Hamner Avenue, River Road, Corydon Avenue, Parkridge Avenue, and Pacific Avenue.

**Transit.** The Project vicinity is currently served by both the Corona Cruiser and the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA). The Corona Cruiser is a fixed-route bus system that travels along two routes and connects with RTA routes. Within the study area, the Corona Cruiser route includes Parkridge avenue, which is south of the Project site. The RTA provides both local and regional services throughout the region with 38 fixed routes, 9 commuter link routes, and Dial-A-Ride services. Existing RTA bus Route 3 is located on Hamner Avenue, approximately 0.25 mile from the Project site is the closest existing route to the Project.

**Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Equestrian Facilities.** Hamner Avenue is planned to have a Class II bike lane south of Hidden Valley Parkway, and there are existing Class II bike lanes along River Road, Corydon Street, and Country Club Road. There are no existing sidewalks adjacent to the Project site; however, existing equestrian trails exist along Second Street and Pacific Avenue.

## 4.15 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

As identified by a Sacred Lands File search, there are no known/known sacred lands within 0.5 mile of the Project site. In compliance with SB 18, the City has sent letters to Native American groups or individuals that may have knowledge regarding tribal cultural places, cultural resources or heritage sites within or adjacent to the Project site:

- Cahuila Band of Indians
- Cabazon Band of Mission Indians
- Twenty Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians
- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
- Ramona Band of Cahuilla
- Quechen Indian Nation
- Temecula Band of Luiseño Indians (Pechanga)
- Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- Colorado River Indian Tribes
- Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation

## 4.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

**Wastewater.** The City of Norco owns and operates a sewer system that includes 12 lift stations and approximately 106 miles of pipeline. The existing sewer system includes within and adjacent to the Project site includes a 24-inch transmission sewer main that runs within Mountain Avenue through the Project site, 8-

inch sewer lines that are located within Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street, and an 18-inch sewer line that is located northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection.

The City of Norco is a member agency of the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA), a Joint Powers Authority. WRCRWA owns and operates a wastewater conveyance, treatment and disposal system. Five agencies have the right to discharge to the WRCRWA treatment facility and collection system; including: Home Gardens Sanitary District, Jurupa Community Services District, Western Municipal Water District, the City of Corona, and the City of Norco.

The WRCRWA treatment facility currently has a maximum treatment plant capacity of 14 million gallons per day (MGD) and currently treats approximately 7.75 MGD (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). The City of Norco owns 27.5 percent of the WRCRWA treatment facility's total capacity, or a total capacity or 2.70 mgd, and currently discharges 1.71 mgd (WRCRWA 2019). Hence, the City has approximately 0.99 mgd additional capacity at the WRCRWA treatment facility. The City also owns 100,000 gpd of sewer capacity and wastewater treatment capacity in the City of Corona wastewater system.

**Water System Infrastructure.** The City's water system serves water to approximately 26,000 people through 7,500 residential, commercial and industrial service connections, and 156 miles of pipe in length with includes pipe ranging in size from 2-inch to 24-inch (WT 2019). Additionally, the City has 4 active groundwater wells, located in southwesterly portions of Norco that have a combined capacity of 3,200 gallons per minute (gpm), and 3 purchased water connections with the Western Municipal Water District's (WMWD) Arlington Desalter Facility and Chino Desalter Authority, and the City of Corona (WT 2019). The City's minimum annual delivery of Arlington Desalter water is 4,400 AF, which can be increased up to 7,000 AF annually. The Chino Desalter Authority delivers water supplies to the City at a constant rate for an annual volume of 1,000 AF.

The Project site is currently connected to the water distribution system at various locations. Second Street contains a 12-inch water line and First Street, Pacific Avenue, and Mountain Avenue contain 6-inch water lines.

**Water Supply and Groundwater.** The City's local groundwater provides approximately 38 percent of the City's water demands and imported water from the Municipal Water District of Southern California (MWD) accounting for the remaining 62 percent of the water demand. During 2017, groundwater supplied in the City of Norco was approximately 84.1 percent purchased treated groundwater and 15.9 percent groundwater from Norco's Temescal groundwater basin wells (WT 2019). The City's service area and distribution system overlies the unadjudicated Temescal Groundwater Basin, with a small portion of the service area overlying the southern end of the Chino Groundwater Basin. The Chino Groundwater Basin is an adjudicated basin, managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster. The City is a member of the Appropriative Pool in the Chino Basin. The City's local groundwater supplies are pumped from the Temescal and Chino groundwater basins through four City groundwater wells.

**Drainage.** Several existing drainage features are adjacent to the Project area. Existing stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. In addition, the South Norco Channel conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. Off-site flows enter the Project site from the culverts on Mountain Avenue to the culvert crossings on First Street. The channel meanders through the site as an unimproved, natural channel. Currently, most of the Project site (approximately 90 to 95 percent) is tributary to the South Norco Channel. The remaining area flows to the north and is tributary to the North Norco Channel.

**Solid Waste.** A large majority (97 percent in 2017) of the City's solid waste disposed of at landfills is transported to the El Sobrante Landfill in the City of Corona at 10919 Dawson Canyon Road (CalRecycle 2019). The El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 16,054 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2051 (CalRecycle 2019). In March 2019, the landfill averaged 11,439 tons per day and had a maximum disposal of 14,414 tons in a day. Thus, the landfill has an average daily additional capacity of 4,616 tons per day, and an additional capacity of 1,640 tons on a maximum disposal day.

### REFERENCES

Biological Technical Report for Palomino Business Park, Prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc, 2019 (BTR 2019).

California Gas and Electric Utilities 2018 California Gas Report (CGEU 2018). Accessed at: https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2018 California Gas Report.pdf.

CalReycyle Solid Waste Information System. Accessed at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx

CalReycyle Disposal Reporting System: Jurisdiction Tons by Facility. Accessed at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/DisposalReporting/Destination/DisposalByFacility

City of Norco 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP 2015). Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/pw/urban\_water\_management\_plan.asp

City of Norco Water Utility Division (WT 2019). Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/pw/water\_utility/default.asp

Cultural Resources Assessment, Prepared by Material Culture Consulting, 2019 (MCC 2019). Historical Resource Analysis Report, Prepared by Urbana Preservation and Planning, 2019 (Urbana 2019).

Geotechnical Investigation and Liquefaction Evaluation. Prepared by Southern California Geotechnical. 2019 (GEO 2019).

Jurisdictional Delineation for Palomino Business Park, Prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc, 2019 (JD 2019).

Material Culture Consulting. 2019 (MCC 2019). Paleontological Resources Assessment

Palomino Business Park Air Quality Analysis, Prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan<u>Compatibility Zone Factors</u> (RIV ALUC 2004a). Accessed: <u>http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/05-</u> %20Vol.%201%20Individual%20Airports.pdf

Southern California Edison. Infrastructure Upgrades. (SCE 2019). Accessed at: <a href="http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability">http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability</a>.

Water Supply Assessment for the Palomino Business Park. Prepared by Charles Marr Consulting, 2019 (WSA 2019).

Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority Board of Directors Agenda Item 5.B. March 18, 2019 (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). Accessed at: http://www.wrcrwa.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/\_03182019-109

Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority Fiscal-Year-2018-2019 Approved Budget (WRCRWA 2019). Accessed: https://www.wrcrwa.org/DocumentCenter/View/117/WRCRWA-Approved-Budget---Fiscal-Year-2018-2019-PDF This page intentionally left blank.

# 5. Environmental Impact Analysis

This section focuses on evaluating the significant environmental effects of the proposed Project, which is described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*. This Chapter describes the existing physical environmental setting (also referred to as "baseline") for each environmental topic, and the impacts that would result from implementation of proposed Project. Because existing federal, state, and local regulations will also shape how the proposed Project is implemented, and provide requirements for avoiding and reducing environmental impacts, a discussion of relevant plans, programs, and policies pertinent to each environmental issue addressed in each environmental topic section is provided. Additionally, as necessary, feasible mitigation measures are identified to reduce the significant impacts of proposed Project.

## ENVIRONMENTAL TOPICS

The following sections in this chapter analyze the environmental topics listed below:

5.1 Aesthetics	5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
5.2 Air Quality	5.10 Land Use and Planning
5.3 Biological Resources	5.11 Noise
5.4 Cultural Resources	5.12 Public Services
5.5 Energy	5.13 Transportation
5.6 Geology and Soils	5.14 Tribal Cultural Resources
5.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	5.15 Utilities and Service Systems

5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This EIR evaluates the direct and indirect impacts resulting from construction and ongoing operations of the proposed Project. Under CEQA, EIRs are intended to focus their discussion on significant impacts, and may limit discussion of other impacts to a brief explanation of why the impacts are not significant. The Notice of Preparation (NOP)/Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed Project was used to help determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, issues considered Potentially Significant are addressed in this EIR. Issues identified as Less Than Significant or No Impact in the NOP/Initial Study are not addressed beyond the discussion contained in the Initial Study (included as Appendix A).

## FORMAT OF ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC SECTIONS

Each environmental topic section generally includes the following main subsections:

- Regulatory Setting, describes applicable federal, state, and local plans, policies, and regulations that the proposed Project must address, and will shape its implementation.
- Environmental Setting, describes the existing physical environmental conditions (environmental baseline) related to the environmental topic being analyzed.
- Thresholds of Significance, sets forth the thresholds of significance (significance criteria) used to determine whether impacts are "significant."

- Methodology, provides a description of the methods used to analyze the impact and determine whether it would be significant or less than significant.
- Environmental Impacts, provides an analysis of the impact statements for each identified significance threshold. The analysis of each impact statement is organized as follows:
  - A statement of the CEQA threshold being analyzed,
  - $\circ$  The EIR's conclusion as to the significance of the impact.
  - An impact assessment that evaluates the changes to the physical environment that would result from proposed Project.
  - An identification of significance comparing identified impacts of the proposed Project to the significance threshold with implementation of any existing Plans Programs, or Policies, prior to implementation of any required mitigation.
  - A discussion of potential cumulative impacts that could occur from implementation of the proposed Project and other cumulative projects.
  - A list of any existing Plans Programs, or Policies.
  - For each impact determined to be potentially significant, feasible mitigation measure(s) to be implemented are provided. Mitigation measures include enforceable actions to:
    - avoid a significant impact;
    - minimize the severity of a significant impact;
    - rectify an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the effected physical environment;
    - reduce or eliminate the impact over time through preservation and/or maintenance operations during the life of the project; and/or
    - compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environmental conditions.
  - $\circ$  Actions to be taken to ensure effective implementation of required mitigation measures.

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING/BASELINE

The "Environmental Setting" subsections describe current conditions regarding the environmental resource area reviewed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 states that "An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. The environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a Lead Agency determines whether an impact is significant. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to gain an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives."

CEQA Guidelines and case law recognize that the date for establishing an environmental baseline cannot be rigid (see CEQA Guidelines Sections 15146, 15151, and 15204). In some instances, information is presented in the environmental setting that differs from the precise time of the NOP/Initial Study. This information is considered representative of baseline conditions. Furthermore, environmental conditions may vary from year to year, and in some cases, it is necessary to consider conditions over a range of time periods. A NOP/Initial Study was prepared for the proposed Project, and was distributed on March 22, 2019 for a 30-day public review and comment period that ended on April 22, 2019. This time period would generally consist of the baseline, however, the baseline conditions relevant to the environmental issues being analyzed are described within Section 4.0, Environmental Setting, and within each subsection of this section. In some cases, (such as in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*), discussion of baseline conditions is also provided in the impacts analyses to provide context for the impact in the most reader-friendly format and organization.

### THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE/SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

CEQA Guidelines Section 15382 defines a significant effect on the environment as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant."

The "Thresholds of Significance" subsections provide the specific thresholds of significance by which impacts are judged to be significant or less than significant in this EIR. These include identifiable quantitative or qualitative standards or sets of criteria pursuant to which the significance of each given environmental effect can be determined. Exceedance of a threshold of significance normally means the effect will be determined to be "significant" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(a)). However, an iron-clad definition of a "significant" effect is not always possible because the significance of an activity may vary with the setting (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(b)). Therefore, a Lead Agency has the discretion to determine whether to classify an impact described in an EIR as "significant," depending on the nature of the area affected. The thresholds of significance used to assess the significant of impacts are based on those provided in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

## IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE CLASSIFICATIONS

The following classifications are used throughout the impact analysis in this EIR to describe the level of significance of environmental impacts:

- **Significant Impact:** A significant impact is defined by Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself "shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment ... [but] may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant." As defined in this EIR, a significant impact exceeds the defined significance criteria and therefore requires mitigation.
- No Impact: No adverse effect on the environment would occur, and mitigation measures are not required.
- Less than Significant Impact: The impact does not reach or exceed the defined threshold (criterion) of significance. Therefore, no mitigation is required.
- Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The impact reaches or exceeds the defined threshold (criterion) of significance, and mitigation is therefore required. Feasible mitigation measures, including standard conditions of approval and applicable plans, programs, and policies, when implemented, will reduce the significant impact to a less-than-significant level.

• **Significant and Unavoidable Impact:** The impact reaches or exceeds the defined threshold (criterion) of significance, and mitigation is therefore required. However, application of all feasible mitigation measures, standard conditions of approval, and applicable plans, programs, and policies would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

While CEQA requires that an EIR identify all feasible mitigation to avoid or reduce the significant impacts of a project, it also permits public agencies to approve a project even though it would result in one or more significant unavoidable environmental effects. For a Lead Agency to approve a project with one or more significant unavoidable impacts, it must first prepare a statement of overriding considerations, which identifies the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, that outweigh its significant unavoidable effects, and thereby warrant its approval (Public Resources Code Section 21083; CEQA Guidelines Section 15093). The statement of overriding considerations must be supported by substantial evidence in the record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)).

### CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effect of the proposed Project's impacts with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Both CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that cumulative impacts be analyzed in an EIR. As set forth in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), "the discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone." The CEQA Guidelines direct that the discussion should be guided by practicality and reasonableness, and focus on the cumulative impacts that would result from the combination of the proposed project and other projects, rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to cumulative impacts.

According to Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines,

'Cumulative impacts' refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Therefore, the cumulative discussion in this EIR focuses on whether the impacts of the proposed Project are cumulatively considerable within the context of impacts caused by other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Additionally, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), an EIR should not discuss cumulative impacts that do not result at least in part from the project being evaluated in the EIR. Thus, cumulative impact analysis is not provided for any environmental issue where the proposed Project would have no environmental impact. Analysis of cumulative impacts is, however, provided for all Project impacts that are evaluated within this EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) states that the information utilized in an analysis of cumulative impacts should come from one of the following, or a reasonable combination of the two:

- A list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the lead agency; or
- A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan or related planning document that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect.

The cumulative analysis for air quality and traffic relies on projections contained in adopted local, regional, or statewide plans or related planning documents, such as Southern California Regional Transportation Plan and relevant regional plans developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The cumulative analyses for other environmental issues use the list of projects approach.

Different types of cumulative impacts occur over different geographic areas. For example, the geographic scope of the cumulative air quality analysis, where cumulative impacts occur over a large area, is different from the geographic scope considered for cumulative analysis of aesthetic resources, for which cumulative impacts are limited to specific viewsheds. Thus, in assessing aesthetic resources impacts, only development within and immediately adjacent to the Project area would contribute to a cumulative visual effect is analyzed, whereas cumulative traffic impacts are based upon annual growth projections and the other proposed and/or foreseeable development within the traffic study area of roadways and intersections. Because the geographic scope and other parameters of each cumulative analysis discussion can vary, the cumulative geographic scope, and the cumulative projects included in the geographic scope (when the list of projects approach is used), are described for each environmental topic. Table 5-1 provides a list of projects considered in this cumulative environmental analysis, which was compiled per information provided by each agency, and Figure 5-1 shows the locations.

#### Table 5-1: Cumulative Project List

#	Project/Location	Land Use <sup>1</sup>	Quantity	Units <sup>2</sup>	
City of Norco					
NI	Silverlakes Fauestrian	The Field House Restaurant	250	Seats	
	Circinakes Equesinai	Stadium	5,000	Seats	
N2	River Road And Corydon Street Commercial Center	General Office	22.000	TSF	
		Shopping Center	13.709	TSF	
		Supermarket	44.200	TSF	
		Pharmacy w/ Drive-Through	14.576	TSF	
		Coffee Shop w/ Drive-Through	2.000	TSF	
		Fast-Food w/o Drive-Through	7.883	TSF	
		Fast-Food w/ Drive-Through	5.978	TSF	
		Gas Station w/ Convenience Market	12	VFP	
N3	SWC Horseless Carriage Dr./Fifth St.	Warehousing	414.431	TSF	
N4	SEC of Hamner Av. / Fifth St.	Hotel	90	RM	
N5	3275 Hamner Av.	Hotel	122	RM	
N6	SEC of Sierra Av. / Sixth St.	Commercial	37.571	TSF	
N7	Norco Carmax	Automobile Sales (Used)	11.447	TSF	
	City of I	astvale			
E1	Van Leeuwen GPA	SFDR	224	DU	
	City of	Corona			
C1	Jeffrey Holbrook West Coast Development	Multi-Family Residential	148	DU	
C2	Pecuniary Capital, LLC	Townhomes	60	DU	
C3	Nova Homes	SFDR	103	DU	
C4	ASTA/Strata	Townhomes	45	DU	
C5	C&C Development	Affordable Housing	86	DU	
C6	Sherborn, LLC	Industrial	76.00	AC	
C7	Corona Regional Medical Center Expansion	Medical Office	332.000	TSF	
C8	Roger Egge Private Realty Advisors	Industrial	95.500	TSF	
C9	Sierra Bella	SFDR	237	DU	
C10	Rexxco - Terrana Apartment Community	Apartments	279	DU	
C11	Skyline Heights	SFDR	297	DU	
C12	Vista Monterey	Apartments	442	DU	
C13	Arantine Hills Master Planned Community	Commercial	80.000	TSF	
		Residential	1,621	DU	
<u></u>	Foothill Commercial Plaza	Commercial/Retail/Restaurant	82.700	TSF	
CI4		Hotel	120	RM	
C15	Van Daele Homes	Condos	92	DU	
C16	Home Gardens Water District Well Collection Line	Well			
C17	Household Hazardous Waste	Household Collection Facility	3.168	TSF	
C18	1548 Maple St.	General Office	6.568	TSF	
C19	LA Fitness	Health/Fitness Club	37.000	TSF	
C20	Lincoln Av. and Rincon St. Industrial	Industrial	731.000	TSF	
C21	Senior Housing	Senior Adult Housina - Attached	64	DU	
County of Riverside					
SEDR 426 DU					
R∨1	Irails at Corona	Retail	8.500	TSF	

<sup>1</sup> SFDR = Single Family Detached Residential

<sup>2</sup> TSF = Thousand Square Feet; DU = Dwelling Unit; VFP = Vehicle Fueling Position ; AC = Acres; RM = Rooms

## **Cumulative Projects**



Project Boundaries

# 5.1 Aesthetics

## 5.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing visual setting and aesthetic character of the Project site and vicinity and evaluates the potential for the Project to impact scenic vistas, visual character and quality, light and glare, as well as shadow. This analysis focuses on changes that would be seen from public viewpoints and provides an assessment of whether aesthetic changes from implementation of the Project would result in substantially degraded aesthetic conditions.

## 5.1.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### City of Norco General Plan Land Use Element Policies

The following General Plan policies are applicable to the proposed Project:

#### Community Design

- **Policy 2.4.1a** New development in the City should incorporate western-themed architectural features and building style, the level of which will be determined based on the location of a building, the type of construction, and the use of a building.
- **Policy 2.4.1b** Freestanding signage shall be kept at a minimum and shall be designed to match building architecture with the incorporation of western design features. Signage that does occur (exclusive of pylon and pole signs) shall be low in profile to preclude unnecessary clutter along the City's visual corridors.
- **Policy 2.4.1c** Street and on-site landscaping shall be provided in such a way so as to create pleasing site-related aesthetics, but also to maintain visual corridors and vista points on a neighborhood and community scale as much as possible.
- **Policy 2.4.1e** The City shall promote the development of high quality commercial and public facilities requiring landscaping, maintenance, and permanent upkeep on all new development.
- **Policy 2.4.1f** New office, research, and industrial projects shall be developed in accordance with approved guidelines and/or within height limits to minimize encroachment into expansive views of the horizon.
- **Policy 2.4.1g** Commercial development proposed in areas that adjoin residential development shall provide adequate buffering by landscaping, screening, or open space. Height limits shall be established in all commercial zones so as to protect the privacy and solar access on adjacent residential lots.

#### City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan

The following Gateway Specific Plan policies are applicable to the proposed Project:

**Policy 1:** Develop consistent streetscape and architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme.

**Policy 2:** Require compliance with the Project Area design guidelines in plans prepared for new development, expansion or redevelopment, and make Project Area design standards a major consideration in the site plan review and approval process.

**Policy 3:** Utilize landscape materials within the Corridor which are drought tolerant, clean, safe and relatively low maintenance. Formal forms and configurations should be utilized at activity center nodes, such as major intersections, while less formal, natural planting patterns should be utilized throughout other parts of the Project Area such as in street medians and landscape setbacks.

**Policy 5:** Develop land use/site planning concepts that allow for adequate setbacks and land use buffering techniques to mitigate land use conflicts.

**Policy 8:** Promote clustering of multiple, medium sized structures on large parcels rather than single, massive structures.

**Policy 9:** Allow maximum site development through liberal site development standards in return for wellplanned site plans which respond to established design guidelines.

**Policy 10:** Apply design guidelines to mitigate conflicts between uses where a change in land use is not practical.

Policy 3.1.5: Site Planning. Project Area site planning standards are as follows:

- where buildings are highly visible from side streets and/or adjacent parking areas, blank walls shall be prohibited;
- in the case of multi-storied buildings, it is important that multi-storied buildings relate to the pedestrian scale;
- within the commercial district, buildings shall be designed to be visually connected in order to eliminate a strip commercial appearance;
- architecture and outdoor space within the commercial and office park districts shall be integrally designed and oriented toward the pedestrian experience;
- bi-level landscape buffers shall be provided between existing residential land uses and proposed commercial office park and industrial land uses.

**Policy 3.1.6:** Architecture. The following guidelines should be consulted when designing and reviewing future development anywhere within the Gateway Specific Plan:

Industrial District

- avoid long, inarticulated building facades. Buildings with varietal front setbacks are strongly encouraged;
- avoid blank front and side walls on street frontages;
- flat roofs with parapet walls to screen rooftop equipment are appropriate, although buildings with articulated varying roof planes are encouraged;
- the use of prefab, all metal steel for sheathing of buildings is prohibited;
- conceal all service areas and storage areas either within the building themselves or by screening walls by a solid masonry, concrete or stucco stud wall of one color;
- ultra-flat smooth facades, and polished reflective surfaces are not encouraged within the project area;
- all screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and a roof parapet wall shall be used to screen roof mounted equipment.

Policy 3.1.8: Landscape Architecture. Project Area landscape design standards are as follows:

- establish a colorful landscape edge at the base of buildings and avoid asphalt edges at the base of structures as much as possible. Plant materials located in containers are appropriate;
- landscaping should result in a low profile image, i.e. use of blade grass lawn areas and other ground covers, canopy trees in parking areas, use of hedges, and low walls and plantings to screen service areas;
- on-site plant masses should assume a non-uniform arrangement. The diversity of massing types should be great enough to provide interest, but kept to a level which evokes a relaxed, natural feeling;
- water conserving irrigation systems and drought tolerant plants shall be used in all public and private landscaping whenever appropriate;
- landscape materials should enhance the major architectural design elements through coordinated use of shrub and leaf colors, tree forms, plant material masses, and lighting;
- plant material and massing should be designed to complement architectural elevations and roof lines through color, texture, density and form on both the vertical and horizontal planes;
- a combination of landscaping, fences and walls shall be used on the perimeter of properties to define property lines, separate use areas and provide on-site security;
- landscaping, fences and walls, or a combination thereof shall be used on the perimeter of properties to visually screen and/or physically enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tank and other appurtenant items of negative visual quality.

Policy 3.2.2: Streetscape Lighting.

- all lighting fixtures in the public right-of-way shall be consistent and approved by the City Engineer following the recommendation of the Planning Commission. As shown in Exhibit 27 of the Gateway Specific Plan, materials must be consistent and in keeping with the western/early Californian theme. Luminaries, poles and supporting hardware must also be consistent;
- lights shall not be placed to cause glare or excessive light spillage on neighboring sites;
- a uniform light color is preferred for the area;
- light standards shall not exceed 20 feet in height and in no case shall they exceed the height of the buildings on-site;
- the design of light fixtures and required structural support shall be architecturally compatible with the surrounding buildings.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

#### 15.12.080 Security Standards—Commercial/Industrial Building

#### D. Lighting and Address Markings shall conform to the following specifications:

- 1. The address number of every commercial building shall be located and displayed so that it is easily visible from the street. The numerals in these numbers shall be twelve inches in height and be of a color contrasting to the background. In addition, any business which affords vehicular access to the rear through any driveway, alleyway or parking lot shall also display the same numbers on the rear of the building which shall be six inches in height.
- 2. The address number of every residential dwelling shall be located and displayed so that it is easily visible from the street. The numerals in these numbers shall be 4-inches in height and be of a color contrasting to the background.
- 3. All exterior doors to buildings shall be equipped with a lighting device capable of providing a minimum of one foot-candle of light. All exterior bulbs shall be protected by weather and vandalism resistant covers.

4. Open parking lots, and access thereto, providing more than 10 parking spaces and for use by the general public, shall be provided with a maintained minimum of one foot-candle of light on the parking surface from dusk until the termination of business every operating day.

**18.41.11 Building Architecture:** Building architecture shall reflect a desired western theme and identity. Qualities that reflect the western theme can be described as rural, informal, traditional, rustic, low profile and equestrian oriented. Conversely, qualities that are inconsistent with the western theme are urban, formal, contemporary, sophisticated, and massive. The following elements shall be considered during the architectural review process:

- (13) It is further noted and declared that a decision to substantially modify or deny plans submitted for review under this may result from plans based upon significant use of the following colors, materials, design features, and elements which are not generally illustrative and reflective of and compatible with the natural setting of the scenic and historic beauty and rural environment of the City of Norco and City's desire for a western motif; and which could have a deleterious or adverse effect on surrounding property and the peace, health, safety, and general economic welfare of the inhabitants, businesses, and industries:
  - (a) Bright, shiny, or non-textured metal on exterior surfaces; porcelain, plastic or similar surfaces of non-earthen hues;
  - (b) Bright, fluorescent type or non-earthen tone colors;
  - (c) Exposed mechanical equipment, including vents and exhausts;
  - (d) Nondescript or boxy building without façade or other recognizable characteristic or distinctive style or theme; any building design that is dominated or intended to be dominated by signs or commercial advertising;
  - (e) Lighting accentuating or intending to accentuate advertising or not shielded and not arranged to reflect away from adjoining properties;
  - (f) Paper, cloth, plastic, and metal flags or other devices electing display purposes;
  - (g) Extensive chain link fencing without off-setting landscaping features;
  - (h) Unscreened or unobscured loading docks and trash and service areas;
  - (i) Plastic or artificial plants or landscaping (Ord. 801, 2003).

**Chapter 15.30.020**: Hours of Construction Activity, limits construction activities to the hours of 6:30 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays. No construction activity for residential development projects that consist of more than one unit is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or national holidays unless otherwise permitted with conditions on entitlements. The restrictions from Saturdays, Sundays, and national holidays shall not apply to single-building permits for expansion and upgrade to existing buildings; however, no such construction shall begin before 8 a.m.

### 5.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Aesthetic resources include a combination of numerous elements, such as landforms, vegetation, water features, urban design, and/or architecture, that impart an overall visual impression that is pleasing to, or valued by, its observers. Factors important in describing the aesthetic resources of an area include visual character, scenic resources, and scenic vistas. These factors together not only describe the intrinsic aesthetic appeal of an area, but also communicate the value placed upon a landscape or scene by its observers.

#### Scenic Vistas

Scenic vistas consist of expansive, panoramic views of important, unique, or highly valued visual features that are seen from public viewing areas. This definition combines visual quality with information about view exposure to describe the level of interest or concern that viewers may have for the quality of a particular view or visual setting. A scenic vista can be impacted in two ways: a development project can have visual impacts by either directly diminishing the scenic quality of the vista or by blocking the view corridors or "vista" of the scenic resource at public locations. Important factors in determining whether a proposed project would block scenic vistas include the location of the vista, in combination with the project's proposed height, mass, and surrounding public land uses and travel corridors.

The Open Space Element of the Norco General Plan encourages land use development to be done in a manner that protects the City's primary landforms and scenic vistas. However, the General Plan does not specifically identify any scenic vistas. Beacon Hill and the Norco bluffs are identified as primary landforms in Open Space Element Policy 2.6.1b and Policy 2.6.1c, respectively. Beacon Hill is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the Project site and the Norco bluffs are approximately 1.5 miles to the northwest.

The Project site does not contain nor is adjacent to a scenic vista. However, long-distance views of the Santa Ana mountains to the south of the Project site and the San Gabriel Mountains to the north of the site are available from north-south roadways, such as Mountain Avenue and Pacific Avenue. Also, views of the Norco Hills to the east of the site and the Chino Hills to the west of the site are available along east-west roadways, including First Street and Second Street.

#### Visual Character and Quality

**Project Site:** The existing visual character of the Project site and surrounding area is neither unique nor of special aesthetic value or quality. The Project site consists of 65 parcels that are currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility for Hidden Villa Ranch.

Residential structures are located along First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue, many of which are vacant and have boarded up windows. Several of the occupied residences have exterior areas for chickens, horses, goats, ponies, and dogs; however, none are commercial agricultural operations. The residential structures generally consist of single-story ranch style structures on concrete foundations and pitched roofs with composition shingles and detached garages. However, there are several two-story residences also. The residential areas have limited ornamental landscaping and many of the residential properties are surrounded by chain link fencing.

The Hidden Villa Ranch facility is located on the northern central portion of the site on the west side of Mountain Avenue and south of Second Street with a parking lot on the east side Mountain Avenue. The facility includes a residence and garage, the original egg processing building that is a wood and corrugated metal structure in a state of deterioration, and the modern 65,000 square foot two-story egg processing building. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility area also includes 10 foundations that demarcate the location of previous chicken houses that have been removed.

Tall ornamental trees and concrete walls line Mountain Avenue near the Hidden Villa Ranch facility, which screen some of the existing onsite structures. However, the large two-story industrial modern egg processing building is directly adjacent to Mountain Avenue. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility parking lot that is located on the east side of Mountain Avenue is fenced partially with chain linked fencing and partially with 6-foot high tubular steel fencing. The asphalt parking lot is degraded with weeds breaking through the pavement. In addition, Mountain Avenue is lined with above ground power lines. Views of the Hidden Villa Ranch facility

from Second Street include 6-foot high walls, truck parking and loading areas, and the 2-story modern egg processing building.

A large area of the central portion of the Project site consists of undeveloped vacant land that is covered with regularly mowed ruderal vegetation. In addition, an earthen drainage channel passes through the southeastern portion of the site, to the northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection.

**Surrounding Area:** The Project site is located within a partially urbanized area that is surrounded by roadways. Second Street is the northern boundary of the site. Single-family residences are located to the north of Second Street. Pacific Avenue forms the western boundary of the site and single-family residences are located across Pacific Avenue from the site. Areas adjacent to First street and south of the Project site consist of industrial and residential uses. Additionally, areas to the west of the site are mostly developed for two-story industrial uses, except for a small area of single-family residential that is located near First Street.

**Existing Views:** Photographs of key views were taken from the public roadways adjacent to the Project site (shown in Figure 5.1-1), which are provided as Figures 5.1-1A through D and described below.

- Second Street: As shown on Figure 5.1-1A, existing views from motorists traveling east along Second Street consist of mainly residences and vacant parcels surrounded by chain link fencing, utility poles, ornamental trees, and an unimproved equestrian trail. To the east of the proposed Project, further along Second Street, there is an existing business park that is comprised of ten industrial buildings with associated parking areas and landscaping. There is a large warehouse to the east of this development that is improved with additional truck loading and parking areas. Both of these developments can be viewed by motorists traveling along Second Street. Other public views along Second Street are limited to large trees and surrounding residences.
- First Street: As shown on Figure 5.1-1B, existing views from motorists traveling east First Avenue mainly consist vacant parcels surrounded by chain link fencing, utility poles, ornamental trees, and an unimproved equestrian trail. Long range views consist of industrial uses to the east, mature trees, and intermittent views of the mountains in the background. Further down First Street, at the intersection of First Street and Hamner Avenue, views consistent mainly of commercial uses within various shopping centers, as well as long range views of mountains to the east.
- **Mountain Avenue:** As shown on Figure 5.1-1C, existing views from motorists traveling north along Mountain Avenue mainly consist of industrial buildings, utility poles, ornamental trees, chain link fencing, vacant parcels, and various residences. While traveling along Mountain Avenue from First Street, views consist of mainly open fields and vacant parcels on the west side of the street and residences and storage areas along the east side of the street. Further down Mountain Avenue, the existing Hidden Villa Ranch industrial building, which consists of brick with corrugated metal, directly abuts the street to the west. Additionally, chain link fencing is present along the road on developed areas.
- **Pacific Avenue:** As shown on Figure 5.1-1D, similar to views from Mountain Avenue, existing views from motorists traveling north along Pacific Avenue mainly consist of industrial buildings, utility poles, ornamental trees, chain link fencing, vacant parcels, and various residences. Additionally, views from the front yards of residences on Pacific Avenue looking east consist of intermittent long-range views of the mountains that are obstructed by mature vegetation and larger industrial buildings.



Project Site

N

Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

## **Existing Site Photos**



View looking southwest at the intersection of Second Street and Mission Avenue. Existing residences, equestrian trail, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.



View looking southeast at the intersection of Second Street and Pacific Avenue. Existing residences, equestrian trail, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.

## **Existing Site Photos**



View looking northeast on First Street. The end of Pacific Avenue's cul-de-sac is visible in the background. Existing residences, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.



View looking northwest at the intersection of First Street and Mountain Avenue. Existing conditions include vaccant land, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.

## **Existing Site Photos**



View looking northwest on Mountain avenue. Existing conditions include chicken egg operation structues, overhead utility poles, and ornimental trees onsite.



View looking south on Mountain avenue. Existing conditions include vacant fields with grasses, ornamental trees, and some fencing onsite. Overhead utility poles are visible in the background.

## **Existing Site Photos**



View looking east on Pacific Avenue. Existing conditions include residences, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.



View looking north on Pacific Avenue. Existing conditions include residences, overhead utility poles, and ornamental trees onsite.

#### Light and Glare

Light pollution may most simply be described as the alteration of natural light levels in the outdoor environment due to artificial light sources. More commonly, it is taken to mean excessive or obtrusive artificial light. The term also includes the incidental or obtrusive aspects of outdoor lighting, such as glare (visual

impairment), trespass into areas not needing lighting, use in locations or at times when lighting is not needed and disturbance of the natural nighttime landscape. Night lighting and glare can affect human vision, navigation and other activities.

The Project site is located within a partially urbanized area that generates the majority of light from vehicular traffic on local streets, street lighting, signage, residential interiors, and exterior security lighting. The existing residences and industrial uses on the Project site do not generate substantial light given their limited size, number, and functionality. Light generated by vehicular traffic primarily exists on arterial roadways such as Second Street, which borders the Project site to the north, and First Street, which borders the Project to the south. Existing street lighting is located along Mountain Avenue and First Street,

Nighttime lights can create a form of light pollution that adversely affects the natural environment, such as causing glare that endangers driving or glare into private off-site areas. Because nighttime lighting in the Project vicinity is currently limited, glare, which is a reflection of light, is also limited. The existing sensitive receptors relative to light and glare include the nearby residential uses and motorists traveling on local streets.

### 5.1.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- AE-1 Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- AE-2 Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- AE-3 In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
- AE-4 Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The Initial Study established that the proposed Project would result in no impact related to Threshold AE-2; no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

### 5.1.5 METHODOLOGY

Aesthetic resources were assessed based on the visual quality of the Project site and surrounding area and the changes that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project. The significance determination for scenic vistas is based on consideration of whether the vista can be viewed from public areas within or near the Project site and the potential for the Project to either hinder views of the scenic vista or result in its visual degradation. The evaluation of aesthetic character identifies the proposed Project's development characteristics and its expected appearance, and compares it to the site's existing appearance and character, and to the character of adjacent existing and future planned uses to determine whether and/or

to what extent a degradation of the visual character of the area could occur (considering factors such as the blending/contrasting of new and existing buildings given the proposed uses, density, height, bulk, setbacks, signage, etc.).

The analysis of light and glare identifies light-sensitive land uses and describes the Project's proposed light and glare sources, and the extent to which Project lighting could spill off the Project site onto adjacent existing and future light-sensitive areas. The analysis also considers the potential for sunlight to reflect off building surfaces (glare) and the extent to which such glare would interfere with the operation of motor vehicles or other activities.

## 5.1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

# IMPACT AE-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA.

#### Less Than Significant Impact.

As described previously, the Project site does not contain nor is adjacent to a scenic vista. However, longdistance background views of the San Gabriel, Santa Ana Mountains, Norco Hills, and Chino Hills can be seen from east-west roadway corridors in the Project vicinity (First Street and Second Street) and north-south roadway corridors (Pacific Street and Mountain Avenue) are visible to motorists travelling on Pacific Avenue and Mountain Avenue. In addition, intermittent long-range views of the mountains can be seen across the Project site in between existing buildings, fencing, and trees, from the surrounding roadways.

Beacon Hill and the Norco Bluffs are identified as primary landforms in the City's General Plan. The Norco Bluffs are not visible from the Project site or vicinity. Intermittent long-distance public views of Beacon Hill are available from cars and pedestrians along Mountain Street, looking southeast and east, as well from cars and pedestrians on Pacific Street looking east across some portions of the Project site. From Pacific Street, Beacon Hill is visible in the background, with chain link fence, landscaping and industrial buildings in the foreground. From First Street, intermittent obstructed views are available to eastbound motorists and pedestrians. Overall, there are currently no unobstructed public views of scenic vistas related to the Norco Bluffs or Beacon Hill.

The proposed Project would result in the development of a light industrial business park with 35 industrial warehousing buildings ranging in size from 9,000 square feet to 158,000 square feet, 3 commercial buildings ranging in size from 4,000 to 13,000 square feet, and related facilities. The height and lot coverage of the developed site would be regulated by the design guidelines in the Gateway Specific Plan. Building heights are proposed to range between 35 feet and 50 feet. The maximum height of the proposed buildings is 50 feet, as the Project is requesting a 15-foot height increase to allow for flexibility in final building design for the larger buildings, located in the interior of the site, and to accommodate architectural treatments such as roof parapets. Because the higher buildings would be located in the central portion of the site, they would not affect long distance views of mountains and hills from public locations. Additionally, the proposed buildings would vary in size and height and would be staggered throughout the Project site to create visual interest.

In addition, the proposed buildings would be setback at various distances from the surrounding roadways. The minimum setbacks include a 15-foot landscaped area along First Street, a 25-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. The distances from the roadway centerlines are, as follows:

• Pacific Avenue: between 112 feet and 131 feet from the centerline.

- **Mountain Avenue:** Phase 1 building to centerline setbacks would range from 72 feet to 124 feet. Phase 2 building to centerline setbacks would range from between 75 feet to and 126 feet.
- First Street: between 66 feet and 142 feet from centerline.
- Second Street: between 75 feet from centerline.

Although the proposed Project would change public views experienced by motorists and pedestrians of the Project site, the Project would not encroach into existing public views of a scenic vista. The proposed setbacks and maximum building heights would maintain the existing public views of the mountains and Beacon Hill from Mountain Avenue, Pacific Street, First Street and Second Street. These views would not be obscured from public viewpoints within the roadway corridors. Also, intermittent long-range views of the mountains would remain visible in between buildings, fencing, and trees from the surrounding roadways.

Overall, the height, scale, and design of the proposed Project would not hinder long range views of the mountains and hills, and would not result in visual degradation of the mountain vistas. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT AE-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE THE EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF PUBLIC VIEWS OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS (PUBLIC VIEWS ARE THOSE THAT ARE EXPERIENCED FROM PUBLICLY A PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE VANTAGE POINT). THE PROJECT IS IN A PARTIALLY URBANIZED AREA AND WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE ZONING OR OTHER REGULATION GOVERNING SCENIC QUALITY.

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As described previously, the Project site is located within a partially urbanized area that is surrounded by roadways. Beyond the roadways, lands are developed with rural density single-family residential and industrial uses. The existing character of the Project site and surrounding area is neither unique nor of special aesthetic value or quality.

Implementation of the proposed Project would redevelop the site as a light industrial business park with 35 industrial warehousing buildings ranging in size from 9,000 square feet to 158,000 square feet, 3 commercial buildings ranging in size from 4,000 to 13,000 square feet, and related facilities. The height and lot coverage of the developed site would be regulated by the design guidelines in the Gateway Specific Plan; with building heights ranging between 35 feet and 50 feet and having western-themed architectural features.

Although development pursuant to the Project would result in a change to the existing visual character of the site, the change in character represented by the business park development would be consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines that include the standards related to the western theme and character, site design, parking, walls and fences, lighting, and landscaping that would ensure that a degradation of the visual character of the site would not occur.

The proposed landscaping includes 14 types of trees, more than 12 varieties of shrubs and groundcover, and dozens of accent plants, all of which are drought-tolerant and/or low-water species. The landscape design includes a combination of shrubs, shade trees, and conifers that would break up with height and massing of the proposed structures. Also, consistent with Exhibit 28 in the Gateway Specific Plan, trees would be selected not only for their aesthetic value but also for the density of the leaf canopy, size at full growth, and tolerance to drought conditions. As shown in Figure 3-10 Conceptual Landscaping Plan, the proposed trees are drought tolerant species with the majority being over 50-foot in height at maturity. In addition, a 6-foot high landscaped berm is proposed along Pacific Avenue, and 3-foot high landscaped berms are

proposed along Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street, which would also screen public views of the Project site.

As described above, the existing visual character of the Project site and its surroundings is neither unique nor of special aesthetic value or quality due to the presence of older structures, dilapidated or boarded up buildings, limited and inconsistent landscaping, and various fencing/walls. The change from the residential and industrial uses to the proposed light industrial business park and commercial uses would change the character of the site, but it would not degrade the site because the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines are intended to provide a quality aesthetics of the site and surrounding area.

View Simulations have been developed to represent the proposed western design, as well as the scale, mass, landscaping, and proportion of the proposed Project. The locations of the view simulations are provided in Figure 5.1-2. As shown in Figures 5.1-2A through 5.1.2C, the proposed Project would implement various architectural elements, such as barn shed roof overhangs, stucco walls, and wood pedestrian canopies and awnings that add horizontal articulation. Parking lots, vehicles, loading areas, and service areas would be orientated away from public views to ensure that these areas would not be dominant visual elements. The overhangs of the balconies and shed roofs would provide shade and visual interest and will provide the feel of the covered walkway so common in western architecture. The buildings would be painted "off-white" or with "tertiary earth tones of brown hues" that would complement and/or contrast with the natural colors of unpainted wood, brick, and rockwork (Section 3 of the Gateway Specific Plan). Western themed streetlight fixtures mounted to decorative wooden poles would line roadways (consistent with Exhibit 27 of the Gateway Specific Plan). An improved 12-foot wide equestrian trail, as well as landscaped parkway, would be constructed along Pacific Avenue with adjacent fencing comprised of wood posts and rails that are consistent the western theme required by the Gateway Specific Plan. A rustic style water tower is proposed at the city entry near Pacific Avenue and First Street. Therefore, with implementation of the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines, impacts related to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

#### **General Plan Regulations Governing Scenic Quality**

Because the Project site is located within a partially urbanized area, an analysis with the proposed Project's consistency with the policies of the City of Norco General Plan that govern scenic quality is provided in Table 5.1-1. As shown, the proposed Project would be consistent with each policy; thus, impacts related to conflict would not occur.
## **Visual Simulation Location Map**



Project Site

N

Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco This page intentionally left blank.

## **Visual Simulations**

 $\left(1\right)$ 



View of main entrance on Mountain Avenue.



View at the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **Visual Simulations**



View of Building 12 looking southwest on Mountain Avenue.



View of Building 13 looking northwest on Mountain Avenue.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **Visual Simulations**



View of Buildings 12 and 13 looking northwest on Mountain Avenue.



View looking south on Second Street.

This page intentionally left blank.

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy		
Land Use Element			
<b>Policy 2.4.1a:</b> New development in the City should incorporate western-themed architectural features and building style, the level of which will be determined based on the location of a building, the type of construction, and the use of a building.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the proposed Project would incorporate western-themed architectural features, including building style, fencing style, street lighting styles, and signage styles. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with Policy 2.4.1 a.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1b:</b> Freestanding signage shall be kept at a minimum and shall be designed to match building architecture with the incorporation of western design features. Signage that does occur (exclusive of pylon and pole signs) shall be low in profile to preclude unnecessary clutter along the City's visual corridors.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the proposed Project would incorporate limited western-themed signage that would comply with the Gateway Specific Plan signage guidelines. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with Policy 2.4.1b.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1c:</b> Street and on-site landscaping shall be provided in such a way so as to create pleasing site-related aesthetics, but also to maintain visual corridors and vista points on a neighborhood and community scale as much as possible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project landscaping plan has been designed and would be implemented pursuant to the requirements of the Gateway Specific Plan, which have been designed to create pleasing aesthetics and maintain visual corridors within the Project area. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1c.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1f:</b> New office, research, and industrial projects shall be developed in accordance with approved guidelines and/or within height limits to minimize encroachment into expansive views of the horizon.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed previously, the proposed Project includes a CUP to increase the maximum allowable building height from 35 feet to 50 feet for approximately 50 percent of the site. As described previously, the 15-foot taller buildings would be located in the interior of the site and would be visually buffered by other Project buildings and landscaping. In addition, due to the interior location of the 15-foot taller buildings, they would not encroach into expansive views of the horizon. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1f.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1g:</b> Commercial development proposed in areas that adjoin residential development shall provide adequate buffering by landscaping, screening, or open space. Height limits shall be established in all commercial zones so as to protect the privacy and solar access on adjacent residential lots.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project does not propose commercial development adjacent to residential development. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1g.		

#### Gateway Specific Plan Regulations Governing Scenic Quality

An analysis of the proposed Project's consistency with the development and design standards of the Gateway Specific Plan that regulate scenic quality is provided in Table 5.1-2. As shown, the proposed Project would be consistent with each standard; thus, impacts related to conflict would not occur.

Specific Plan Development Standards	Proposed Project Consistency		
Site Development Standards			
Minimum Lot Area:	Consistent. The lots on the Project site would be		
Industrial District	consistent with the minimum lot sizes required for both		
43,560 sf	industrial and commercial areas.		
Commercial District			
13,125 sf			
Minimum Lot Width:	Consistent. The lots on the Project site would be		
Industrial District	consistent with the minimum lot width of 125 ft in the		
125 ft	Industrial District and 75 ft in the Commercial District.		
	Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with		
Commercial District	the minimum lot width requirements.		
75 ft			
Minimum Lot Depth:	Consistent. The lots on the Project site would be		
Industrial District	consistent with the required minimum lot depth of 250 ft		
250 ft	in the Industrial District. Therefore, the proposed Project		
	would be consistent with the minimum lot depth		
Commercial District	requirement.		
None required			
Minimum Front Setback:	Consistent. The front setback within the Project		
Industrial District	development would be a 15-foot landscaped area		
15 ft with landscaping; all front yard setbacks abutting	along First Street, a 25-foot landscaped area along		
Second Street between Mountain Avenue and Pacific	Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback along		
Avenue shall not be less than 25 ft	Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along		
	Mountain Avenue. Therefore, the proposed Project would		
Commercial District	be consistent with the minimum front setback requirements		
25 ft with landscaping; 60 ft minimum when front yard	in the Industrial District and the Commercial District.		
parking is included; this setback shall include a 15 ft			
minimum, suitably landscaped area along the lot			
frontage			
Minimum Rear Setback:	<b>Consistent.</b> There is no rear setback required with the		
Industrial District	Project development, therefore the Project is consistent		
None required	with the minimum rear setback requirement. There is no		
	rear setback required with the Project development that		
Commercial District	is within the Commercial District.		
None required; 15 ft minimum with landscaping on a			
dedicated street			
Minimum Side Setback:	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project includes a 15-foot landscaped		
Industrial District	setback along First Street, a 25-foot landscaped setback		
50 ft on Pacific Avenue, 20 ft (fully landscaped) on	along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback		
Second Street, 20 ft (fully landscaped) on First Street, 10	along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area		
ft on Mountain Avenue	along Mountain Avenue. Therefore, the proposed Project		
	would be consistent with the minimum side setback		
Commercial District	requirements in the Industrial District and the Commercial		
None required; 15 ft with landscaping if side yard abuts	District.		
a dedicated street			
Maximum Building and Structure Height:	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project proposes to construct buildings		
Industrial District	with a maximum height of approximately 35 ft.		
35 ft however that building is utilizing a parapet wall in	However, the Project includes a CUP to allow a maximum		
order to hide rooftop equipment shall not exceed 40 ft	building height of 50 ft in the central portion of the site.		
	Therefore, with approval of the requested CUP, the		

#### Table 5.1-2: Gateway Specific Plan Consistency with Scenic Quality Standards

Specific Plan Development Standards	Proposed Project Consistency
Commercial District	proposed Project would be consistent with the building
35 ft however that building is utilizing a parapet wall in	height requirements of the Industrial District and the
order to hide rooftop equipment shall not exceed 50 ft	Commercial District.
Minimum Landscape Area:	Consistent. The proposed Project would provide over
Industrial District	15% of landscaping within the total development, which
Minimum of 15% of the total development, which includes	includes all landscaped setback areas. Iherefore, the
all landscaped setback areas. One-third of the required	proposed Project would be consistent with the minimum
lanascaping shall be in parking lot areas.	the Commercial District.
Commercial District	
Minimum of 15% of the total development, which includes	
all landscaped setback areas. One-third of the required	
landscaping shall be in parking lof areas.	
Project Area Design Policies	
Policy 1: Develop consistent streetscape and	Consistent. As described previously, the proposed
architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a	Project includes landscaping along all of the street
gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts	corridors within the Project site. The landscaping would
thematic everyion to discourage inponetive or	within roadway sotback group. The minimum sotbacks
contemporary architectural expressions or to imitate the	include a 15-foot landscaped area along First Street a
architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious	25-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 15-
coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis	foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These
placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian	setbacks would also include a 6-foot landscaped berm
theme.	on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on
	Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.
	Also, the architectural style of the proposed new
	buildings and signage would comply with the western
	design theme, as required by the Gateway Specific Plan.
	Thus, the Project would develop consistent streetscape
	and architectural lanascape palettes; and would be
Policy 2: Require compliance with the Project Area	Consistent. As described previously, the proposed
design guidelines in plans prepared for new	Project would be developed in compliance with the
development, expansion or redevelopment, and make	Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines, which would
Project Area design standards a major consideration in	be reviewed during the site plan review and approval
the site plan review and approval process.	process. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.
Policy 3: Utilize landscape materials within the Corridor	Consistent. As described in Section 3.0, Project
which are drought tolerant, clean, safe and relatively low	Description, and previously, the proposed Project would
maintenance. Formal forms and contigurations should be	install drought tolerant landscaping that would be in
utilized at activity center nodes, such as major	compliance with the Municipal Code and Gateway
the sections, while less formal, natural planting patterns	Project would comply with CalGreen (Title 24)
Area such as in street medians and landscape sothacks	requirements related to drought tolerant landscaping
	and low flow irrigation Larger trees are proposed on
	the periphery of the Project site along Mountain Avenue
	Pacific Avenue, First Street and Second Street, and
	. senie stronoog inter oncer, and occond oncer; and

Specific Plan Development Standards	Proposed Project Consistency
	enhanced landscaping would occur at Project driveways. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.
Policy 5: Develop land use/site planning concepts that allow for adequate setbacks and land use buffering techniques to mitigate land use conflicts.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project</i> <i>Description</i> and previously, in addition to the landscaped parkways and 12-foot wide equestrian trails, the proposed Project provides minimum setbacks that include a 15-foot landscaped setback along First Street, a 25- foot landscaped setback along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped setback along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks would also have a 3-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. These setbacks and use of berms around the Project site, in addition to substantial landscaping along the streets, provide adequate setbacks and land use buffering techniques to mitigate land use conflicts. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 5.
Land Use/Fiscal Policies	
<b>Policy 8:</b> Promote clustering of multiple, medium sized structures on large parcels rather than single, massive structures.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project consists of 35 light industrial business park buildings and 3 commercial buildings of various size and orientation within the Project site. The industrial buildings consist of multiple, medium sized structures that range from 9,240 square feet to 160,275 square feet. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 8.
<b>Policy 9:</b> Allow maximum site development through liberal site development standards in return for well-planned site plans which respond to established design guidelines.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project consists of a well-planned development that provides buffers from adjacent land uses and is consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 9.
<b>Policy 10:</b> Apply design guidelines to mitigate conflicts between uses where a change in land use is not practical.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.1, Aesthetics, the Project includes setbacks, berms, and landscaping to provide buffers that mitigate potential land use compatibility conflicts. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 10.
General Design Guidelines and Development Standard	S
<ul> <li>Policy 3.1.5: Site Planning. Project Area site planning standards are as follows:</li> <li>where buildings are highly visible from side streets and/or adjacent parking areas, blank walls shall be prohibited;</li> <li>in the case of multi-storied buildings, it is important that multi-storied buildings relate to the pedestrian scale;</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would meet the site planning standards listed in Policy 3.1.5. Blank walls would not be located adjacent to streets or parking areas. Multi-storied buildings would have pedestrian level windows and doors and architectural features that would provide pedestrian scale. The proposed commercial uses would not be provided in a strip commercial configuration. In addition, bi-layered landscape buffers that include groundcovers, shrubs,

Specific Plan Development Standards	Proposed Project Consistency
<ul> <li>within the commercial district, buildings shall be designed to be visually connected in order to eliminate a strip commercial appearance;</li> <li>architecture and outdoor space within the commercial and office park districts shall be integrally designed and oriented toward the pedestrian experience;</li> <li>bi-level landscape buffers shall be provided between existing residential land uses and proposed commercial office park and industrial land uses.</li> </ul>	trees, and berms would be provided between the Project and adjacent residential uses. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.1.5.
<ul> <li>Policy 3.1.6: Architecture. The following guidelines should be consulted when designing and reviewing future development anywhere within the Gateway Specific Plan:</li> <li>Industrial District</li> <li>avoid long, inarticulated building facades. Buildings with varietal front setbacks are strongly encouraged;</li> <li>avoid blank front and side walls on street frontages;</li> <li>flat roofs with parapet walls to screen rooftop equipment are appropriate, although buildings with articulated varying roof planes are encouraged;</li> <li>the use of prefab, all metal steel for sheathing of buildings is prohibited;</li> <li>conceal all service areas and storage areas either within the building themselves or by screening walls by a solid masonry, concrete or stucco stud wall of one color;</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would meet the architectural standards listed in Policy 3.1.6. The proposed buildings would not have long inarticulated or blank building facades. Buildings would have western design architecture on all public sides. The proposed buildings would not consist of metal sheathing. Storage areas would be concealed by proposed walls and landscaping. The proposed structures would not consist of smooth or polished reflective surfaces, and all screening would be architecturally integrated with the building design. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.1.6.
<ul> <li>ultra-flat smooth facades, and polished reflective surfaces are not encouraged within the project area;</li> <li>all screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and a roof parapet wall shall be used to screen roof mounted equipment.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Policy 3.1.8: Landscape Architecture. Project Area landscape design standards are as follows:</li> <li>establish a colorful landscape edge at the base of buildings and avoid asphalt edges at the base of structures as much as possible. Plant materials located in containers are appropriate;</li> <li>landscaping should result in a low-profile image, i.e. use of blade grass lawn areas and other ground covers, canopy trees in parking areas, use of hedges, and low walls and plantings to screen service areas;</li> <li>on-site plant masses should assume a non-uniform arrangement. The diversity of massing types should be great enough to provide interest, but kept to a level which evokes a relaxed, natural feeling;</li> <li>water conserving irrigation systems and drought tolerant plants shall be used in all public and private</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would meet these landscape standards listed in Policy 3.1.8, which would be verified during the City's landscape plan review and approval process. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.1.8.

Specific Plan Development Standards	Proposed Project Consistency
<ul> <li>landscape materials should enhance the major architectural design elements through coordinated use of shrub and leaf colors, tree forms, plant material masses, and lighting;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>plant material and massing should be designed to compliment architectural elevations and roof lines through color, texture, density and form on both the vertical and horizontal planes;</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>a combination of landscaping, fences and walls shall be used on the perimeter of properties to define property lines, separate use areas and provide on-site security;</li> </ul>	
• landscaping, fences and walls, or a combination thereof shall be used on the perimeter of properties to visually screen and/or physically enclose outdoor storage areas, loading docks and ramps, transformers, storage tank and other appurtenant items of negative visual quality.	

#### IMPACT AE-4: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CREATE A NEW SOURCE OF SUBSTANTIAL LIGHT OR GLARE WHICH WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT DAY OR NIGHTTIME VIEWS IN THE AREA.

#### Less Than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Limited, if any, nighttime lighting would be needed during Project construction. Chapter 15.30.020 of the Norco Municipal Code, Hours of Construction Activity, limit construction activities to the hours between 6:30 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on a weekday; with no construction activity permitted on Saturdays, Sunday, or national holidays. Thus, most construction activity would occur during daytime hours during the week, and construction-related illumination would be used for limited safety and security purposes and would be required to be directed downward. In addition, construction of the Project would not include any materials that would generate offsite glare that could direct light to sensitive receptors. Therefore, impacts related to lighting and glare during construction would be less than significant.

#### Operation

**Lighting.** As described previously, the Project site is developed with 36 single-family residences, a warehouse distribution facility, and contains large areas of vacant land. Two of the adjacent roadways provide streetlighting. Thus, the existing light and glare generated from the site is limited. The proposed Project would demolish the existing uses and would develop 35 new industrial warehousing buildings, and 3 commercial buildings that would generate light from interior lighting emanating through windows, parking lot lighting, new street lighting, and new exterior security lighting. Lighting from the vehicles and trucks traveling to and from the Project site would also increase nighttime lighting.

The Project would be consistent with the City of Norco's Municipal Code and General Plan requirements, which requires that onsite areas be illuminated for purposes of safety, security, and nighttime wayfinding including lighting for parking areas, pedestrian walkways, signage, architectural and landscape features, and loading dock areas. Although the amount of nighttime lighting from the Project site would increase, the Project would be subject to the lighting requirements of the City's Municipal Code Sections 15.12.080, which provides lighting standards; and Municipal Code Section 18.41.11 that requires exterior lights be shielded

and arranged to reflect away from adjoining properties. In addition, the Gateway Specific Plan Section 3.2.2b requires that lights not be placed to cause glare or excessive light spillage on neighboring sites.

Overall, although nighttime lighting would increase with implementation of the Project, the additional lighting would be limited to safety, security, and signage purposes; and would be shielded and designed to be confined to the Project site through compliance with existing Municipal Code and Gateway Specific Plan lighting standards. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in substantial light that would adversely affect views of the area, and impacts related to lighting would be less than significant.

**Glare.** Glare can emanate from many different sources, some of which include direct sunlight, sunlight reflecting from cars or buildings, and bright outdoor or indoor lighting. Glare from reflective surfaces occurs as a result of the addition of large expanses of glass, metal, and other reflective surfaces for building façades with new construction.

The Project would develop new buildings that would generally be constructed of concrete, and typical of most business park buildings, would not include large areas of glass windows, metal, or other reflective materials. The windows would be individually framed openings and are recessed to create more depth and shadow. Also, the proposed landscape design would reduce the effects of light and glare by including trees that would be up to approximately 25-85 feet tall once matured and installing the 3-foot high berm along Pacific Avenue and the 3-foot high berms along Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street that would screen lighting and prevent glare sources.

In addition, implementation of the City's Municipal Code would prevent glare. Sections 15.12.080 provides lighting standards and Section 18.41.11 does not allow bright, shiny, or non-textured metal on exterior surfaces; and requires exterior lights be shielded, which would prevent glare. Also, the Gateway Specific Plan Section 3.2.2b ensures that lights do not cause glare or excessive light spillage on neighboring sites, and Gateway Specific Plan Section 3.1.6 prohibits architectural elements such as highly reflective surfaces and reflective glass. Thus, impacts related to increased sources of glare would be less than significant with compliance with the Gateway Specific Plan and the City's Municipal Code, which would be verified through the plan check and the development permitting process.

## 5.1.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative aesthetics study area for the proposed Project is the viewshed from public areas that can view the Project site and locations that can be viewed from the Project site. The conversion of the Project site from industrial warehouse, residential uses, and vacant land to business park uses would contribute to a change in the visual characteristics of the area. As discussed previously, implementation of the land uses approved by the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan would substantially change the existing visual character of the Project site. However, the Project would be compliant with the City's Municipal Code, General Plan, and Gateway Specific Plan provisions, which would minimize aesthetic impacts related to the planned land uses. Pursuant to the City's General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan designations for the site, implementation of the proposed Project would represent a consistent and logical continuation of the planned pattern of development in Norco.

As evidenced by the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan provisions, the City has long anticipated that this area would be redeveloped for new urban uses. The cumulative change in visual condition that would result from the proposed Project, in combination with future nearby projects would not be considered adverse, because the proposed Project would implement the City's General Plan, Municipal Code, and Gateway Specific Plan regulations related to architecture, landscaping, signs, lighting, and other related items that are intended to improve visual quality. Thus, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant cumulatively considerable impact related to degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The cumulative study area for light and glare are areas immediately adjacent to the Project site that could receive light or glare from the Project or could generate daytime glare or nighttime lighting that would be visible within the Project site and could combine with lighting from the Project. Because cumulative projects would result in more intense development than currently exists, the proposed Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects could create significant cumulative nighttime lighting and daytime glare impacts. However, application of the City's Municipal Code and Gateway Specific Plan regulations require compliance with light and glare standards that would avoid significant effects. These regulations provide that lighting would be shielded to prevent light from shining onto adjacent properties or inclusion of features that could create glare. With implementation of the existing City regulations, the development that would occur by the related projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution of light and glare. Thus, the cumulative effects of development from the Project in combination with cumulative projects related to light and glare are less than significant.

# 5.1.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

- Norco General Plan Policies
- Norco Municipal Code
- Gateway Specific Plan Policies

### 5.1.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts AE-1, AE-3, and AE-4 would be less than significant.

### 5.1.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

### 5.1.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Existing regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts associated with aesthetics for Impacts AE-1, AE-3, and AE-4 to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to aesthetics would occur.

#### REFERENCES

City of Norco General Plan Land Use Element. Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=25452

City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan. Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/planning/plans/gateway.asp City of Norco Municipal Code. Accessed at: <u>https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Norco/</u>

This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.2 Air Quality

## 5.2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an overview of the existing air quality within the Project area and surrounding region, a summary of applicable regulations, and analyses of potential short-term and long-term air quality impacts from implementation of the proposed Project. Mitigation measures are recommended as necessary to reduce significant air quality impacts. This analysis is based on data in the Palomino Business Park Project Air Quality Analysis and the Construction and Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment (HRA 2019), both of which were prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019 (UC 2019), included as Appendix B and C, respectively.

## 5.2.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### **United States Environmental Protection Agency**

#### Criteria Air Pollutants

At the federal level, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has been charged with implementing national air quality programs. The USEPA's air quality mandates are drawn primarily from the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), which was enacted in 1970. The most recent major amendments to the CAA were made by Congress in 1990.

The CAA requires the USEPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The USEPA has established primary and secondary NAAQS for the following criteria air pollutants: ozone, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and lead. Table 5.3-1 shows the NAAQS for these pollutants. The CAA also requires each state to prepare an air quality control plan, referred to as a state implementation plan (SIP). The CAA Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) added requirements for states with nonattainment areas to revise their SIPs to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. The SIP is modified periodically to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins, as reported by their jurisdictional agencies. The USEPA is responsible for reviewing all SIPs to determine whether they conform to the mandates of the CAA and its amendments, and to determine whether implementing the SIPs will achieve air quality goals. If the USEPA determines a SIP to be inadequate, a federal implementation plan that imposes additional control measures may be prepared for the nonattainment area.

The USEPA also has regulatory and enforcement jurisdiction over emission sources beyond state waters (outer continental shelf), and those that are under the exclusive authority of the federal government, such as aircraft, locomotives, and interstate trucking. The USEPA's primary role at the state level is to oversee state air quality programs. The USEPA sets federal vehicle and stationary source emissions standards and provides research and guidance in air pollution programs.

#### Hazardous Air Pollutants

The USEPA has programs for identifying and regulating hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). Title III of the CAAA directed the USEPA to promulgate national emissions standards for HAPs (NESHAP). The NESHAP may differ for major sources than for area sources of HAPs. Major sources are defined as stationary sources with potential to emit more than 10 tons per year (tpy) of any HAP or more than 25 tpy of any combination of HAPs; all other sources are considered area sources. The emissions standards are to be promulgated in two phases. In the first phase (1992–2000), the USEPA developed technology-based emission standards designed to produce the maximum emission reduction achievable. These standards are

generally referred to as requiring maximum achievable control technology (MACT). For area sources, the standards may be different, based on generally available control technology. In the second phase (2001–2008), the USEPA promulgated health-risk-based emissions standards that were deemed necessary to address risks remaining after implementation of the technology-based NESHAP standards.

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	National Standard	Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources	
Ozone	1 hour	0.09 ppm		High concentrations can directly	Formed when ROG and NO <sub>X</sub> react in	
	8 hours	0.07 ppm	0.075 ppm	affect lungs, causing irritation. Long-term exposure may cause damage to lung tissue.	the presence of sunlight. Major sources include on-road motor vehicles, solvent evaporation, and commercial/industrial mobile equipment.	
Carbon Monoxide	1 hour	20 ppm	35 ppm	Classified as a chemical asphyxiant, carbon monoxide	Internal combustion engines, primarily aasoline-powered motor vehicles.	
(CO)	8 hours	9.0 ppm	9 ppm	interferes with the transfer of fresh oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen.	5	
Nitrogen Dioxide	1 hour	0.18 ppm	0.100 ppm	Irritating to eyes and respiratory tract. Colors atmosphere reddish-	Motor vehicles, petroleum refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft,	
(NO <sub>2</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm	brown.	ships, and railroads.	
Sulfur Dioxide	1 hour	0.25 ppm	75 ppb	Irritates upper respiratory tract; injurious to lung tissue. Can yellow	Fuel combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.	
(SO <sub>2</sub> )	3 hours		0.50 ppm	the leaves of plants, destructive to marble, iron, and steel. Limits		
	24 hours	0.04 ppm	0.14 ppm	visibility and reduces sunlight.		
	Annual Arithmetic Mean		0.03 ppm			
Respirable Particulate	24 hours	50 µg/m³	$150 \ \mu g/m^3$	May irritate eyes and respiratory tract, decreases in lung capacity,	Dust and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations, combustion,	
Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m³		cancer and increased mortality. Produces haze and limits visibility.	atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g., wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).	
Fine Particulate	24 hours		$35 \ \mu g/m^3$	Increases respiratory disease, lung	Fuel combustion in motor vehicles,	
Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m³	12 µg/m³	death. Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.	residential and agricultural burning; Also, formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NO <sub>X</sub> , sulfur oxides, and organics.	
Lead (Pb)	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m³		Disturbs gastrointestinal system,	Present source: lead smelters, battery	
	Calendar Quarter		1.5 μg/m³	and neuromuscular and neurological dysfunction (in severe cases).	Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.	
	Rolling 3-Month Average		0.15 µg/m³			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 hour	0.03 ppm		Nuisance odor (rotten egg smell), headache and breathing difficulties (higher concentrations)	Geothermal power plants, petroleum production and refining	
Sulfates (SO4)	24 hour	25 μg/m³		Decrease in ventilatory functions; aggravation of asthmatic symptoms; aggravation of cardio- pulmonary disease; vegetation damage; degradation of visibility; property damage.	Industrial processes.	
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 hour	Extinction of 0.23/km; visibility of 10 miles or		Reduces visibility, reduced airport safety, lower real estate value, and discourages tourism.	See PM <sub>2.5</sub> .	

#### Table 5.2-1: Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants

Palomino Bu	siness Park Projec	ct			5.2 Air Quality
Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	National Standard	Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources
		more			

ppm = parts per million; ppb = parts per billion;  $\mu g/m^3$  = micrograms per cubic meter.

The CAAA also required the USEPA to promulgate vehicle or fuel standards containing reasonable requirements that control toxic emissions of, at a minimum, benzene and formaldehyde. Performance criteria were established to limit mobile-source emissions of toxics, including benzene, formaldehyde, and 1,3-butadiene. In addition, Section 219 required the use of reformulated gasoline in selected areas with the most severe ozone nonattainment conditions to further reduce mobile-source emissions.

#### California Air Resources Board

#### Criteria Air Pollutants

The California Air Resources Board (CARB), a department of the California Environmental Protection Agency, oversees air quality planning and control throughout California. CARB is responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementation of the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CCAA, which was adopted in 1988, requires CARB to establish the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). CARB has established CAAQS for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, visibility-reducing particulate matter, and the above-mentioned criteria air pollutants. Applicable CAAQS are shown in Table 5.2-1.

The CCAA requires all local air districts in the state to endeavor to achieve and maintain the CAAQS by the earliest practical date. The act specifies that local air districts shall focus particular attention on reducing the emissions from transportation and area-wide emission sources and provides districts with the authority to regulate indirect sources.

Among CARB's other responsibilities are overseeing compliance by local air districts with California and federal laws, approving local air quality plans, submitting SIPs to the USEPA, monitoring air quality, determining and updating area designations and maps, and setting emissions standards for new mobile sources, consumer products, small utility engines, off-road vehicles, and fuels.

#### **Diesel Regulations**

The CARB and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have adopted several iterations of regulations for diesel trucks that are aimed at reducing diesel particulate matter (DPM). More specifically, the CARB Drayage Truck Regulation, the CARB statewide On-road Truck and Bus Regulation, and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach "Clean Truck Program" (CTP) require accelerated implementation of "clean trucks" into the statewide truck fleet. In other words, older more polluting trucks will be replaced with newer, cleaner trucks as a function of these regulatory requirements.

Moreover, the average statewide DPM emissions for Heavy Duty Trucks (HDT), in terms of grams of DPM generated per mile traveled, will dramatically be reduced due to these regulatory requirements. Diesel emissions identified in this analysis therefore overstate future DPM emissions because not all these regulatory requirements are reflected in the modeling.

#### **Toxic Air Contaminants**

Air quality regulations also focus on toxic air contaminants (TACs). In general, for those TACs that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. In other words, there is no safe level of exposure. This contrasts with the criteria air pollutants, for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the ambient standards have been established. Instead, the USEPA and CARB regulate HAPs and TACs, respectively, through statutes and regulations that generally require the use of the MACT or best available control technology (BACT) for toxics and to limit emissions. These statutes and

regulations, in conjunction with additional rules set forth by the districts, establish the regulatory framework for TACs.

TACs in California are regulated primarily through the Tanner Air Toxics Act (Assembly Bill [AB] 1807 [Chapter 1047, Statutes of 1983]) (Health and Safety Code Section 39650 et seq.) and the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act (Hot Spots Act) (AB 2588 [Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1987]) (Health and Safety Code Section 44300 et seq.). AB 1807 sets forth a formal procedure for CARB to designate substances as TACs. This includes research, public participation, and scientific peer review before CARB can designate a substance as a TAC. To date, CARB has identified more than 21 TACs and adopted the USEPA's list of HAPs as TACs. Most recently, diesel PM was added to the CARB list of TACs. Once a TAC is identified, CARB then adopts an airborne toxics control measure (ATCM) for sources that emit that particular TAC. If there is a safe threshold for a substance at which there is no toxic effect, the control measure must reduce exposure below that threshold. If there is no safe threshold, the measure must incorporate BACT to minimize emissions.

The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act requires existing facilities emitting toxic substances above a specified level to prepare a toxic-emission inventory, prepare a risk assessment if emissions are significant, notify the public of significant risk levels, and prepare and implement risk reduction measures.

CARB published the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (Handbook), which provides guidance concerning land use compatibility with TAC sources. Although it is not a law or adopted policy, the Handbook offers advisory recommendations for the siting of sensitive receptors near uses associated with TACs, such as freeways and high-traffic roads, commercial distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, and industrial facilities, to help keep children and other sensitive populations out of harm's way. Based on CARB's Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CHAPIS), no major TAC sources are located in proximity to the Project area. In addition, CARB has promulgated the following specific rules to limit TAC emissions:

- **CARB Rule 2485** (13 CCR, Chapter 10 Section 2485), Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling
- **CARB Rule 2480** (13 CCR Chapter 10 Section 2480), Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit School Bus Idling and Idling at Schools
- CARB Rule 2477 (13 CCR Section 2477 and Article 8), Airborne Toxic Control Measure for In-Use Diesel Fueled Transport Refrigeration Units (TRU) and TRU Generator Sets and Facilities Where TRUs Operate

#### SCAQMD

#### Criteria Air Pollutants

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) attains and maintains air quality conditions in the Basin through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean air strategy of SCAQMD includes preparation of plans for attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution. SCAQMD also inspects stationary sources of air pollution and responds to citizen complaints; monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions; and implements programs and regulations required by the CAA, CAAA, and CCAA. Air quality plans applicable to the proposed Project are discussed below.

#### Air Quality Management Plan

SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for preparing the air quality management plan (AQMP), which addresses federal and state CAA requirements. The AQMP details goals, policies, and programs for improving air quality in the Basin.

The 2012 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on December 12, 2012. The purpose of the 2012 AQMP for the Basin is to set forth a comprehensive and integrated program that will lead the region into compliance with the federal 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> air quality standard, and to provide an update to the Basin's commitment towards meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standards. The AQMP would also serve to satisfy recent USEPA requirements for a new attainment demonstration of the revoked 1-hour ozone standard, as well as a vehicle miles travelled (VMT) emissions offset demonstration.<sup>1</sup> The 2012 AQMP, as approved by CARB, serves as the official SIP submittal for the federal 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard. In addition, the AQMP updates specific new control measures and commitments for emissions reductions to implement the attainment strategy for the 8-hour ozone SIP. The 2012 AQMP set forth programs which require integrated planning efforts and the cooperation of all levels of government: local, regional, state, and federal.

In March 2017 AQMD finalized the 2016 AQMP, which continues to evaluate integrated strategies and control measures to meet the NAAQS, as well as, explore new and innovative methods to reach its goals. Some of these approaches include utilizing incentive programs, recognizing existing co-benefit programs from other sectors, and developing a strategy with fair-share reductions at the federal, state, and local levels. Similar to the 2012 AQMP, the 2016 AQMP incorporates scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including the 2016 RTP/SCS and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories.

#### SCAQMD Rules and Regulations

All projects are subject to SCAQMD rules and regulations. Specific rules applicable to the proposed Project include the following:

**Rule 401 – Visible Emissions.** A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any 1 hour that is as dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Bureau of Mines.

**Rule 402 – Nuisance.** A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule do not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

**Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust.** SCAQMD Rule 403 governs emissions of fugitive dust during and after construction. Compliance with this rule is achieved through application of standard Best Management Practices, such as application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils, covering haul vehicles, restricting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour, sweeping loose dirt from paved site

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although the federal 1-hour ozone standard was revoked in 2005, the USEPA has proposed to require a new 1-hour ozone attainment demonstration in the South Coast extreme ozone nonattainment area as a result of a recent court decision. Although USEPA has replaced the 1-hour ozone standard with a more health protective 8-hour standard, the CAA anti-backsliding provisions require that California have approved plans for attaining the 1-hour standard.

access roadways, cessation of construction activity when winds exceed 25 mph, and establishing a permanent ground cover on finished sites.

Rule 403 requires project applicants to control fugitive dust using the best available control measures such that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, Rule 403 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating an offsite nuisance. Applicable Rule 403 dust suppression (and PM<sub>10</sub> generation) techniques to reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least three times daily. Locations where grading is to occur shall be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least 0.6 meters (2 feet) of freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code Section 23114.
- Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.
- Suspend all grading activities when wind speeds (including instantaneous wind gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Provide bumper strips or similar best management practices where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
- Replant disturbed areas as soon as practical.
- Sweep onsite streets (and offsite streets if silt is carried to adjacent public thoroughfares) to reduce the amount of particulate matter on public streets. All sweepers shall be compliant with SCAQMD Rule 1186.1, Less Polluting Sweepers.

**Rule 445 – Wood Burning.** This rule prohibits permanently installed wood burning devices into any new development. A wood burning device means any fireplace, wood burning heater, or pellet-fueled wood heater, or any similarly enclosed, permanently installed, indoor or outdoor device burning any solid fuel for aesthetic or space-heating purposes, which has a heat input of less than one million British thermal units per hour.

**Rule 481 – Spray Coating.** This rule applies to all spray painting and spray coating operations and equipment and states that a person shall not use or operate any spray painting or spray coating equipment unless one of the following conditions is met:

- The spray coating equipment is operated inside a control enclosure, which is approved by the Executive Officer. Any control enclosure for which an application for permit for new construction, alteration, or change of ownership or location is submitted after the date of adoption of this rule shall be exhausted only through filters at a design face velocity not less than 100 feet per minute nor greater than 300 feet per minute, or through a water wash system designed to be equally effective for the purpose of air pollution control.
- Coatings are applied with high-volume low-pressure, electrostatic and/or airless spray equipment.
- An alternative method of coating application or control is used which has effectiveness equal to or greater than the equipment specified in the rule.

**Rule 1108 - Volatile Organic Compounds.** This rule governs the sale, use, and manufacturing of asphalt and limits the volatile organic compound (VOC) content in asphalt used in the Basin. This rule also regulates the VOC content of asphalt used during construction. Therefore, all asphalt used during construction of the Project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 1108.

**Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings.** No person shall apply or solicit the application of any architectural coating within the SCAQMD with VOC content in excess of the values specified in a table incorporated in the Rule.

**Rule 1143 – Paint Thinners and Solvents.** This rule governs the manufacture, sale, and use of paint thinners and solvents used in thinning of coating materials, cleaning of coating application equipment, and other solvent cleaning operations by limiting their VOC content. This rule regulates the VOC content of solvents used during construction. Solvents used during the construction phase must comply with this rule.

#### **Toxic Air Contaminants**

Based on information available from CARB, overall cancer risk throughout the basin has had a declining trend since 1990. In 1998, following an exhaustive 10-year scientific assessment process, the State of California Air Resources Board (CARB) identified particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines as a toxic air contaminant. The SCAQMD initiated a comprehensive urban toxic air pollution study, called MATES-II (for Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study). Diesel particulate matter (DPM) accounts for more than 70 percent of the cancer risk.

In 2008, the SCAQMD prepared an update to the MATES-II study, referred to as MATES-III. MATES-III estimates the average excess cancer risk level from exposure to TACs is an approximately 17 percent decrease in comparison to the MATES-II study.

The SCAQMD's most recent in-depth analysis of the toxic air contaminants and their resulting health risks for all of Southern California was from the Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study in the South Coast Air Basin, MATES IV," which shows that cancer risk has decreased more than 55 percent between MATES III (2005) and MATES IV (2012).

MATES-IV study represents the baseline health risk for a cumulative analysis. MATES-IV calculated cancer risks based on monitoring data collected at ten fixed sites within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). None of the fixed monitoring sites are within the local area of the Project area. However, MATES-IV has extrapolated the excess cancer risk levels throughout the basin by modeling the specific grids. MATES-IV modeling predicted an excess cancer risk of 977.48 in one million for the Project area. DPM is included in this cancer risk along with all other TAC sources. DPM accounts for 68 percent of the total risk shown in MATES-IV. Cumulative Project generated TACs are limited to DPM.

## 5.2.3 AIR QUALITY SETTING

#### Climate and Meteorology

The Project area is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, and all of Orange County.

The ambient concentrations of air pollutants are determined by the amount of emissions released by sources and the atmosphere's ability to transport and dilute such emissions. Natural factors that affect transport and dilution include terrain, wind, atmospheric stability, and sunlight. Therefore, existing air

quality conditions in the area are determined by such natural factors as topography, meteorology, and climate, in addition to the amount of emissions released by existing air pollutant sources.

Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with the physical features of the landscape to determine the movement and dispersal of air pollutants. The topography and climate of Southern California combine to make the Basin an area of high air pollution potential. The Basin is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and high mountains around the rest of the perimeter. The general region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific, resulting in a mild climate tempered by cool sea breezes with light average wind speeds. The usually mild climatological pattern is disrupted occasionally by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana winds. During the summer months, a warm air mass frequently descends over the cool, moist marine layer produced by the interaction between the ocean's surface and the lowest layer of the atmosphere. The warm upper layer forms a cap over the cool marine layer and inhibits the pollutants in the marine layer from dispersing upward. In addition, light winds during the summer further limit ventilation. Furthermore, sunlight triggers the photochemical reactions which produce ozone.

#### Criteria Air Pollutants

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) currently focus on the following air pollutants as indicators of ambient air quality: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM<sub>10</sub>), fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead. These pollutants are referred to as "criteria air pollutants" because they are the most prevalent air pollutants known to be injurious to human health. Extensive health-effects criteria documents regarding the effects of these pollutants on human health and welfare have been prepared over the years.<sup>2</sup> Standards have been established for each criteria pollutant to meet specific public health and welfare criteria set forth in the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). California has generally adopted more stringent ambient air quality standards for the criteria air pollutants (referred to as State Ambient Air Quality Standards, or state standards) and has adopted air quality standards for some pollutants for which there is no corresponding national standard, such as sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, and visibility-reducing particles.

#### Ozone

Ozone, the main component of photochemical smog, is primarily a summer and fall pollution problem. Ozone is not emitted directly into the air; but is formed through a complex series of chemical reactions involving other compounds that are directly emitted. These directly emitted pollutants (also known as ozone precursors) include reactive organic gases (ROGs) or volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). While both ROGs and VOCs refer to compounds of carbon, ROG is a term used by CARB and is based on a list of exempted carbon compounds determined by CARB. VOC is a term used by the USEPA and is based on its own exempt list. The time period required for ozone formation allows the reacting compounds to spread over a large area, producing regional pollution problems. Ozone concentrations are the cumulative result of regional development patterns rather than the result of a few significant emission sources.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Additional sources of information on the health effects of criteria pollutants can be found at CARB and USEPA's websites at http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/health.htm and http://www.epa.gov/air/airpollutants.html, respectively.

Once ozone is formed, it remains in the atmosphere for one or two days. Ozone is then eliminated through reaction with chemicals on the leaves of plants, attachment to water droplets as they fall to earth ("rainout"), or absorption by water molecules in clouds that later fall to earth with rain ("washout").

Short-term exposure to ozone can irritate the eyes and cause constriction of the airways. In addition to causing shortness of breath, ozone can aggravate existing respiratory diseases such as asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema.

#### **Carbon Monoxide**

CO is a colorless, odorless gas produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels, such as gasoline or wood. CO concentrations tend to be the highest during the winter morning, when little to no wind and surface-based inversions trap the pollutant at ground levels. Because CO is emitted directly from internal combustion engines, unlike ozone, motor vehicles operating at slow speeds are the primary source of CO in the Basin. The highest ambient CO concentrations are generally found near congested transportation corridors and intersections.

#### Nitrogen Dioxide

 $NO_2$  is a reddish-brown gas that is a by-product of combustion processes. Automobiles and industrial operations are the main sources of  $NO_2$ . Combustion devices emit primarily nitric oxide (NO), which reacts through oxidation in the atmosphere to form  $NO_2$ . The combined emissions of NO and  $NO_2$  are referred to as NOx, which are reported as equivalent  $NO_2$ . Aside from its contribution to ozone formation,  $NO_2$  can increase the risk of acute and chronic respiratory disease and reduce visibility.  $NO_2$  may be visible as a coloring component of a brown cloud on high pollution days, especially in conjunction with high ozone levels.

#### Sulfur Dioxide

SO<sub>2</sub> is a colorless, extremely irritating gas or liquid that enters the atmosphere as a pollutant mainly as a result of burning high sulfur-content fuel oils and coal, and from chemical processes occurring at chemical plants and refineries. When SO<sub>2</sub> oxidizes in the atmosphere, it forms sulfur trioxide (SO<sub>3</sub>). Collectively, these pollutants are referred to as sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>).

Major sources of SO<sub>2</sub> include power plants, large industrial facilities, diesel vehicles, and oil-burning residential heaters. Emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> aggravate lung diseases, especially bronchitis. This compound also constricts the breathing passages, especially in people with asthma and people involved in moderate to heavy exercise. SO<sub>2</sub> potentially causes wheezing, shortness of breath, and coughing. Long-term SO<sub>2</sub> exposure has been associated with increased risk of mortality from respiratory or cardiovascular disease.

#### Particulate Matter

 $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  consist of particulate matter that is 10 microns or less in diameter and 2.5 microns or less in diameter, respectively (a micron is one-millionth of a meter).  $PM_{10}$  and  $PM_{2.5}$  represent fractions of particulate matter that can be inhaled into the air passages and the lungs and can cause adverse health effects. Acute and chronic health effects associated with high particulate levels include the aggravation of chronic respiratory diseases, heart and lung disease, and coughing, bronchitis and respiratory illnesses in children. Particulate matter can also damage materials and reduce visibility. One common source of  $PM_{2.5}$  is diesel exhaust emissions.

PM<sub>10</sub> consists of particulate matter emitted directly into the air (e.g., fugitive dust, soot, and smoke from mobile and stationary sources, construction operations, fires, and natural windblown dust) and particulate matter formed in the atmosphere by condensation and/or transformation of SO<sub>2</sub> and ROG. Traffic generates particulate matter emissions through entrainment of dust and dirt particles that settle onto roadways and parking lots. PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are also emitted by burning wood in residential wood stoves and fireplaces and open agricultural burning. PM<sub>2.5</sub> can also be formed through secondary processes such as airborne reactions with certain pollutant precursors, including ROGs, ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), NOx, and SOx.

#### Lead

Lead is a metal found naturally in the environment and present in some manufactured products. There are a variety of activities that can contribute to lead emissions, which are grouped into two general categories, stationary and mobile sources. On-road mobile sources include light-duty automobiles; light-, medium-, and heavy-duty trucks; and motorcycles.

Emissions of lead have dropped substantially over the past 40 years. The reduction before 1990 is largely due to the phase-out of lead as an anti-knock agent in gasoline for on-road automobiles. Substantial emission reductions have also been achieved due to enhanced controls in the metals processing industry. In the Basin, atmospheric lead is generated almost entirely by the combustion of leaded gasoline and contributes less than one percent of the material collected as total suspended particulates.

#### Toxic Air Contaminants

Concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs), or in federal parlance, hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), are also used as indicators of ambient air quality conditions. A TAC is defined as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air; however, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at low concentrations.

According to the California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality, the majority of the estimated health risk from TACs can be attributed to relatively few compounds, the most important being particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines (DPM). DPM differs from other TACs in that it is not a single substance, but rather a complex mixture of hundreds of substances. Although DPM is emitted by diesel-fueled internal combustion engines, the composition of the emissions varies depending on engine type, operating conditions, fuel composition, lubricating oil, and whether an emission control system is present.

Unlike the other TACs, no ambient monitoring data are available for DPM because no routine measurement method currently exists. However, CARB has made preliminary concentration estimates based on a particulate matter exposure method. This method uses the CARB emissions inventory's PM<sub>10</sub> database, ambient PM<sub>10</sub> monitoring data, and the results from several studies to estimate concentrations of diesel PM. In addition to diesel PM, the TACs for which data are available that pose the greatest existing ambient risk in California are benzene, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, carbon tetrachloride, hexavalent chromium, para-dichlorobenzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, and perchloroethylene.

#### CO Hotspots

An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot" is an exceedance of the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm. It has long been recognized that CO hotspots are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at congested intersections. In response, vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly stringent in the last twenty years. Currently, the allowable CO emissions standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams/mile for passenger cars (there are requirements for certain vehicles that are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of increasingly sophisticated and efficient emissions control technologies, CO concentration in the SCAB is now designated as attainment, and CO concentrations in the Project vicinity have steadily declined (UC 2019).

#### Odorous Emissions

Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache). Offensive odors are unpleasant and can lead to public distress generating citizen complaints to local governments. Although unpleasant, offensive odors rarely cause physical harm. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source, wind speed, direction, and the sensitivity of receptors.

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

SCAQMD maintains monitoring stations within district boundaries, Source/Receptor Areas (SRAs), that monitor air quality and compliance with associated ambient standards. The Project area is located within the Southwest San Bernardino Valley monitoring station, located approximately 8.94 miles north of the Project site in Ontario (SRA 33). The nearest long-term air quality monitoring site for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and Carbon Monoxide (CO) is the South Coast Air Quality Management District Metropolitan Riverside County monitoring station, located approximately 10.77 miles north of the Project site (SRA 23). The most recent 3 years of data is shown on Table 5.2-2 and identifies the number of days ambient air quality standards were exceeded in the area. Additionally, data for SO<sub>2</sub> has been omitted as attainment is regularly met in the South Coast Air Basin and few monitoring stations measure SO<sub>2</sub> concentrations.

Both CARB and the USEPA use this type of monitoring data to designate areas with air quality problems and to initiate planning efforts for improvement. The three basic designation categories are nonattainment, attainment, and unclassified. Nonattainment is defined as any area that does not meet, or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. Attainment is defined as any area that meets the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. Unclassifiable is defined as any area that cannot be classified on the basis of available information as meeting or not meeting the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. California designations include a subcategory of nonattainment-transitional, which is given to nonattainment areas that are progressing and nearing attainment.

The SCAQMD monitors levels of various criteria pollutants at 38 permanent monitoring stations and 5 single-pollutant source Lead (Pb) air monitoring sites throughout the air district. In 2017, the federal and state ambient air quality standards (NAAQS and CAAQS) were exceeded on one or more days for ozone, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> at most monitoring locations. No areas of the SCAB exceeded federal or state standards for NO2, SO2, CO, sulfates or lead. See Table 5.2-3, for attainment designations for the SCAB.

Pollutant	Standard	Year		
ronolam	Sianaara	2015	2016	2017
Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )				
Maximum 1-Hour Concentration (ppm)		0.132	0.142	0.145
Maximum 8-Hour Concentration (ppm)	>0.07 ppm	0.105	0.104	0.118
Number of Days Exceeding State 1-Hour Standard	>0.12 ppm	1	1	2
Number of Days Exceeding State 8-Hour Standard	>0.09 ppm	31	33	47
Number of Days Exceeding Federal 8-Hour Standard	>0.07 ppm	55	69	81
Number of Days Exceeding Health Advisory	>0.07 ppm	59	71	82
Carbon Monoxide	(CO)	1		
Maximum 1-Hour Concentration (ppm)	> 35 ppm	2.5	1.7	
Maximum 8-Hour Concentration (ppm)	> 20 ppm	1.7	1.3	

 Table 5.2-2: Air Quality Monitoring Summary 2015-2017

Pollutant	Standard	Year			
- Cholan	Sidildaid	2015	2016	2017	
Nitrogen Dioxide (I	NO <sub>2</sub> )	II			
Maximum 1-Hour Concentration (ppm)	> 0.18 ppm	0.079	0.089	0.093	
Number of Days Exceeding State 1-Hour Standard	> 0.18 ppm	0	0	0	
Particulate Matter $\leq 10$ Microns (PM <sub>10</sub> )					
Maximum 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m3)		87.0	62.0	85.1	
Number of Samples Exceeding State Standard	> 50 µg/m³	3	7	8	
Number of Samples Exceeding Federal Standard	> 150 µg/m³	0	0	0	
Particulate Matter $\leq 2.5$ Microns (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )					
Maximum 24-Hour Concentration ( $\mu g/m^3$ )		52.7	49.5	67.8	
Number of Samples Exceeding Federal 24-Hour Standard	> 35 µg/m³	12.4	7.3	9.2	

-- = data not available from SCAQMD or ARB.

Criteria Pollutant	State Designation	Federal Designation
Ozone - 1hour standard	Nonattainment	No Standard
Ozone - 8 hour standard	Nonattainment	Nonattainment (Extreme)
PM10	Nonattainment	Attainment (Maintenance)
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Nonattainment	Nonattainment (Serious)
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Attainment (Maintenance)
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment (Maintenance)
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Attainment
Lead <sup>3</sup>	Attainment	Nonattainment (Partial)

#### Table 5.2-3: Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB)

Source: http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm

The Project site is currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility, which generate air quality emissions. Because some of the residential structures are vacant, the analysis does not include emissions from residential uses. The air quality emissions associated with the existing chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility are shown in Table 5.2-4.

Operational Emissions		Emissions (pounds per day)						
	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
Total Maximum Daily Emissions Summer	7.55	60.16	39.04	0.26	12.27	3.74		
Total Maximum Daily Emissions Winter	6.94	63.58	37.65	0.26	12.27	3.74		

Table 5.2-4: Existing Egg Warehouse and Distribution Facility Air Quality Emissions

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Sensitive Land Uses

Land uses such as schools, children's daycare centers, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be more sensitive to poor air quality than the general public because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress. In addition, residential uses are considered more sensitive to air quality conditions than commercial and industrial uses, because people generally spend longer periods of time at their residences, resulting in greater exposure to ambient air quality conditions. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution. Exercise places a high demand on respiratory functions, which can be impaired by air pollution, even though exposure periods during exercise are generally short. In addition, noticeable air pollution can detract from the enjoyment of recreation.

Existing sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project area consists of residences; the closest of which is approximately 20 feet from the Project area boundary.

- R1: An existing residence east of Pacific Avenue and south of Second Street, approximately 53 feet north of the Project site.
- R2: An existing residence on the south side of Second Street, approximately 20 feet west of the Project site.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Federal nonattainment designation for lead is only applicable to the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB.

- R3: An existing residence on the north side of Second Street, approximately 104 feet north of the Project site.
- R4: An existing residence on the east side of Mountain Avenue, approximately 60 feet east of the Project site.
- R5: Existing residences on the east side of Mountain Avenue, approximately 41 feet east of the Project site.
- R6: Existing residences on the south side of First Street, approximately 68 feet south of the Project site.

## 5.2.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a significant adverse effect on air quality resources if it would:

- AQ-1 Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- AQ-2 Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard;
- AQ-3 Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- AQ-4 Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to Threshold AQ-4; no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

#### **Regional Thresholds**

The SCAQMD's most recent regional significance thresholds from March 2015 for regulated pollutants are listed in Table 5.2-5. The SCAQMD's CEQA air quality methodology provides that any projects that result in daily emissions that exceed any of the thresholds in Table 5.2-5 would be considered to have both an individually (project-level) and cumulatively significant air quality impact.

Pollutant	Construction	Operations
NOx	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM10	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
PM2.5	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
SOx	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day

#### Table 5.2-5: SCAQMD Regional Air Quality Thresholds

#### Localized Significance Thresholds

SCAQMD has also developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards, and thus would not cause or contribute to

localized air quality impacts. LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each of the 38 source receptor areas (SRAs) in the Basin. The localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in the "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" document prepared by SCAQMD, were developed for use on projects that are less than or equal to 5-acres in size and are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NOx, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Construction of the proposed Project would grade a maximum of 8-acres per day. Although the daily grading area of 8-acres is greater than 5-acres, the applicable SCAQMD localized thresholds for a 5-acre site from the "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" document's mass rate look-up tables are used to first provide a conservative screening analysis of the construction emissions. This is conservative because it estimates emissions of the 8-acre area and concentrates them into a 5-scre site. If the emissions from the 8-acre area are less than the thresholds for a 5-acre area, it can be assured that impacts would les less than significant. The LSTs construction thresholds for a 5-acre site in SRA 33 are shown in Table 5.3-6.

The closest sensitive receptor to the Project area is an existing residence on the south side of Second Street, approximately 20 feet west of the Project site. Therefore, the LSTs for a receptor distance of 25 meters (82 feet) (the closest threshold) is used to evaluate LST emissions.

Pollutant	Construction	Operations	
	118 lbs/day (Demolition)		
NOx	220 lbs/day (Site Preparation)	270 lbs/day	
	270 lbs/day (Grading)		
674 lbs/day (Demolition)			
CO	1,354 lbs/day (Site Preparation)	1 <b>,</b> 700 lbs/day	
	1,700 lbs/day (Grading)		
	4 lbs/day (Demolition)		
<b>PM</b> 10	9 lbs/day (Site Preparation)	3 lbs/day	
	12 lbs/day (Grading)		
	3 lbs/day (Demolition)		
PM2.5	7 lbs/day (Site Preparation)	2 lbs/day	
	8 lbs/day (Grading)		

Table 5.2-6: SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds

#### Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk Threshold

Cancer risk is expressed in terms of expected incremental incidence per million population. The SCAQMD has established an incidence rate of 10 persons per million as the maximum acceptable incremental cancer risk due to diesel particulate matter (DPM) exposure. This threshold serves to determine whether or not a given project has a potentially significant development-specific and cumulative impact. Projects that exceed the project-specific significance thresholds are considered by the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are not considered to be cumulatively significant.

## 5.2.5 METHODOLOGY

This analysis focuses on the nature and magnitude of the change in the air quality environment due to implementation of the proposed Project, based on the maximum development assumptions that are outlined in Section 3.0, *Project Description*.

Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed Project would result from construction equipment usage and from construction-related traffic. Additionally, emissions would be generated from operations of the future warehouse/distribution, light manufacturing, and business uses and from traffic volumes generated by these new uses. The net increase in emissions generated by these activities and other secondary sources have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable thresholds of significance recommended by SCAQMD.

#### Construction

Short-term construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors from development of the Project were assessed in accordance with methods recommended by SCAQMD. The Project's regional emissions were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), as recommended by SCAQMD. CalEEMod was used to determine whether short-term construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants associated with the proposed Project would exceed applicable regional thresholds and where mitigation would be required. Modeling was based on project-specific data and predicted short-term construction-generated emissions associated with the Project were compared with applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for determination of significance.

In addition, to determine whether or not construction activities associated with development of the Project would create significant adverse localized air quality impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, the worst-case daily emissions contribution from the proposed Project was compared to SCAQMD's LSTs that are based on the pounds of emissions per day that can be generated by a project without causing or contributing to adverse localized air quality impacts. The daily total on-site combustion, mobile, and fugitive dust emissions associated with construction was combined and evaluated against SCAQMD's LSTs for a 5-acre site. Although the proposed Project would grade a maximum of 8 acres per day, use of the 5-acre threshold provides a conservative evaluation because it estimates emissions of the 8 acres and concentrates them into a 5-scre site.

#### Operations

Long-term (i.e., operational) regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, including mobileand area-source emissions from the Project, were also quantified using the CalEEMod computer model. Area-source emissions were modeled according to the size and type of the land uses proposed. Mass mobile-source emissions were modeled based on the increase in daily vehicle trips that would result from the proposed Project. Trip generation rates were available from the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed Project (see Appendix B of this EIR). Predicted long-term operational emissions were compared with applicable SCAQMD thresholds for determination of significance.

#### Trip Length

For passenger car trips, the CalEEMod default for a one-way trip length of 16.6 miles was assumed. For heavy duty trucks, an average one-way trip length of 52.65 miles was derived from distances from the Project site to the far edges of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Assuming 50% of trucks travel to the Port of Los Angles and Port of Long Beach and the remaining 50% of trucks travel to either the Banning Pass, the San Diego County Line, Cajon Pass, or Downtown Los Angeles, a weighted truck trip length of 52.65 miles was determined.

- Project site to the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach: 54.42 miles;
- Project site to Banning Pass: 66.43 miles;
- Project site to San Diego County Line: 52.55 miles:
- Project site to Cajon Pass: 36.70 miles;
- Project site to Downtown Los Angeles: 47.83 miles;

Average Weighted Truck Trip Length = 52.65 miles

Although the SCAQMD approach of 40 miles is deemed to be applicable for the Project, for purposes of a conservative analysis, a truck trip length of 53 miles was utilized consistent with regional vehicular trips to the Project site.

#### **Onsite Equipment Emissions**

It is common for industrial warehouse buildings to require cargo handling equipment to move containers and empty chassis to and from the various pieces of cargo handling equipment that receive and distribute containers. The most common type of cargo handling equipment is the yard truck which is designed for moving cargo containers. Yard trucks are also known as yard goats, utility tractors (UTRs), hustlers, yard hostlers, and yard tractors. Yard trucks have a horsepower (HP) range of approximately 175 hp to 200 hp. Based on the latest available information from SCAQMD, warehouse projects typically have 3.6-yard trucks per million square feet of building space.

The operational equipment for the proposed Project includes seven 200 hp compressed natural gas tractors operating at 4 hours a day for 365 days of the year. In addition, forklifts are a common piece of equipment used in warehouse operations. As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the Project would implement sustainable design features that includes powering indoor forklifts by electricity. The proposed Project would also power all outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) by non-diesel fueled engines.

## 5.2.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

## IMPACT AQ-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY PLAN.

Less than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the proposed Project. Projects that are consistent with the regional population, housing, and employment forecasts identified by SCAG are considered to be consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the forecast assumptions by SCAG forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. Additionally, because SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in general plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a general plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's regional forecast projections, and thus also with the AQMP growth projections.

A majority of the Project area is designated by the City General Plan as the Gateway Specific Plan, with exception of a 4-acre area designated as Residential Agricultural (RA) with an Agricultural – Low Density 20,000 square feet (A-1-20) zoning designation. The Gateway Specific Plan zones the majority of the Project site as industrial, with a small area of commercial on the northwest corner of Mountain Avenue and First Street, and a small area of residential on Second Street to the east of Pacific Avenue.

Consistent with the existing Specific Plan designation of the Project area, the Project proposes to construct and operate 35 industrial buildings and 3 commercial buildings that would total approximately 2,050,000 square feet of light industrial business park and commercial uses. The vast majority of the proposed Project would be consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use and zoning designations. Because SCAG's regional growth forecasts and the AQMP are based upon land uses designated in general plans, the Project would not exceed SCAG's growth projections. As such, the proposed Project would not conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT AQ-2: THE PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN A CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE NET INCREASE OF A CRITERIA POLLUTANT FOR WHICH THE PROJECT REGION IS NON-

## ATTAINMENT UNDER AN APPLICABLE FEDERAL OR STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD.

#### Construction

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NOx, SOx, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Pollutant emissions associated with construction would be generated from the following construction activities: (1) demolition, grading, and excavation; (2) construction workers traveling to and from the Project area; (3) delivery and hauling of construction supplies to, and debris from, the Project area; (4) fuel combustion by onsite construction equipment; (5) building construction; application of architectural coatings; and paving. These construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dust, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants.

Construction emissions are short-term and temporary. The maximum daily construction emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using CalEEMod; and the modeling includes compliance with SCAQMD Rules 403, 481, 1108, 1113, and 1143 (described above), which are included as PPP AQ-1 through PPP AQ-3, and would reduce air contaminants during construction. Table 5.2-7 provides the maximum daily emissions of criteria air pollutants from construction of the Project.

	Emissions (pounds per day)					
Year	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5
2020	13.12	160.05	76.75	0.23	29.63	13.70
2021	14.65	148.01	102.10	0.44	29.87	11.10
2022	65.73	106.58	114.40	0.48	34.57	10.57
Maximum Daily Emissions	65.73	160.05	114.40	0.48	34.57	13.70
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	Yes	Νο	No	Νο	No
a a						

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

As shown in Table 5.2-7, emissions resulting from construction would exceed criteria pollutant thresholds for NOx. Thus, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is included to require all construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower (>150 HP) to be CARB certified tier 4 or higher. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, emissions of NOx from construction activities would be reduced to below the SCAQMD significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant as shown on Table 5.2-8.

Table 5.2-8	8: Maximum	Peak	Construction	Emissions	with Mitigation
-------------	------------	------	--------------	-----------	-----------------

	Emissions (pounds per day)					
Year	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5
2020	4.05	44.58	79.01	0.23	20.50	7.39
2021	13.97	98.60	103.33	0.44	29.49	8.88
2022	65.12	98.83	115.82	0.48	1.53	10.27
Maximum Daily Emissions	65.12	98.83	115.82	0.48	29.49	10.27
---------------------------	-------	-------	--------	------	-------	-------
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	Νο	No	Νο	No	Νο	Νο

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### **Construction Diesel Source Health Risk**

The HRA prepared for the Project describes that the receptor with the greatest potential exposure to Project construction DPM source emissions is located approximately 61 feet east of the Project site at existing residences on the east side of Mountain Avenue. At the maximally exposed individual receptor (MEIR), the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to Project construction DPM source emissions is estimated at 1.62 in one million, which is less than the threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be 0.0002, which would not exceed the applicable threshold of 1.0 (HRA 2019). As such, the Project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent land uses as a result of Project construction activity. Therefore, impacts related to construction diesel health risks would be less than significant.

#### Operation

**Significant and Unavoidable.** Implementation of the proposed Project would result in long-term emissions of criteria air pollutants from area sources generated by the proposed industrial, warehousing, commercial, and office uses, such as vehicular emissions, natural gas consumption, landscaping, and use of consumer products.

The Project's operational air quality impacts are primarily from vehicle trips. Over 89 percent (by weight) of all Project operational-source emissions would be generated by mobile sources (vehicles). As detailed in the Project Description's sustainability design features include that all on-site outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts, and other on-site equipment) would be powered by electricity or non-diesel fueled engines. In addition, the majority of VOC emissions result from consumer products, such as cleaning supplies, kitchen aerosols, cosmetics and toiletries.

Emissions from operation of the Project are provided in Table 5.2-9. As shown, the emissions from the existing egg warehouse distribution uses have been subtracted from the projected Project emissions to identify the net increase in emissions that would occur from operation of the Project. Table 5.2-9 shows that net emissions would exceed regional operational thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for emissions of VOC and NOx. As a result, Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would be implemented, which would require heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds have a 2010 model year engine or newer or be equipped with a particulate matter trap. Mitigation Measure AQ-4 would be implemented to install signs at loading dock facilities that restrict idling to no more than 3 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 requires electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building; and Mitigation Measure AQ- requires that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling.

Summer Scongrie	Emissions (pounds per day)							
Sommer Stendrig	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	123.44	544.79	541.06	2.54	135.30	40.84		
Existing Industrial Emissions	7.55	60.16	39.04	0.26	12.27	3.74		
Net Project Emissions (Project- Existing)	115.88	484.63	502.02	2.28	123.03	37.10		
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55		
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No		
Winter Scenario	Emissions (pounds per day)							
Willer Scenario	voc	NOx	со	\$O <sub>x</sub>	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	104.96	575.39	507.80	2.48	132.33	40.86		
Existing Industrial Emissions	6.94	63.58	37.65	0.26	12.27	3.74		
Net Project Emissions (Project- Existing)	98.02	511.81	470.15	2.23	123.06	37.12		
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55		
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No		

Table 5.2-9: Summary	y of Operational	Emissions
----------------------	------------------	-----------

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

The operational emissions with implementation of the mitigation measures is provided in Table 5.2-10. As shown, with compliance with existing rules, and implementation of the mitigation measures, emissions would continue to exceed regional thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for emissions of VOC and NOx. As described previously, approximately 89 percent of all operational-source emissions (by weight) would be generated by vehicles. Therefore, operation of the Project would result in VOC and NOx emissions that would be significant and unavoidable.

Summer Scenario	Emissions (pounds per day)						
	voc	NOx	со	\$O <sub>x</sub>	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	120.86	474.56	538.95	2.49	134.09	39.67	
Existing Industrial Emissions	7.55	60.16	39.04	0.26	12.27	3.74	
Project Net Emissions (Project- Existing)	113.31	414.40	499.91	2.23	121.82	35.94	
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55	
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Winter Scenario	Emissions (pounds per day)						

#### Table 5.2-10: Summary of Operational Emissions With Mitigation

	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	102.21	504.43	504.27	2.43	134.11	39.70
Existing Industrial Emissions	6.94	63.58	37.65	0.26	12.27	3.74
Project Net Emissions (Project- Existing)	95.27	440.85	466.62	2.17	121.84	35.96
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

**Potential Overlap of Construction and Operational Activity.** Based on the assumed buildout and phasing of the proposed Project, there is potential for overlap of construction and operational activities. As a conservative measure, the 50% of the peak daily emissions of the overlap of construction and operational activities are shown in Table 5.2-11 (with mitigation). As shown, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3 and AQ-4, emissions from an overlap of construction and operational activities would exceed regional thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for emissions of VOC, NOx, and CO. Thus, an overlap of construction and operation would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to emissions of VOC, NOx, and CO.

**Health Impacts of Particulate Emissions.** The EIR identifies a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to NOx and VOC emissions, due largely to trucking operations. NOx is a "criteria" pollutant, a pollutant that is regulated by the US EPA pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act. The potential health impacts of criteria pollutants are analyzed on a regional level, not on a facility/project level. The SCAQMD and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPD), experts in the area of air quality, both recognize that a meaningful, accurate analysis of potential health impacts resulting from criteria pollutants is not currently possible and not likely to yield substantive information that promotes informed decision making. The SJVAPD, in its amicus curiae brief for the recent California Supreme Court decision in *Sierra Club* v. *County of Fresno* (2018)6 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 502, explained that "it is not feasible to conduct a [health impact analysis] for criteria air pollutants because currently available computer modeling tools are not equipped for this task." The SJVAPD described a project-specific health impact analysis of riteria pollutants is not really a localized, project-level impact analysis but one of regional" cumulative impacts.

It should also be noted that NOx and VOCs are "precursor" pollutants, which makes analysis of potential health impacts even more difficult. NOx and VOCs are precursors to ozone, which is formed in the atmosphere from the chemical reaction of NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight. As explained by the SCAQMD in its amicus curiae brief for *Sierra Club v*. County of *Fresno*, it takes time and the influence of meteorological conditions for these reactions to occur, so ozone may be formed at a distance downwind from the sources." Given this, "...it takes a large amount of additional precursor emissions to cause a modeled increase in ambient ozone levels over an entire region." Therefore, SCAQMD opined that while it "may be feasible" for large, regional projects with very high emissions of NOx and VOCs to conduct an accurate health impact analysis, "SCAQMD staff does not currently know of a way to accurately quantify ozone-related health impacts caused by NOx or VOC emissions from relatively small projects."

Thus, the difficulties with preparing potential health impact analysis related to the project's NOx and VOC emissions are twofold. First, current modeling is not capable of correlating emissions of criteria pollutants to

concentrations that can be reasonably linked to specific health impacts. Second, NOx and VOCs are precursor emissions and concentrations of NOx and VOC are impacted by regional atmospheric conditions. NOx and VOCs emitted by the project may, depending upon interactions with the sun and other emissions, convert to ozone by complex chemical processes. Thus, there is a significant level of unpredictability associated with such conversion to ozone, as noted by the SCAQMD and the SJVAPD.

The EIR did analyze localized operational impacts associated with the Project's NOx emissions, and concluded that such impacts would be less than significant. The SCAQMD's Localized Significance Thresholds ("LST") represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor are and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, the Project would not generate emissions on a localized scale that are expected to result in an exceedance of applicable standards, which are intended to be protective of the public health. The Project's significant and unavoidable NOx impact is related to the Project's regional emissions, which are assessed against the SCAQMD's regional thresholds. As discussed above, given the regional nature of such emissions and numerous unpredictable factors, an analysis that correlates health with regional emissions. Table 4.2-1 of the EIR includes a list of criteria pollutants and summarizes common sources and effects. Thus, the EIR's analysis is reasonable and intended to foster informed decision making.

Maximum Daily Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)							
	voc	NOx	со	SOx	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>		
Construction Peak Emissions	32.56	49.41	57.91	0.24	14.75	5.13		
Operational Total Emissions	113.31	440.85	499.91	2.23	121.84	35.96		
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	145.87	490.26	557.81	2.47	136.58	41.09		
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55		
Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No		

 Table 5.2-11: Emissions from Potential Overlap of Construction and Operation

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

## IMPACT AQ-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS.

#### **CO Hotspots**

Less than Significant Impact. An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot", would occur if an exceedance of the State's one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur. The 2003 AQMP estimated traffic volumes that could generate CO concentrations to result in a "hot spot". As shown on Table 5.3-12, the busiest intersection had a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day, and the 1-hour CO concentration was 4.6 ppm. This indicates that, even with a

	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)							
Intersection Location	Eastbound (a.m./p.m.)	Westbound (a.m./p.m.)	Southbound (a.m./p.m.)	Northbound (a.m./p.m.)	Total (a.m./p.m.)			
Wilshire-Veteran	4,954/2,069	1,830/3,317	721/1,400	560/933	8,062/7,719			
Sunset-Highland	1,417/1,764	1,342/1,540	2,304/1,832	1,551/2,238	6,614/5,374			
La Cienega-Century	2,540/2,243	1,890/2,728	1,384/2,029	821/1,674	6,634/8,674			
Long Beach-Imperial	1,217/2,020	1,760/1,400	479/944	756/1,150	4,212/5,514			

Table 5.2-12: Traffic Volumes for Intersections Evaluated in 2003 AQMP

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

With operation of the proposed Project, the highest average daily trips on a segment of road would be 40,000 daily trips on I-15 southbound off-ramp and Hidden Valley Parkway, which is lower than the highest daily traffic volumes of 100,000 vehicles per day at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. Additionally, Table 5.3-13, the highest trips on a segment of road for the Project is 4,820 vehicles per hour on Hamner Avenue, Mountain Avenue, and Hidden Valley Parkway. As such, Project-related traffic volumes are less than the traffic volumes identified in the 2003 AQMP; and are not high enough to generate a CO "hot spot". Therefore, impacts related to CO "hot spots" from operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Table 5.2-13: Proposed Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)							
Intersection	Northbound (a.m./p.m.)	Southbound (a.m./p.m.)	Eastbound (a.m./p.m.)	Westbound (a.m./p.m.)	Total (a.m./p.m.)			
Hamner Ave/3rd St.	1,834/1,497	1,277/1,429	504/739	493/239	4,108/3,903			
Hamner Ave/2nd St.	1,146/1,283	1,148/1,879	809/1,092	1,694/1,149	4,797/5,404			
Hamner Ave/Mountain Ave/Hidden Valley Pkwy	914/1,449	639/1,403	402/766	1,921/1,204	3,875/4,820			
I-15 Southbound Off- Ramp/Hidden Valley Pkwy	82/239	1,1299/881	828/1,758	1,167/968	3,206/3,846			

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Localized Construction Air Quality Impacts

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed previously, the daily construction

 $<sup>^4</sup>$  Based on the ratio of the CO standard (20.0 ppm) and the modeled value (4.6 ppm).

emissions generated onsite by the proposed Project are evaluated against SCAQMD's LSTs or a 5-acre site as a conservative screening analysis to determine whether the emissions would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts.

The appropriate Source Receptor Area (SRA) for the LST analysis is the Southwest San Bernardino air monitoring station (SRA 33). The closest sensitive receptor to the Project area is an existing residence on the south side of Second Street, approximately 20 feet west of the Project site. Therefore, the LSTs for a receptor distance of 25 meters (82 feet) (the closest threshold) is used to evaluate LST emissions. Table 5.2-14 identifies daily localized onsite emissions that are estimated to occur during construction of the proposed Project. As shown, emissions during the peak construction activity would exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, including with implementation of PPP AQ-1 through PPP AQ-3. Therefore, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would be implemented to reduce construction emissions. With implementation of these mitigation measures, construction emissions would not exceed LST thresholds.

On-Site Demolition Emissions	Emiss	Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5	
Maximum Daily Emissions	34.59	22.84	4.68	2.11	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	118	674	4	3	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	Yes	No	
On-Site Site Preparation Emissions	Emiss	ions (pou	unds per	day)	
	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Maximum Daily Emissions	63.79	22.39	11.28	6.59	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	220	1,354	9	7	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	Yes	No	
On-Site Grading Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)				
C C	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5	
Maximum Daily Emissions	139.32	72.33	18.53	10.88	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,700	12	8	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	Yes	Yes	

Table 5.2-14: Localized Significance Emissions from Peak Construction Activity

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

After implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, emissions during peak construction activity would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold for any of the pollutants, as shown on Table 5.2-15. Therefore, with implementation of PPPs and mitigation measures, impacts related to localized significant emissions from construction activity would be less than significant.

	Emissions (pounds per day)				
<b>On-Site Demolition Emissions</b>	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5	
Maximum Daily Emissions	8.55	23.54	2.42	0.78	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	118	674	4	3	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	
	Emissi	ions (pou	nds per	day)	
<b>On-Site Site Preparation Emissions</b>	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Maximum Daily Emissions	3.03	25.65	5.76	2.78	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	220	1,354	9	7	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	
	Emissi	ions (pou	nds per	day)	
<b>On-Site Grading Emissions</b>	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	
Maximum Daily Emissions	23.86	74.59	9.43	4.57	
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,700	12	8	
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	

 Table 5.2-15: Localized Significance Emissions from Peak Construction Activity With Mitigation

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Localized Operational Air Quality Impacts

**Less than Significant.** As shown on Table 5.2-16, emissions from operation of the proposed Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to localized operational emissions.

Table 5.2-16: Localized Significance Emissions from Operation of the Project

Peak Operational Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	NOx	со	<b>PM</b> 10	PM2.5		
Maximum Daily Emissions	30.25	25.48	2.80	1.97		
SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,700	3	2		

Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No

Source Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk

A Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment, included as Appendix B, was prepared for the Project to evaluate the health risk impacts as a result of exposure to diesel particulate matter (DPM) as a result of heavy-duty diesel trucks entering and leaving the site during operation of the proposed Project. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Diesel Trucks, trucks accessing the Project site would be required to meet or exceed a 2010 model year engine standard. As such, the Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment evaluated the use of 2010 and newer trucks. In addition, the analysis conservatively assumes use of model year 2010 trucks for the entire duration of analysis herein (e.g., 30 years), which is conservative because it does not include fleet turnover or cleaner technology with lower emissions that would occur throughout operation of the proposed uses.

On-site truck idling was estimated to occur as trucks enter and travel through the facility. Although the proposed uses are required to comply with CARB's idling limit of 5 minutes, SCAQMD recommends that the on-site idling emissions should be estimated for 15 minutes of truck idling, which takes into account on-site idling that occurs while the trucks are waiting to pull up to the truck bays, idling at the bays, idling at check-in and check-out, etc. As such, this analysis estimated truck idling at 15 minutes, consistent with SCAQMD's recommendation.

As described above, SCAQMD recommends using a 10 in one million is used as the cancer risk threshold. A risk level of 10 in one million implies a likelihood that up to 10 people, out of one million equally exposed people would contract cancer if exposed continuously (24 hours per day) to the levels of toxic air contaminants over a specified duration of time.

**Residential:** The residential land use with the greatest potential exposure to Project DPM source emissions is an existing residence located approximately 60 feet east of the Project site, on the east side of Mountain Avenue. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to Project DPM source emissions is calculated at 6.33 in one million, which is less than the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in one million. Additionally, non-cancer risks were calculated to be 0.002, which would not exceed the applicable threshold of 1.0. As such, the Project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent residences, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Workers:** The workers with the greatest potential exposure to Project DPM source emissions are located immediately adjacent to the east of the Project site on the east side of Mountain Avenue. At the maximally exposed worker (MEIW), the maximum incremental cancer risk impact at this location is 0.47 in one million which is less than the threshold of 10 in one million. Also, the non-cancer risks were calculated to be 0.001, which would not exceed the applicable threshold of 1.0. As such, the Project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent workers, and impacts would be less than significant.

**School Children:** The school site with the greatest potential exposure to Project DPM source emissions is George Washington Elementary School, located at at 1220 West Parkridge Avenue, which is approximately 700 feet west of the Project site. This school is anticipated to have the greatest potential exposure to DPM emissions due to its location near the Project site, truck travel patterns, and meteorological conditions. At the maximally exposed individual school child (MEISC), the maximum incremental cancer risk impact would be 0.28 in one million which is less than the threshold of 10 in one million. Maximum non-cancer risks at this same location were estimated to be 0.0003 which would not exceed the applicable threshold of 1.0. As such, the Project would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to any school children, and impacts would be less than significant.

## 5.2.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As described previously, per SCAQMD's methodology, if an individual project would result in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceeds the SCAQMD's thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants.

As described in Impact AQ-2 above, emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for VOC and NOx after implementation of PPPs and mitigation measures. Because approximately 89 percent of all operational-source emissions (by weight) would be generated by project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products that neither the project applicant nor the City have the ability to reduce emissions of. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

# 5.2.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

#### State

- Clean Car Standards Pavley (AB 1493)
- California Advanced Clean Cars CARB (Title 13 CCR)
- Low-Emission Vehicle Program LEV III (Title 13 CCR)
- Statewide Retail Provider Emissions Performance Standards (SB 1368).
- Airborne Toxics Control Measure to Limit School Bus Idling and Idling at Schools (13 CCR 2480)
- Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fuel Commercial Vehicle Idling (13 CCR 2485)
- In-Use Off-Road Diesel Idling Restriction (13 CCR 2449)
- Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6)
- California Green Building Code (Title 24, Part 11)
- Appliance Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 20)

#### Regional

- SCAQMD Rule 201: Permit to Construct
- SCAQMD Rule 402: Nuisance Odors
- SCAQMD Rule 403: Fugitive Dust
- SCAQMD Rule 1113: Architectural Coatings
- SCAQMD Rule 1186: Street Sweeping
- SCAQMD Rule 1403: Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities

#### Plans, Program and Policies (PPPs)

The following standard SCAQMD Rules would reduce impacts related to air quality emissions. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

**PPP AQ-1:** The following measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of SCAQMD Rule 403 (4):

- All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 mph per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.
- The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.

**PPP AQ-2:** The following measures shall be incorporated into construction plans and specifications as implementation of Rule 1113 (9). Only "Low-Volatile Organic Compounds" paints (no more than 100 gram/liter of VOC) and/or High Pressure Low Volume (HPLV) applications consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1113 shall be used.

### 5.2.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impact AQ-1 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

- Impact AQ-2: Construction and operational associated with the proposed Project would generate a substantial increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the threshold criteria and would cumulative contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SCAB.
- Impact AQ-3: The proposed Project could result in new source sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants proximate to existing or planned sensitive receptors.

### 5.2.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Tier 4

The construction plans and specifications shall state that construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower (>150 HP) shall comply with EPA/CARB Tier 4 emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

#### Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Watering Actively Graded Areas

The construction plans and specifications shall state that during site preparation and grading activity all actively graded areas within the Project site shall be watered at 2.1-hour watering intervals (e.g., 4 times per day) or a movable sprinkler system shall be in place to ensure minimum soil moisture of 12% in maintained for actively graded areas. Moisture content shall be verified with use of a moisture probe by the grading contractor.

#### Mitigation Measure AQ-3: Diesel Trucks

The construction plans and operational specifications shall state that contractors and building operators (by contract specifications) shall ensure that on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds will have a 2010 model year engine or newer or will be equipped with a particulate matter trap, as available.

#### **Mitigation Measure AQ-4: Idling Regulations**

The Project plans and specifications shall include signs at loading dock facilities that include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 3 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations.

#### Mitigation Measure AQ-5: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Carpool Parking

The Project plans and specifications shall include electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building for employees and the public to use.

#### Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Transportation Management

The Project plans and specifications shall require that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. The TMA shall advertise its services to the building occupants. The TMA shall offer transit incentives to employees and shall provide shuttle service to and from public transit, should a minimum of 5 employees request and use such service from a transit stop at the same drop-off and/or pickup time. The TMA shall distribute public transportation information to its employees. The TMA shall provide electronic message board space for coordination rides.

### 5.2.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

**Impact AQ-2:** Emissions from the construction of the Project would be less than significant after PPP AQ-1 through PPP AQ-3 and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.

Emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for NOx after implementation of PPPs and mitigation measures. Because approximately 89 percent of all operational-source emissions (by weight) would be generated by Project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products that neither the Project applicant nor the City have the ability to reduce emissions of. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

**Impact AQ-3:** After implementation of PPP AQ-1 through PPP AQ-3 and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, emissions during peak construction activity would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold for any of the pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### REFERENCES

Palomino Business Park Air Quality Analysis, Prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019

Palomino Business Park Construction and Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment, Prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019 This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.3 Biological Resources

## 5.3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the proposed Specific Plan related to biological resources. Information within this section includes data from the Biological Technical Report (BTR 2019) and the Jurisdictional Delineation (JD 2019), which were prepared for the Project by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc. and are provided as Appendix D and E. These studies are based on information compiled through field reconnaissance, a general biological survey, habitat assessment, vegetation mapping, focused Burrowing Owl Surveys, and investigation of jurisdictional waters and wetlands.

## 5.3.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973 defines an endangered species as "any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range." A threatened species is defined as "any species which is likely to become an Endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range." Under provisions of Section 9(a)(1)(B) of the FESA, unless properly permitted, it is unlawful to "take" any endangered or threatened listed species. "Take" is defined in Section 3(18) of FESA as: "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." Further, the USFWS, through regulation, has interpreted the terms "harm" and "harass" to include certain types of habitat modification as forms of "take." These interpretations, however, are generally considered and applied on a case-by-case basis and often vary from species to species. In a case where a property owner seeks permission from a federal agency for an action which could affect a federally listed plant or animal species, the property owner and agency are required to consult with USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the FESA if there is a federal nexus, or consult with USFWS and potentially obtain a permit pursuant to Section 10 of the FESA in the absence of a federal nexus. Section 9(a)(2)(b) of the FESA addresses the protections afforded to listed plants. Within this EIR, the following acronyms are used to identify federal status species:

- FE: Federally-listed as Endangered
- FT: Federally-listed as Threatened
- FPE: Federally proposed for listing as Endangered
- FPT: Federally proposed for listing as Threatened
- FPD: Federally proposed for delisting
- FC: Federal candidate species (former C1 species)

The Project site is within the jurisdiction of the Carlsbad USFWS Office, which encompasses the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Imperial, and San Diego.

#### **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects individuals as well as any part, nest, or eggs of any bird listed as migratory. In practice, federal permits issued for activities that potentially impact migratory birds typically have conditions that require pre-disturbance surveys for nesting birds. In the event nesting is observed, a buffer area with a specified radius must be established, within which no disturbance or

intrusion is allowed until the young have fledged and left the nest, or it has been determined that the nest has failed. If not otherwise specified in the permit, the size of the buffer area varies with species and local circumstances (e.g., presence of busy roads, intervening topography, etc.), and is based on the professional judgment of a monitoring biologist. A list of migratory bird species protected under the MBTA is published by USFWS.

#### Federal Clean Water Act, Section 401/ California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

Section 401 of the CWA requires that any applicant for a federal permit for activities that involve a discharge to waters of the U.S. shall provide the federal permitting agency with a certification from the State in which the discharge is proposed that the discharge will comply with applicable water quality standards, limitations and restrictions. As such, before the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will issue a CWA Section 404 permit, applicants must apply for and receive a Section 401 water quality certification (WQC) from the RWQCB.

In addition to is responsibilities in implementing Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB regulates "discharging waste, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect "waters of the state" (Water Code Section 13260 (a)), pursuant to provisions of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act which defines RWQCB jurisdictional "waters of the state" as "any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state" (Water Code Section 13050 (e)).

With the exception of isolated waters and wetlands, most discharges of fill to waters of the state are also subject to a CWA Section 404 permit. If a CWA Section 404 permit is not required for the project, the RWQCB may still require issuance of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The RWQCB may regulate isolated waters that are not under jurisdiction of the USACE through issuance of WDRs. However, projects that obtain a Section 401 WQC are simultaneously enrolled in a statewide general WDR. Processing of Section 401 WQC's generally requires submittal of 1) a construction storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), 2) a final water quality technical report that demonstrates that post-construction storm water Best Management Practices (BMPs) comply with the local design standards for municipal storm drain permits (MS4 permits) implemented by the State Water Resources Control Board effective January 1, 2011, and 3) a conceptual Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) to compensate for permanent impacts to waters of the State, if any. In addition to submittal of a CEQA document, a WQC application typically requires a discussion of avoidance and minimization of impacts to RWQCB jurisdictional resources, and efforts to protect beneficial uses as defined by the local RWQCB basin plan for the project. The RWQCB cannot issue a Section 401 WQC until the project CEQA document is certified by the lead agency.

#### Federal Clean Water Act, Section 404

Section 404 of the CWA regulates the discharge of dredged material, placement of fill material, or excavation within "waters of the U.S." and authorizes the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, to issue permits for such actions. "Waters of the U.S." are defined by the CWA as "rivers, creeks, streams, and lakes extending to their headwaters and any associated wetlands." Wetlands are defined by the CWA as "areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions." The permit review process entails an assessment of potentially adverse impacts to USACE jurisdictional "waters of the U.S." However, the USACE does not have regulatory authority over non-navigable, isolated, intrastate waters such as mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, natural ponds, and vernal pools, which are not hydrologically connected to other intra- or inter-state "waters of the U.S."

#### **California Endangered Species Act**

Under the California's Endangered Species Act (CESA), California Species of Special Concern are species designated as vulnerable to extinction due to declining population levels, limited ranges, and/or continuing threats. Informally listed species are not protected per se, but warrant consideration in the preparation of biological resource assessments. For some species, the CNDDB is only concerned with specific portions of the life history, such as roosts, rookeries, or nest areas. Within this EIR, the following acronyms are used to identify state special-status species:

- SE: State-listed as Endangered
- ST: State-listed as Threatened
- SR: State-listed as Rare
- SCE: State candidate for listing as Endangered
- SCT: State candidate for listing as Threatened
- SFP: State Fully Protected
- SSC: California Species of Special Concern

#### State of California Fish and Game Code, Sections 3503.5, 3511, 3515

Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code states that it is "unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto." Activities that result in the abandonment of an active bird of prey nest may also be considered in violation of this code. In addition, California Fish and Game Code, Section 3511 prohibits the taking of any bird listed as fully protected, and California Fish and Game Code, Section 3515 states that is it unlawful to take any non-game migratory bird protected under the MBTA.

#### State of California Fish and Game Code, Section 1602

Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code requires any entity (e.g., person, state or local government agency, or public utility) who proposes a project that will substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream, or lake to notify the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) of the proposed project. In the course of this notification process, the CDFW will review the proposed project as it affects streambed habitats within the project area. The CDFW may then place conditions in the Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement to avoid, minimize, and mitigate any potentially significant adverse impacts within CDFW jurisdictional limits.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policies contained in the Conservation Element are relevant to the proposed Project:

**Policy 2.8.1:** Localized Wildlife Protection Policy: For project sites with isolated wildlife features not subject to protection by the MSHCP (Section 2.8.4) including ponds, tree groves, vegetated groves, vegetated drainage swales, etc., conserve and protect such areas as much as feasibly possible in open space areas as part of an overall landscaping plan.

**Policy 2.8.2:** Biological Assessment Process. As part of the development review process for all development proposals, the City should require habitat and biological assessments in areas expected to contain significant or important plant and wildlife communities identifying species types and locations.

**Policy 2.8.3:** Wildlife Mitigation Policy. The City should require development that has been found to have a potential adverse impact on sensitive species habitat to mitigate the potential impacts of proposed habitat changes.

**Policy 2.8.4a:** Implement the requirements of the MSHCP for public and private development projects including the collection of mitigation fees.

**Policy 2.8.4b:** Comply with the "Other Plan Requirements" of the MSHCP including requirements for: Riparian/Riverine and Fairy Shrimp Habitat; Narrow Endemic Plants; Criteria Area Survey Species; and Urban/Wildlife Interface Guidelines.

**Policy 2.8.4c:** Employ Best Management Practices of the MSHCP in project siting and design for both public and private development projects.

**Policy 2.8.6:** Natural Vegetation Policy: Review all new development so as to remove only the minimal amount of natural vegetation as possible and require revegetation of graded areas with native plant species consistent with public safety requirements.

**Policy 2.8.7:** Wildlife Migratory Corridor Policy: Protect and enhance known wildlife migratory corridors and help create new corridors whenever possible.

### 5.3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project site contains abandoned egg-farm infrastructure, an active trucking/distribution center, residences, small-scale livestock areas, and fenced-off undeveloped land that is regularly mowed. The Project site also includes segments of Second Street, Mountain Avenue, and First Street, which sub-divide the site.

The Project site is generally devoid of natural vegetation communities, except for a small patch of riparian habitat that is 0.02 acre. In addition, two drainage courses flow through the southern and southeastern portion of the Project site. The vegetation/land use types on the site is described below and shown on Figure 5.3-1 (BTR 2019).

#### Vegetation Communities

**Developed.** The Project site includes approximately 47.4 acres of developed land. These areas consist of existing and utilized roads, residential lots, commercial buildings, and parking areas. While ornamental plantings are occasionally present within the developed areas, these areas are generally devoid of natural vegetation.

**Disturbed.** The Project site includes approximately 19.9 acres of disturbed land. These areas consist of undeveloped areas that are routinely maintained and/or have been subject to ongoing disturbance in the form of stockpiling debris and unpaved vehicular access roads. Dominant plant species observed in the disturbed areas included primarily non-native species such as stinknet (Oncosiphon piluliferum), red-stemmed filaree (Erodium cicutarium), London rocket (Sisymbrium irio), summer mustard (Hirschfeldia incana), Mediterranean grass (Schismus barbatus), and foxtail barley (Hordeum murinum).

The central portion of the Project site contains abandoned egg-farm infrastructure which, although it was developed in the past, is also considered disturbed as it has become overtaken by these non-native species.

**Ruderal.** The Project site includes approximately 47 acres of land that is dominated by ruderal species. These areas are routinely mowed/maintained. Dominant plant species observed include primarily non-native grasses and herbs such as cheeseweed (Malva parviflora), common fiddleneck (Amsinckia

## **Vegetation Comunities**



This page intentionally left blank.

intermedia), ripgut grass (Bromus diandrus), foxtail barley (Hordeum murinum), and London rocket (Sisymbrium irio).

**Ornamental.** The Project site includes approximately 1.6 acres of land that is covered with ornamental plantings such as Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.) and Peruvian pepper (*Schinus molle*) trees which are associated with the developed areas. While ornamental trees are scattered throughout the Project site within the developed and disturbed areas, this ornamental vegetation cover exhibits a dense canopy with multiple individuals in close proximity.

**Riparian.** The Project site contains approximately 0.02 acre of riparian habitat which consists of approximately two mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) individuals. This vegetation type occurs within an earthen, ephemeral drainage in the southern portion of the Project site and is surrounded by ruderal species that are regularly maintained.

#### **Special Status Species**

Special-status species are species that have been identified by federal, state, or local resource conservation agencies as threatened or endangered, under provisions of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts (FESA and CESA, respectively), because they have declining or limited population sizes, usually resulting from habitat loss.

#### **Special-Status Plant Species**

No special-status plants were detected on the Project site or within off-site areas affected by the Project. The potential for special status plant species was evaluated based on the following factors: 1) species identified by the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) as occurring (either currently or historically) on or in the vicinity of the Project site, 2) applicable MSHCP survey areas, and 3) any other special-status plants that are known to occur within the vicinity of the Project site, or for which potentially suitable habitat occurs within the site (BTR 2019).

#### Special-Status Wildlife Species

No special-status animals were detected at the Project site. Several special-status species have a low to moderate potential to occur on site including burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*), and western yellow bat (*Lasiurus xanthinus*). In addition, due to the proximity of the site to the Prado Flood Control Basin and Regional Park and the nature of birds to travel long distances for foraging, several special-status birds have low potential to forage over the undeveloped areas on site; however, the Project site does not provide suitable breeding habitat due to its disturbed setting, lack of natural vegetation, and urban surroundings. These species include golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), and white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*) (BTR 2019).

The special status wildlife species with the potential to occur are described below:

**Burrowing Owl**: The burrowing owl is designated as a CDFW Species of Special Concern. The burrowing owl occurs in shortgrass prairies, grasslands, lowland scrub, agricultural lands (particularly rangelands), prairies, coastal dunes, desert floors, and some artificial, open areas as a year-long resident. They require large open expanses of sparsely vegetated areas on gently rolling or level terrain with an abundance of active small mammal burrows. As a critical habitat feature need, they require the use of rodent or other burrows for roosting and nesting cover.

During the focused burrowing owl surveys conducted in March, April, and May of 2019 no burrowing owls, or evidence of burrowing owls (e.g., cast pellets, preened feathers, or whitewash clustered at a burrow) were observed.

**Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR):** The SKR is a federally Endangered species and a state Threatened species. The SKR has a relatively small geographic range (about 1,108 sq. miles) for a mammal species and is restricted to Riverside County and adjacent northern-central San Diego County, California. The SKR is found almost exclusively in open grasslands or sparse shrublands with cover of less than 50 percent during the summer.

Although much of the Project site is developed/disturbed and no burrows or evidence of occupation was detected in the ruderal or disturbed areas, the Project site contains potentially suitable habitat for the SKR and therefore, the SKR has the potential to be present. The Project site is located within the Fee Assessment Area of the SKR HCP. Within the Fee Area, suitable habitat is assumed to be occupied and focused surveys are not required with the payment of the SKR Fee.

**Western Yellow Bat:** The Western yellow bat is designated as a CDFW Species of Special Concern and WBWG high priority. This species preferentially roosts in trees, generally palms in the southern U.S. The Project site contains primarily Eucalyptus species ornamental trees that provide low potential roosting habitat for the Western yellow bat. As such, this species has very low potential to roost on site and would more likely occur on site for foraging.

**Golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos):** This raptor is a state fully protected species and is protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. This species nests typically prefers to nest on cliff faces but will occasionally nest in tall trees. Foraging habitat includes open country, including grasslands and early successional stages of forest and shrub habitats.

**Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni):** This bird species is listed as threatened by the state and prefers Great Basin grasslands, riparian forests, riparian woodlands, and valley and foothill grasslands. Swainson's hawk has a low potential to forage in the Specific Plan area and no potential to nest. However, Swainson's hawk is known to migrate long distances.

White-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*): This bird species is a state fully protected species and requires open grasslands, meadows or marshes for foraging near isolated-full-canopied trees for nesting.

#### **Jurisdictional Waters**

Two earthen ephemeral drainage features occur within the Project site. Drainage 1 originates within the Project site and extends west for approximately 250 linear feet before turning south for approximately 648 linear feet and entering a reinforced concrete pipe. Drainage 1 re-emerges approximately 415 feet south of the pipe and continues south for approximately 200 linear feet before its confluence with Drainage 2 at which point both drainages enter three large pipe culverts and exit the south just north of First Street. The total length of Drainage 1 is 1,098 linear feet. Upon leaving the site, flows from the drainages continue southwesterly for approximately 0.75 miles and enter the Santa Ana River briefly before discharging into the Prado Flood Control Basin (BTR 2019).

Drainage 1 has an Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of 1 to 5 feet. The drainage is largely unvegetated; however, the banks and occasionally the channel are vegetated with non-native grasses, predominantly wall barley (*Hordeum murinum ssp. leporinum*, FACU), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*, NI), and little seed canary grass (*Phalaris minor*, NI). USACE jurisdiction associated with Drainage 1 totals approximately 0.08 acre, all of which consists of non-wetland waters (JD 2019), as listed in Table 5.3-1. CDFW jurisdiction associated with Drainage 1 totals approximately 0.14 acre, none of which consists of riparian vegetation (JD 2019), as listed in Table 5.3-1.

	USACE/RWQCB			CDFW			Linear Feet
	Non-Wetland	Wetland	Total	Non-Riparian	Riparian	Total	
Drainage	Waters (acres)	(acres)	(acres)	Streambed	Streambed	(acres)	
1	0.08	0	0.08	0.14	0	0.14	1,098
2	0.63	0	0.63	0.87	0.02	0.89	1,894
Total	0.71	0	0.71	1.01	0.02	1.03	2,992

Table 5.3-1: Potential US	ACE/RWQCB and CDFW	/ Jurisdiction
---------------------------	--------------------	----------------

Source: Biological Technical Report, 2019.

Drainage 2 (the South Norco Channel) originates offsite and flows through the Project site from the eastern boundary. Drainage 2 is an incised, ephemeral stream with a sandy earthen bottom and supports an OHWM of 5 to 23 feet. The drainage is largely unvegetated; however, approximately two mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*, FAC) individuals are present in the channel. The banks and are vegetated with nonnative grasses, predominantly wall barley and ripgut brome. USACE jurisdiction associated with Drainage 2 totals approximately 0.71 acre, all of which consists of non-wetland waters (JD 2019), as listed in Table 5.3-1. In addition, CDFW jurisdiction associated with Drainage 2 totals approximately 0.87 acre, of which 0.02 acre consists of riparian vegetation. Areas of potential USACE and CDFW jurisdiction are shown on Figure 5.3-2.

#### **Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools**

The Project site contains approximately 1.03 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, including 1.01 acres of unvegetated riverine areas, and 0.02 acre of riparian habitat, which are shown on Figure 5.3-3.

No vernal pools are present within the Project site. The site was evaluated thoroughly following periods of substantial rainfall in 2019 and the site does not contain any natural depressions that would inundate long enough to support vernal pools. Furthermore, the soils within this area are categorized as fine sandy loam soils, which are generally not associated with vernal pools. The northeastern corner of the Project site, near the corner of Mountain Avenue and Second Street, consists of a truck parking area that is regularly disturbed and contains a roadside depression that became inundated but due to the repeated disturbance is not expected to support fairy shrimp, some subspecies of which are identified as a special status species. In addition, the depression does not support vernal pool indicator plants or other wetland plant species that would classify the depression as a vernal pool (BTR 2019).

#### Wildlife Movement

The Project site lacks migratory wildlife corridors, as it does not contain the structural topography and vegetative cover that facilitate regional wildlife movement, is subject to a high level of ongoing human disturbance, and much of the Project study area is fenced or consists of active public roadways, which act as inhibitors to wildlife movement (BTR 2019).

#### Habitat Conservation Plan

The site is located within the Eastvale Area Plan of the Western Riverside County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), but outside of the MSHCP Criteria Area, the Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area, Mammal and Amphibian Survey Areas, as well as outside of Core and Linkage areas. The Project site is within the Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area and Burrowing Owl Survey Area for the MSHCP (BTR 2019).

This page intentionally left blank.



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

## **Jurisdictional Features**



- Project Boundary
- Corps/RWQCB Non-Wetland Waters
- $-\frac{5}{\sqrt{5}}$  Width in Feet
- Data Pit Location
- Photo Location

This page intentionally left blank.



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco

## Riparian/Riverine Areas



- Project Boundary CDFW Non-Riparian Streambed CDFW Riparian
- $-\frac{5}{\sqrt{5}}$  Width in Feet
- Photo Location

This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.3.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- 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.
- BIO-2 Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US 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-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.
- 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.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in no impact related to Threshold BIO-5; no further assessment of these impacts is required in this EIR.

## 5.3.5 METHODOLOGY

The analysis within this EIR section and the Biological Technical Report (BTR 2019) is based on information compiled through field reconnaissance and reference materials. Surveys included a general biological survey, habitat assessment, vegetation mapping, and investigation of jurisdictional waters and wetlands throughout the Project site and off-site infrastructure improvement areas.

The literature review was based on the review of the following: California Natural Diversity Database, a CDFW species account database, Federal Register listings, California Native Plant Society, USFWS critical habitat maps, United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service soils mapping, and numerous regional flora and fauna field guides.

A general biological field survey, in-field habitat assessment, vegetation mapping, and investigation of jurisdictional waters and wetlands was conducted. The vegetation communities, jurisdictional features, wildlife species observed in the field, and other biological features or species observations of interest that were identified on the Project site were mapped on aerial photographs.

A jurisdictional delineation of existing drainages and wetland features throughout the Project site was conducted on April 5, 2019. The purpose of the delineation was to assess the location, extent, and acreage of "waters of the U.S.," and "waters of the State" under the jurisdiction of the USACE and RWQCB and streambed and associated riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of the CDFW. All areas

were delineated using the protocol stipulated by the CDFW under Section 1600-1607 of the California Fish and Game Code and by the USACE under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any potential wetlands were assessed using the procedures stipulated in the USACE Wetland Delineation Manual and Arid West Supplement (JD 2019).

The methodology related to potential MSHCP impacts evaluates the proposed Project with respect to the Project's consistency with MSHCP Reserve assembly requirements, Section 6.1.2 (Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools), Section 6.1.3 (Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species), Section 6.1.4 (Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface), and Section 6.3.2 (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures).

### 5.3.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT BIO-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT, EITHER DIRECTLY OR THROUGH HABITAT MODIFICATIONS, ON ANY SPECIES IDENTIFIED AS A CANDIDATE, SENSITIVE, OR SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES IN LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, OR REGULATIONS, OR BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.

#### Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.

#### **Special-Status Plant Species**

As described above, no special-status plants were detected on the Project site or within off-site areas affected by the Project. Additionally, no suitable habitat for special-status plant species was detected. Based on the disturbed and maintained nature of the site and the lack of suitable habitat, no impacts to special-status plant species are expected as a result from the Project (BTR 2019). Therefore, impacts related to special status plant species would not occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### Special-Status Wildlife Species

**Burrowing Owl.** As described previously, burrowing owl was confirmed as absent on the project site through focused surveys. However, the site has potential to support burrowing owls due to the presence of suitable habitat, such as sparsely vegetated open areas with rodent or other small mammal burrows that could be used by burrowing owls. Therefore, the MSHCP requires pre-construction surveys. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 has been included to require a pre-construction presence/absence survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If a burrowing owl is observed during the survey, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would also reduce potential impacts to burrowing owls in compliance with guidelines published by CDFW and the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl to a less than significant level.

**SKR.** Although SKR was not detected on the Project site, limited amounts of degraded potential habitat for SKR occurs within the Project site within disturbed and ruderal areas. Although small mammal burrows were detected, there is a low potential for SKR to occur due to the limited amount of habitat, which is degraded within the Project site. The value of the onsite habitat for SKR species is low (BTR 2019). In addition, the proposed Project site occurs within the Fee Assessment Area of the SKR HCP. All projects located within Fee Assessment Area are required to pay the SKR fee, which mitigates any impacts to SKR (BTR 2019). As a result, impacts to SKR would be reduced to a less than significant level.

**Swainson's Hawk.** The proposed Project would remove potential low-quality foraging habitat for migrating Swainson's hawks during spring/fall and winter. Although this species is listed as Threatened by

the state of California, CESA does not protect migrant habitat unless the habitat supports breeding/nesting. The site does not support breeding or nesting; thus, impacts related to Swainson's hawk would not occur. Additionally, the Swainson's hawk is a covered species under the MSHCP; therefore, potentially significant impacts would be reduced below a level of significance through compliance with the MSHCP, including the payment of MSHCP development fees (BTR 2019), which are required for receipt of construction and operational permits by the City of Norco. Thus, impacts related to Swainson's hawks would be less than significant.

**Golden eagle, loggerhead shrike, and white-tailed kite.** Impacts related to these avian species would be less than significant due to the low number of individuals that are potentially affected and the role of these species on the Project site. The Project site and adjacent areas do not provide suitable breeding habitat due to its disturbed setting, lack of natural vegetation, and urban surroundings (BTR 2019). Thus, the anticipated number of these species onsite is low. These species do have the potential to use the site for foraging; however, the quality of the foraging habitat onsite is also low (BTR 2019). In addition, these species are designated as covered species under the MSHCP, and impacts would be further reduced through the MSHCP and payment of development fees. Impacts to these species would be less than significant.

**Western Yellow Bat.** The potential impacts to the western yellow bat would be less than significant. This species is not covered by the MSHCP but impacts to this species would be less than significant as a result of a low level of sensitivity, low quality of habitat onsite, and low numbers of individuals that have the potential to be impacted by the proposed Project.

#### IMPACT BIO-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON ANY RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITY IDENTIFIED IN LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS OR BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE OR US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.

Less than Significant Impact. As described previously and shown in Figure 5.3-3, the Project site contains approximately 1.03 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas that includes 1.01 acres of unvegetated riverine areas, and 0.02 acre of riparian habitat. The riparian habitat is considered a special-status plant community; however, the riparian area within the Project site is a small area that is surrounded by ruderal vegetation that is regularly maintained. The riparian area on site does not function as a proper riparian environment as it does not support plant or animal species that are adapted to such habitats (BTR 2019). Due to the small amount and low quality of the riparian habitat on site, the impacts would be less than significant (BTR 2019). As such, the Project would not result in any significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive vegetation community.

Implementation of the proposed Project would permanently impact 0.48 acre of USACE and RWQCB jurisdictional area, none of which consists of jurisdictional wetlands, and 0.69 acre of CDFW jurisdiction, of which 0.02 acre consists of riparian vegetation (2,431 linear feet) (BTR 2019). The drainages are ephemeral and only a small amount of woody riparian vegetation limited to one mulefat shrub would be impacted by the Project. Although, these features support very limited to no habitat for plant or wildlife species beyond what the adjacent uplands provide, impacts to these drainages would be potentially significant and would require mitigation (BTR 2019). In addition, impacts to these drainage features would trigger CWA Sections 401 and 404 and Fish and Game Code 1602 permitting/authorizations.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is included to ensure permitting by USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW prior to any disturbance of this area, and to provide compensatory mitigation at a minimum 1:1 ratio for USACE/RWQCB and CDFW unvegetated streambed and a minimum 2:1 ratio for riparian vegetation, as

required by USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce impacts to state and federally protected wetlands to a less than significant level.

#### IMPACT BIO-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT 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.

**No Impact.** As described previously, the Project site contains two earthen ephemeral drainage features. Drainage 1 is 1,098 linear feet and contains approximately 0.08 acre of USACE jurisdictional of non-wetland waters and 0.14 acre of CDFW jurisdictional area that does not include riparian vegetation (JD 2019), as listed in Table 5.3-1. Drainage 2 is 1,894 linear feet and contains 0.71 acre of USACE non-wetland waters and 0.02 acre of CDFW riparian vegetation. No wetlands, however, were identified in the jurisdictional delineation (JD 2019) that was prepared for the Project, and the Project would not have any impacts to state or federally protected wetlands, including vernal pools or marsh areas.

#### IMPACT BIO-4: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT 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.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As described previously, the Project site lacks migratory wildlife corridors, as it does not contain the structural topography and vegetative cover that facilitate regional wildlife movement, is subject to a high level of ongoing human disturbance, and much of the Project study area is fenced or consists of active public roadways, which act as inhibitors to wildlife movement (BTR 2019). Therefore, impacts related to migratory wildlife corridors would not occur.

The Project site contains vegetation with the potential to support native nesting birds. Disturbing or destroying active nests is a violation of the MBTA (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.). In addition, nests and eggs are protected under Fish and Game Code Section 3503. As such, direct impacts to breeding birds (e.g., through nest removal) or indirect impacts (e.g., by noise causing abandonment of the nest) is considered a potentially significant impact. Therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 states that vegetation clearing should be conducted outside of the nesting season, which is generally identified as February 1 through September 15. If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to any disturbance of the site, and to implement buffer measures to protect active nests, if any are observed on site. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, impacts related to nesting birds would be reduced to a less than significant level.

#### IMPACT BIO-6: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN, NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN, OR OTHER APPROVED LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR STATE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. As described previously, the Project site is located within the Eastvale Area Plan of the Western Riverside County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), but outside of the MSHCP Criteria Area, the Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area, Mammal and Amphibian Survey Areas, as well as outside of Core and Linkage areas. The Project site is within the Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area and Burrowing Owl Survey Area for the MSHCP (BTR 2019).

**Riparian/Riverine Areas.** The Project site contains approximately 1.03 acres of MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, including 1.01 acres of unvegetated riverine areas, and 0.02 acre of riparian habitat, which are

shown on Figure 5.3-3. The Project would result in impacts to 0.69 acre of MSHCP riparian/riverine resources, of which 0.02 acre consists of riparian vegetation which are ephemeral features that that provide very limited to no habitat for plants or animals beyond that of the adjacent uplands. However, pursuant to Volume I, Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, projects must consider alternatives providing for 100% percent avoidance of riparian/riverine areas. If avoidance is infeasible, then the unavoidable impacts must be mitigated and a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP), which is included as Mitigation Measure BIO-4. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 and the approval of a DBESP, the Project would be consistent with Volume I, Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP (BTR 2019). Thus, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

**Narrow Endemic Plants.** Volume 1, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP requires that within identified Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Areas (NEPSSA), site-specific focused surveys for Narrow Endemic Plants Species are required for all public and private projects where appropriate soils and habitat are present.

A portion of the Project site easterly of Mountain Avenue is located within the MSHCP NEPSSA 7 which targets the following species: San Diego ambrosia (*Ambrosia pumila*), Brand's phacelia (*Phacelia stellaris*), and San Miguel savory (*Clinopodium chandleri*). The Project site does not contain suitable habitat for any special-status plant species, including the NEPSSA target species (BTR 2019). Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in impacts to NEPSSA and would be consistent with Volume 1, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP.

**Urban/Wildland Interface.** The MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The proposed Project is not located within proximity to any MSHCP Criteria Area and is also not in proximity to any MSHCP Conservation Area (BTR 2019). Therefore, impacts related to these areas would not occur and the proposed Project would be consistent with the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines contained in MSHCP Volume I, Section 6.1.4.

Additional MSHCP Survey Needs and Procedures. Volume 1, Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP states that in addition to the Narrow Endemic Plant Species addressed in Volume 1, Section 6.1.3, additional surveys may be needed for other certain plant and animal species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve full coverage for these species. Within areas of suitable habitat, focused surveys are required for additional plant species if a project site occurs within a designated Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area. In addition, focused surveys are also required (with suitable habitat) for seven animal species as identified by the corresponding Survey Area.

A portion of the Project site is located within the MSHCP burrowing owl survey area. As described previously, focused burrowing owl surveys were performed for the Project site and burrowing owls were not detected at the site and Mitigation Measure BIO-1 requires that pre-construction surveys occur no more than 30 days prior to construction to confirm the absence of owls. With the performance of pre-construction surveys, the Project would be consistent with Volume 1, Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP. Thus, impacts related to additional MSHCP survey needs and procedures would not occur.

Overall, with implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, impacts related to the MSHCP would be less than significant.

## 5.3.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative study area for biological resources includes the western Riverside County region, which contains many residential, industrial, and previously disturbed but undeveloped areas, such as the Project site. As previously described, the Project site provides limited potential for special-status plants, burrowing owl, migratory bird species, and jurisdictional resources. Cumulatively considerable impacts to these limited

biological resources would not occur from implementation of the proposed Project with implementation of the mitigation measures described above and listed below.

**Special-Status Wildlife Species:** Mitigation is included that would avoid direct impacts to Burrowing Owl and the Project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to any other special status species. Although SKR was not detected on the Project site, potential habitat for the SKR occurs within the Project site. Although there is a very low probability of the presence of SKR, compliance with the adopted SKR HCP would address potential impacts to this species. The SKR HCP requires all properties within the delineated SKR Fee Area to pay a habitat mitigation fee to address potential impacts to the SKR. Projects within the cumulative study area would also be required to pay this fee if within a delineated area and compliance with the SKR HCP avoids significant cumulative impacts. Thus, the proposed Project would mitigate the potential of the Project to cumulatively combine with other projects; and the Project would not contribute to the cumulative loss of any special status wildlife species. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to wildlife species would be less than cumulatively significant.

**Migratory and/or Nesting Birds:** Mitigation is included to avoid impacts to raptors and migratory bird species through compliance with the MBTA, which would avoid the potential of the Project to contribute to cumulative effects to nesting birds. As described above, the loss of potential foraging habitat for bird species is less than significant due to the limited resources in the area. Because the region consists of similar limited biological resources for bird species, the less than significant impacts from the Project are not anticipated to combine with other development projects to substantially affect these species to a point where their survival in the region is threatened. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to migratory and/or nesting birds would be less than cumulatively significant.

**Jurisdictional Drainages:** As described above, impacts to jurisdictional features would be less than significant with the required permitting from the regulatory agencies, including USACE, RWQCB and/or CDFW and compensation as required by mitigation. With the proposed mitigation and compliance with existing regulations that would be implemented by the permitting process, the Project would not contribute to a net loss of function and/or value of jurisdictional resources in the region. Thus, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts to jurisdictional drainages, and impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.

**MSHCP:** As described above, impacts related to the MSHCP would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation, which would ensure that existing MSHCP regulations are implemented for the proposed Project. With the proposed mitigation, the Project would not conflict with the adopted MSHCP, and would not contribute to a cumulative impact with respect to MSHCP implementation. Thus, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant contribution to cumulative impacts to the MSHCP, and impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.

# 5.3.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

#### Federal

- Federal Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act

#### State

- California's Endangered Species Act
- California Fish and Game Code
- SKR HCP
- MSHCP

## 5.3.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impact BIO-3 The Project has no impact on state or federally protected wetlands. Impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive plant communities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be potentially significant:

- Impact BIO-1 Impacts to special-status species
- Impact BIO-2 Impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive plant communities.
- Impact BIO-4 Impacts to wildlife movement.
- Impact BIO-6 Impacts to the MSHCP.

## 5.3.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Burrowing Owl

Project construction plans and specifications shall state that a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction presence/absence survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If the species is found, the Project proponent shall immediately inform the Wildlife Agencies (CDFW, USFWS) and the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA), and shall coordinate with these agencies to prepare and implement a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, prior to initiating ground disturbance. If the species is not found, no further action is needed.

#### Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Jurisdictional Areas

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for areas identified with jurisdictional features, the Project applicant shall obtain regulatory permits from the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. Through the permitting and subject to approval by the regulatory agencies, the applicant shall compensate for Project-specific impacts at a minimum 1:1 ratio for USACE/RWQCB and CDFW unvegetated streambed, and a minimum 2:1 ratio for riparian vegetation through the purchase of rehabilitation, reestablishment, and/or establishment mitigation credits at an approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program within the San Jacinto River and/or Santa Ana River Watershed.

#### Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Nesting Birds

Project construction plans and specifications shall state that as feasible, vegetation clearing should be conducted outside of the nesting season, which is generally identified as February 1 through September 15. If avoidance of the nesting season is not feasible, then a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within three days prior to any disturbance of the site, including disking, demolition activities, and grading. The survey shall include those areas proposed for disturbance within 45 days. If additional areas are proposed for disturbance, a new nesting bird survey that covers those areas shall be conducted. If active nests are identified, the biologist shall establish suitable buffers around the nests, and the buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests.

#### Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation

Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for areas identified as MSHCP riparian/riverine areas, the Project proponent shall obtain approval of a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) from the CDFW.

## 5.3.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The mitigation measures listed above, and existing regulations would reduce potential impacts associated with biological resources for Impacts BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-4 and BIO-6 to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to biological resources would occur.

### REFERENCES

Biological Technical Report for Palomino Business Park, Prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc, 2019 (BTR 2019).

Jurisdictional Delineation for Palomino Business Park, Prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc, 2019 (JD 2019).

## 5.4 Cultural Resources

## 5.4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the proposed Project related to cultural resources, which include historic and archaeological resources. Information within this section includes data from the Historical Resource Analysis Report prepared by Urbana Preservation and Planning (Urbana 2019) and the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by Material Culture Consulting (MCC 2019), which are provided as Appendices F and G.

#### Definitions

- Archaeological resources include any material remains of human life or activities that are at least 100 years of age, and that are of scientific interest. A unique or significant archaeological resource is an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it (1) contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information; (2) has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; and (3) is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.
- **Cultural resources** are defined as buildings, sites, structures, or objects, each of which may have historic, architectural, archaeological, cultural, or scientific importance, according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- **Historic building** or **site** is one that is noteworthy for its significance in local, state, or national history or culture, its architecture or design, or its works of art, memorabilia, or artifacts.
- **Historic context** refers to the broad patterns of historical development in a community or its region that is represented by cultural resources. A historic context statement is organized by themes such as economic, residential, and commercial development.
- Historic integrity is defined as "the ability of a property to convey its significance."
- Historical resources are defined as "a resource listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources" (CRHR) (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 15064.5). Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), the term "historical resources" includes the following:
  - (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1).
  - (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.
  - (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural,

engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1) including the following:

- (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in California's past;
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
- (4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

## 5.4.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) established the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), which is the official register of designated historic places. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service, and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historical, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must be significant under one or more of the following criteria per 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 60:

- a) Properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- b) Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- c) Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- d) Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.
In addition to meeting one or more of the aforementioned criteria, an eligible property must also possess historic "integrity," which is "the ability of a property to convey its significance." The National Register criteria recognize seven qualities that define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects over 50 years of age can be listed in the National Register as significant historical resources. Properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included in the National Register.

Properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP are also eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, and as such, are considered historical resources for CEQA purposes.

#### California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

These regulations relate to unexpected discoveries of human remains at development sites. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires excavation or disturbance in the vicinity of human remains to cease until the coroner has reviewed the remains. If the remains are determined to be likely of Native American origin, the coroner must contact the Native American Heritage Commission. Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 provides guidance on the appropriate handling of Native American remains.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The Land Use Element of the City of Norco General Plan includes the following policies related to historic or archaeological resources:

**Historical Building Preservation Policy:** The City will identify and preserve the unique historical buildings that significantly identify and establish the community's history and character.

- a. Sites of significant historical, archaeological, and cultural value shall be preserved and/or incorporated into proposed new development with mitigation measures established through the environmental review process.
- b. Vegetation including street trees and public landscaping that help contribute to the City's historical fabric and identity, should be preserved and incorporated into the landscaping plans for any new development that incorporate the particular site or is adjacent to it for public improvement purposes.
- c. Rehabilitation of historical structures should be done so that the integrity of structures is not jeopardized with inappropriate additions or alterations.
- d. No demolition of any historical structure shall occur until an assessment of the cost of rehabilitation of the existing structure has been submitted to the City.
- e. Land use designations and regulations around historical structures should be conducive to the historical use of the structure so that the land value for maintaining the structure, as is, is not jeopardized.
- f. Community design adjacent to historical structures shall not impede the integrity of the historical structure, either through inappropriate design, building mass, landscaping mass, setbacks, etc.

Archaeological Resources Policy: The City will identify and catalogue any archaeological resources and will take measures to preserve those resources that are considered unique and significant to the area's history.

- a. The City should collect, record, and/or mitigate archaeological resources to the level consistent with the related value of each item in terms of historical significance and importance.
- b. New development requiring discretionary approval from the Planning Commission shall be approved with a condition that requires any construction activity to stop upon discovery of archaeological resources until such time as a qualified archaeologist, retained by the property owner or developer, has investigated the site and made recommendations regarding the disposition of any items. Human remains shall not be moved until the Riverside County Coroner's Office has been notified.
- c. New development shall be coordinated with Native American tribes that have a historical presence and interest in the Norco region, or any other groups with historical interest.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

The City of Norco Cultural Resources Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 20), which provides criteria for (1) Landmark and (2) Point of Historical Interest. Municipal Code Section 20.15.010 states: An improvement, object, or natural feature may be designated a Landmark by the City Council upon recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission if it is determined eligible, retains integrity and meets one or more of the following criteria:

- a. Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history; or
- b. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, State, or national history; or
- c. Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftmanship; or
- d. Represents the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect; or
- e. Has a unique location or singular physical characteristics or is a view of vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood community or of the City; or
- f. Reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning; or
- g. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

A Point of Historical Interest (Chapter 20.20.010) is an improvement, object, or natural feature may be designated by the City Council upon the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Commission as a Point of Historical Interest if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- a. The resource qualifies for designation as a landmark; however, the property owner prefers designation as a point of historical interest.
- b. The resource is less than 50 years old, but otherwise qualifies for designation as a landmark
- c. The resource otherwise qualifies for designation as a landmark, but does not retain sufficient integrity (Ord. 910 Sec. 1, 2009)

The City of Norco Municipal Code Chapter 20.10.010 J defines in integrity as "the ability of a cultural resource to convey its significance. To have integrity a cultural resource must be largely intact or be readily restorable through the removal of non-original coverings, facades, additions, or minor reconstructions. Integrity includes historical location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Of these elements, historical location and setting are not essential if the other standards of integrity are or can be met."

## 5.4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Historic

**Background.** In the 1920s, egg farming was a home business model that people could base out of their own houses and yards. Land companies promoted the idea that even people with no farming experience could make a comfortable living on two acres and 1,000 hens with advertising lines like "Poultry Pays in Norco" and "A Norco 'Nest Egg." By 1926, hens in Riverside County were bringing in over \$2.6 million a year, with Norco housing twelve percent of all the hens in the County (Urbana 2019).

The United States Congress passed a bill in 1948, allowing the admittance of 205,000 displaced persons from Europe, with the requirement that 30 percent of these immigrants be agricultural workers to be able to find employment on American farms. The State of California received 14,000 displaced persons, including approximately 2,500 Jewish refugees between 1948 and 1950. Poultry farming was popular among Jewish immigrants because it did not require previous agricultural experience, could be conducted on small lots of land, provided regular income, and did not require advanced English skills (Urbana 2019). The Jewish Agricultural Society helped Jewish immigrants establish poultry farms by providing loans and trained the inexperienced farmers how to select and care for the chickens or turkeys. Harry and Hilda Eisen, who were Polish immigrants and Holocaust survivors, took advantage of this training and started a small egg farm in Arcadia.

There were several Jewish poultry farms in the Norco area. The largest and most successful was the Norco Egg Ranch that was founded on the Project site by Harry and Hilda Eisen. In 1955, Harry and Hilda Eisen bought 5 acres of land on Mountain Avenue, moved from Arcadia, and founded the Norco Egg Ranch with 5,000 hens. By 1961, the Ranch had expanded to 40 acres, and by 1965 to 80 acres. That same year the Eisens built a 65,000 square foot, largely automated, egg processing plant. The farm housed one million hens and processed 540,000 eggs per day. Photos of the Norco Egg Ranch are shown in Figure 5.4-1, Norco Egg Ranch.

Harry Eisen provided seed money to help incorporate the city of Norco in 1964 and was honored for his contributions to the city in 1985. In the early 1980s, the farm had grown to one of the ten largest in the nation, and by the 1990s, was the largest employer in Norco. In 2000, the Eisens sold Norco Ranch Inc. to Moark, LLC (a subsidiary of Land O' Lakes), which moved the operation to Fontana. Between 2005 and 2011, Moark removed all of the chicken houses, although the Eisens kept the land and remaining buildings. Harry Eisen passed away in 2012.

**Project Site.** The project site includes 67 parcels. Of these, 35 include historic-era (at least 45 years of age) improvements that include:

- 28 industrial parcels dating to 1915-1972,
- Three agricultural parcels dating to 1925, 1947, and 1953,

- Three residential parcels dating to 1915 and 1958, and
- One commercial parcel dating to 1955.

Of these parcels that include historic-era improvements, the Norco Egg Ranch property meets the definition of a historical resource and remains locally eligible for designation under the Norco Municipal Code Title 20 and under the criteria of the CRHR.

The Norco Egg Ranch, located at 1658 Mountain Avenue, is comprised of four contributing buildings: the Eisen Residence, the Eisen Residence Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building ("Contributing Structures"). The period of significance for the property is 1956, when the ranch opened, through circa 1965, when the property was expanded, and a modern 65,000 square foot Egg Processing Building was opened at the north end of the ranch.

The residence is a very modest Ranch style dwelling. It has a concrete foundation and a moderatelypitched hipped roof with composition shingles. It has narrow eaves and the exterior walls are clad with stucco. The east-facing facade has a door with a metal security screen and a large ribbon window with diamond paned double-hung flanking a fixed window. Other fenestration consists of wood-framed double-hung and fixed windows and vinyl-framed casement windows (south elevation). The wood-framed detached garage has a low-pitched roof and is located south of the residence. The residence and garage are in good condition and retain a moderate degree of integrity.

In addition, 11 non-contributing structures are located within the boundaries of the Norco Egg Ranch; these non-contributing structures include circa 1980-2000 additions to the modern Egg Processing Building and 10 foundations that demarcate the location of chicken houses that have been removed from the site.

Although the Norco EGG Ranch property contains both the Contributing Structures and non-contributing elements, the property retains a sufficient degree of integrity to physically convey its identified significance under the CRHR Criterion 1 for an association with poultry farming in Norco and under the CRHR Criterion 2 for an association with Harry and Hilda Eisen, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors (Urbana 2019).

## Norco Egg Ranch



View northwest of original Egg Processing Facility



View northwest of south and east elevations of the dwelling unit



View to the west of the east elevation of the detatched garage



View to southwest of the north end of the Modern Egg Processing Facility

This page intentionally left blank.

#### Archaeologic

Most researchers agree that the earliest occupation for the western Riverside County area dates to the early Holocene (11,000 to 8,000 years ago). The material culture related to this time included scrapers, hammer stones, large flaked cores, drills, and choppers, which were used to process food and raw materials.

Around 8,000 years ago, subsistence patterns changed, resulting in a material complex consisting of an abundance of milling stones (for grinding food items) with a decrease in the number of chipped stone tools. The material culture from this time period includes large, bifacially worked dart points and grinding stones, handstones and metates. This Encinitas Tradition includes the Sayles or Pauma cultures that were located in inland San Diego County and western Riverside County, where the Project is located. At approximately 3,500 years ago, Pauma groups in the general vicinity of the Project area adopted new cultural traits which transformed the archaeological site characteristics - including mortar and pestle technology. This indicated the development of food storage, largely acorns, which could be processed and saved for the leaner, cooler months of the year.

At approximately 1,500 years ago, bow and arrow technology started to emerge, and the Palomar Tradition is attributed to this time. The Palomar Tradition is characterized by soapstone bowls, arrowhead projectile points, pottery vessels, rock paintings, and cremation sites. The shift in material culture

assemblages is largely attributed to the emergence of Shoshonean (Takic-speaking) people who entered California from the east.

There is a long history of human occupation in the Norco area. The Cultural Resources Assessment completed records searches and field surveys of the Project site, which identified 8 prehistoric resources within one mile of the Project area. The prehistoric sites consist of bedrock milling features with little to no associated artifacts (MCC 2019).

## 5.4.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- CUL-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to Threshold CUL-3. As described in the Initial Study and listed previously, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 regulate unexpected discoveries of human remains at development sites. Thus, no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

## 5.4.5 METHODOLOGY

The analysis within this EIR section is based on the Historical Resource Analysis Report (Urbana 2019) and a Cultural Resources Assessment (MCC 2019) of the entire Project site and contains information that was compiled through field reconnaissance, record searches, and reference materials. These studies are provided in Appendix F and G of this Draft EIR.

#### Field Surveys

**Cultural.** A cultural survey of the Project site was conducted on January 7, 2019. The survey consisted of walking in parallel transects spaced at a maximum of 15-meter intervals over the exposed soils of the entire Project area, while closely inspecting the ground surface. The area surveyed is consistent with the Project site boundaries and is shown in the Cultural Resources Assessment (MCC 2019), included as Appendix G of this Draft EIR.

All undeveloped ground surface areas within the ground disturbance portion of the Project area was examined for native soils, fossils, artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools or fire-affected rock), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., postholes, foundations), or historic-era debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Existing ground disturbances (e.g., cutbanks, ditches, animal burrows, etc.) were visually inspected.

**Historic.** Field survey activities were completed by an Urbana Architectural Historian. All buildings, structures, site features, and parcels within the Project area were photographed for study. Of the 67 developed properties within the Project site, 35 contain historic-era structures (at least 45 years of age) and 9 are contemporary-period (less than 45 years old), and 23 are vacant and undeveloped. The 35 properties with historic-era structures were documented and evaluated on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms. Of the 35 properties, 19 were previously evaluated and recorded.

Site-specific research was conducted on the subject properties by using data from the Riverside County Assessor, historic maps, city directories, newspaper articles, aerial photographs, and other published sources. The National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the City of Norco Municipal Code Chapter 20 criteria were employed to evaluate the significance of the properties.

#### **Record Searches**

Archaeological and Historic Records Search. An archaeological and historical records was completed by the Eastern Information Center at University of California, Riverside of the California Historical Resources Inventory System (CHRIS) on October 24, 2018. The records search included a 1-mile radius around the Project area, as well as the Project area itself. In addition, a variety of sources were consulted to obtain information regarding the cultural context of the Project area (National Register of Historic Places [1979-2002 and supplements], Historical USGS Topographic maps, Historical USDA aerial photos, CRHR, California Inventory of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, Local Historical Register Listings, and Bureau of Land Management General Land Office Records).

## 5.4.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

# IMPACT CUL-1: THE PROJECT WOULD CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A HISTORICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO SECTION 15064.5.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact.** The Historical Resource Analysis Report (Urbana 2019) provides a detailed historic assessment of all of the structures within the Project site and determined that the Norco Egg Ranch, located at 1658 Mountain Avenue, meets the definition of an historical resource and is locally

eligible for designation under Municipal Code Title 20 and under the criteria of the CRHR. The Norco Egg Ranch is comprised of four Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building.

The period of significance for the property related to the CRHR designation is 1956, when the ranch opened, through circa 1965, when the property was expanded, and a modern 65,000 square foot Egg Processing Building was opened at the north end of the ranch. Eleven non-contributing structures are sited within the boundaries of the ranch; these non-contributing structures include circa 1980-2000 additions to the modern Egg Processing Building and 10 foundations that demarcate the location of chicken houses that have been removed from the property. The Historical Resource Analysis Report states that the property appears to retain a sufficient degree of integrity to physically convey its identified significance under CRHR Criterion 1 for an association with poultry farming in Norco and under CRHR Criterion 2 for an association with Harry and Hilda Eisen, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors (Urbana 2019).

Under the City of Norco Landmark criteria A, the Contributing Structures are associated with poultry farming, which was an important aspect of the City's economic history since the 1920s. The Norco Egg Ranch grew from a small family farm to one of the biggest egg distribution businesses in the country. They contributed greatly to the local economy by relying heavily on local workers and remaining family owned and operated. For these reasons, the Norco Egg Ranch is an important part of the City's economic history. The remaining historic-period buildings are from the earliest period in the ranch's history and are utilitarian and non-descript with only a moderate level of integrity. In addition, their historic setting has been compromised by the removal of other historic-period buildings associated with the ranch. Because of this, they do not clearly convey their association with the Norco Egg Ranch. However, as one of the most successful, home-grown businesses in the history of Norco and one that embodies the 1920s vision for the community, the local importance of this business outweighs the lack of integrity between the Contributing Structures and the remaining historic-period buildings. Therefore, in addition to meeting CRHR Criterion 1 and 2, the Norco Egg Ranch is considered to be significant under the City's Landmark criterion A.

Under the City of Norco Landmark criterion B, the Contributing Structures are associated with the locally prominent Eisen family and their Norco Egg Ranch. Although the family only lived in the residence for approximately 10 years and the utility and nondescript remnants of the Norco Egg Ranch do not physically convey the story of the Eisens or their business, they are the last remaining historic-period buildings closely associated with both the Eisens, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors, and their successful Norco Egg Ranch, which was locally important.

Demolition or removal of the Norco Egg Ranch, specifically its Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence, the Eisen Residence Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, would result in a significant impact to an historical resource. Preservation of the Contributing Structures and the Norco Egg Ranch is not feasible for a number of reasons. First, the Norco Egg Ranch occupies a significant portion of the Project site and, with construction of the Project, the Norco Egg Ranch would be substantially surrounded by industrial and business park uses. Second, because egg production and farming uses have ceased in the area (and southern California generally), preservation in place would not ensure the continued existence of the Norco Egg Ranch through repurposing or reactivation. Third, as noted in Appendix F, the original egg plant building is in a state of deterioration and appears to retain low to moderate integrity.

As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation package for the Norco Egg Ranch. CUL-3 is included and requires the installation on-site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to Norco Egg Ranch would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

#### IMPACT CUL-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO SECTION 15064.5.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The Cultural Resources Assessment identified 8 prehistoric resources within one mile of the Project area. However, the prehistoric sites consist of bedrock milling features with little to no associated artifacts (MCC 2019). In addition, the Cultural Resources Assessment describes that the entire Project area has been heavily disturbed, as a result of previous agricultural and development activities. This includes ground disturbance to depths for installation of the existing utility infrastructure that serves the Project site. The modification and disturbance associated with the extensive development and agricultural activities within the Project area has eradicated any near-surface record of prehistoric, ethnohistoric, or historic-era behavioral activities that may have otherwise been preserved as archaeological sites, deposits or features (MCC 2019). Based on the results of the cultural resources records search and survey, the Project area is considered to have low sensitivity for presence of prehistoric or historical archaeological deposits and it is unlikely that crews will encounter significant cultural resources during project development (MCC 2019).

However, because of the long history of human occupation in the Norco area, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 has been included to mitigate the potential impacts of inadvertent discoveries of potential resources during construction activities. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires an archeologist to be retained to provide on-call services and that in the event that potential archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work must be halted within 50 feet of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource would be less than significant.

## 5.4.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As detailed below, cumulatively considerable impacts related to archaeological resources would not occur from implementation of the Project with implementation of mitigation measures. However, because the project would result in removal of historic resource, impacts related to historic resources would be cumulatively considerable.

**Historic Resources:** Because all historical resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. Federal, state, and local laws and regulations protect historic resources when feasible. However, it is not always feasible to protect historical resources. As described previously, the Project would result in demolition of a CRHR historical resource and a historic resource that meets the City of Norco Landmark criterion. Because the resources are state and local historic resources, the cumulative study area for historic resources includes the City of Norco and State of California.

As described previously, the project would demolish a historic resource. As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation package for the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. CUL-3 is included and requires the installation on-site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; and the loss of the historic resource would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to historic resources.

**Archaeologic Resources:** The cumulative study area for archaeological resources includes the southern California region, which contains the same general prehistoric uses and migration trends as the Project area. The Cultural Resources Assessment determined that modification and disturbance associated with the extensive development and agricultural activities within the Project area has eradicated any archaeological resources and the Project area is considered to have low sensitivity for presence of archaeological deposits (MCC 2019). However, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure CUL-2 to ensure that impacts would not occur in the case of an inadvertent discovery of a potential resource. The mitigation measure ensures that the Project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of archaeological resources; therefore, impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.

# 5.4.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

- National Historic Preservation Act
- Norco Municipal Code
- California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
- Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

## 5.4.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval, the following impact would be less than significant: Impact CUL-1

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

- Impact CUL-1: The proposed Project would impact historic resources.
- Impact CUL-2: The proposed Project could impact archaeological resources.

## 5.4.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

## Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historic American Buildings Survey Documentation

Prior to demolition of any structures, a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package shall be prepared for the Norco Egg Ranch Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. Large format photography shall be used for each building, with supplemental digital views of the buildings in the Field Records section of the package. Additionally, the contributing/character-defining landscape and hardscape features shall be accounted for in large format views.

#### Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Resources

Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the City of Norco Building and Safety Division, from a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for Archaeology as defined at 36 CFR Part 61, Appendix A stating that the archeologist has been retained to provide on-call services in the event archeological resources are discovered. The archeologist shall be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for archeological resource surveillance. In the event a previously unrecorded archaeological deposit is encountered during construction, all activity within 50 feet of the area of discovery shall cease and the City shall be immediately notified. The archeologist shall be contacted to flag the area in the field and determine if the archaeological deposits meet the CEQA definition of historical (State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a)) and/or unique archaeological resource (Public Resources Code 21083.2(g)). If the find is considered a "resource" the archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage and treatment of the deposits. A qualified archaeologist shall evaluate all archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities. If the resources are Native American in origin, a Native American Monitor shall be contacted to evaluate the resources and shall have the opportunity to consult with the City and/or project developer on appropriate treatment and curation of these resources. If unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the applicant's expense. Recovery, salvage and treatment protocols shall be developed in accordance with applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the archaeologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The archaeologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource. Excavation as a treatment option will be restricted to those parts of the unique archaeological resource that would be damaged or destroyed by the Project.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Interpretive Sign or Exhibit.** The project shall install on-site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family.

## 5.5.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

For Impact CUL-1, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a HABS documentation package for the historically significant buildings, as well as CUL-3, which requires an interpretive sign or exhibit. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

Mitigation Measures CULT-2 and existing regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts associated with archaeological resources for Impact CUL-2 to a level that is less than significant.

## REFERENCES

Urbana Preservation and Planning (Urbana 2019). Historical Resource Analysis Report

Material Culture Consulting. 2019 (MCC 2019). Cultural Resources Assessment

## 5.5 Energy

## 5.5.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR assesses the significance of the use of energy, including electricity, natural gas and gasoline, and diesel fuels, that would result from the proposed Project. It discusses existing energy use patterns and examines whether the proposed Project (including development and operation) would result in the consumption of large amounts of fuel or energy or use such resources in a wasteful manner.

Refer to Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, for a discussion of the relationship between energy consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and Section 5.15, Utilities and Service Systems, for a discussion of water consumption. The analysis within this section is based on the Energy Analysis Report, prepared by Urban Crossroads (UC 2019) and included as Appendix H.

## 5.5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

## Energy Independence and Security Act, Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency Standards

In response to Massachusetts et al. vs. Environmental Protection Agency et al., the Bush Administration issued an Executive Order on May 14, 2007, directing the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Department of Transportation (USDOT) to establish regulations that reduce GHG emissions from motor vehicles, non-road vehicles, and non-road engines by 2008. On December 19, 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 was signed into law, requiring an increased Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standard of 35 miles per gallon (mpg) for the combined fleet of cars and light trucks by the 2020 model year.

In addition to setting increased CAFE standards for motor vehicles, the Energy Independence and Security Act includes the following additional provisions:

- Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) (Section 202)
- Appliance and Lighting Efficiency Standards (Sections 301–325)
- Building Energy Efficiency (Sections 411–441)

Additional provisions of the Act address energy savings in government and public institutions, promoting research for alternative energy, additional research in carbon capture, international energy programs, and the creation of green jobs.

## **California Public Utilities Commission Plans and Programs**

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has authority to set electric rates, regulate natural gas utility service, protect consumers, promote energy efficiency, and ensure electric system reliability. The CPUC has established rules for the planning and construction of new transmission facilities, distribution facilities, and substations. Utility companies are required to obtain permits to construct certain power line facilities or substations. The CPUC also has jurisdiction over the siting of natural gas transmission lines.

The CPUC regulates distributed energy generation policies and programs for both customers and utilities. This includes incentive programs (e.g., California Solar Initiative) and net energy metering policies. Net energy metering allows customers to receive a financial credit for power generated by their on-site system and fed back to the utility. The CPUC is involved with utilities through a variety of energy procurement programs, including the Renewable Portfolio Standard program.

In 2008, the CPUC adopted the Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, which is a road map to achieving maximum energy savings in California through 2020. Consistent with California's energy policy and electricity "loading order," the Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan indicates that energy efficiency is the highest priority resource in meeting California's energy needs. The CPUC also adopted energy goals that require all new residential construction in California to be zero net energy by 2020. The zero net energy goal means new buildings must use a combination of improved efficiency and distributed renewable energy generation to meet 100 percent of their annual energy need. In addition to the zero net energy goals for residential buildings by 2020, the CPUC has adopted goals that all new commercial construction in California will be zero net energy by 2030, and 50 percent of existing commercial buildings will be retrofit to zero net energy by 2030.

#### **Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015**

The Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015 (SB 350) requires that the amount of electricity generated and sold to retail customers per year from eligible renewable energy resources be increased from 33 percent to 50 percent by December 31, 2030, thereby doubling energy efficiency within the state. SB 350 makes revisions to the California Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) Program and to certain other requirements on public utilities and publicly owned electric utilities. SB 350 also requires local publicly-owned electric utilities to establish annual targets for energy efficiency savings and demand reduction consistent with a statewide goal established by the CPUC, and provides incentives for electrification of rail facilities. Local utilities would be required to develop more detailed strategies and incentives for use of renewable energy sources, resulting in an increased demand for renewable energy generation.

SB 350 emphasizes the important role of electric vehicles in California's overall scheme to combat climate change, declaring that "[d]eploying electric vehicles should assist in grid management, integrating generation from eligible renewable energy resources, and reducing fuel costs for vehicle drivers." The bill promotes the development of additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure to encourage greater use of electric cars and requires electrical utilities to include expansion of electrical vehicle charging facilities as part of their strategies and incentives for reducing overall energy consumption.

#### Assembly Bill 1007 (Chapter 371, Statutes of 2005)

Assembly Bill 1007 required the California Energy Commission (CEC) to prepare a state plan (State Alternative Fuels Plan) to increase the use of alternative fuels in California. The Commission prepared the State Alternative Fuels Plan in partnership with the California Air Resources Board and in consultation with other state, federal, and local agencies. The final State Alternative Fuels Plan, published in December 2007, attempts to achieve an 80-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions associated with personal transportation, even as California's population increases. Measures proposed that would reduce petroleum fuel use include:

- 1. Lowering the energy needed for personal transportation by tripling the energy efficiency of onroad vehicles by 2050 through:
  - a. Conventional gas, diesel, and flexible fuel vehicles (FFVs) averaging more than 40 miles per gallon (mpg).
  - b. Hybrid gas, diesel, and FFVs averaging almost 60 mpg.
  - c. All electric and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) averaging well over 100 mpg (on a greenhouse gas equivalents [GGE] basis) on the electricity cycle.

- d. Fuel cell vehicles (FCVs) averaging over 80 mpg (on a GGE basis).
- 2. Moderating growth in per capita driving, reducing today's average per capita driving miles by about 5 percent or back to 1990 levels.
- 3. Changing the energy sources for transportation fuels from the current 96 percent petroleum-based to approximately:
  - a. 30 percent from gasoline and diesel from traditional petroleum sources or lower GHG emission fossil fuels such as natural gas.
  - b. 30 percent from transportation biofuels.
  - c. 40 percent from a mix of electricity and hydrogen.
- 4. Producing transportation biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen from renewable or very low carbonemitting technologies that result in, on average, at least 80 percent lower life cycle GHG emissions than conventional fuels.
- 5. Encouraging more efficient land uses and greater use of mass transit, public transportation, and other means of moving goods and people.

## California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(3)

No vehicle or engines subject to this regulation may idle for more than 5 consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to:

- idling when queuing,
- idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operating condition,
- idling for testing, servicing, repairing or diagnostic purposes,
- idling necessary to accomplish work for which the vehicle was designed (such as operating a crane),
- idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature, and
- idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

#### CCR Title 24, Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

The CCR Title 24 Part 6 provides efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings. The standards are updated periodically to allow for incorporation of new energy efficient technologies and methods. The existing Title 24 regulations became effective on January 1, 2017. The 2019 Title 24 standards go into effect on January 1, 2020 and are applicable to building permit applications submitted on or after that date. The 2019 Title 24 standards require solar photovoltaic systems for new homes, establish requirements for newly constructed healthcare facilities, encourage demand responsive technologies for residential buildings, update indoor and outdoor lighting for nonresidential buildings.

The CEC anticipates that single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 7 percent less energy compared to the residential homes built under the 2016 standards. Additionally, after implementation of solar photovoltaic systems, homes built under the 2019 standards will about 53 percent less energy than homes built under the 2016 standards. Nonresidential buildings will use approximately 30 percent less energy due to lighting upgrades.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following goal and policies contained in the Conservation Element are relevant to the proposed Project.

Goal 2.5: Use of Energy Resources Goal – Encourage the Efficient Use of Energy Resources.

#### Policy 2.5.1: Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Policy

**Policy 2.5.1a.** Encourage new construction and project design that uses, or takes advantage of renewable energy resources, including but not limited to solar energy design.

**Policy 2.5.1b.** Provide updated energy information documents for builders as needed to reflect the most recent Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and standards and other applicable new laws, requirements, and feasible building standards as may be available.

**Policy 2.5.2f.** Support alternative modes of transportation as feasible including the equestrian trail system, public transportation, bicycles, etc. to reduce the demand on non-renewable energy resources.

## 5.5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

## Electricity

The Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is the electrical purveyor in the City of Norco. SCE provides electricity service to more than 14 million people in a 50,000 square-mile area of central, coastal and Southern California. SCE is in the process of implementing infrastructure upgrades to ensure the ability to meet future demands. In the Project region, SCE is currently implementing the following infrastructure projects:

- Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Sub-transmission Project that will serve the Cities
  of Norco, Ontario, Corona, Chino, and Eastvale. The project would construct a 66 kV subtransmission line approximately 10.7 miles in length. A combination of both overhead and
  underground construction, it would be constructed from the existing Mira Loma Substation in
  Ontario to an existing substation in Corona (SCE 2019).
- Riverside Transmission Reliability Project that will provide additional transmission capacity to serve existing and projected electrical demand, to provide for long-term system capacity for load growth, and to provide needed system reliability (SCE 2019).

## **Natural Gas**

The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the natural gas purveyor in the City of Norco and is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California. SoCalGas estimates that gas demand will decline at an annual rate of 0.5 percent from 2018 to 2035 due to modest economic growth, mandated energy efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity goals, and conservation savings linked to advanced metering infrastructure (CGEU 2018). The gas supply available to SoCalGas is regionally diverse and includes supplies from California sources (onshore and offshore), Southwestern U.S. supply sources, the Rocky Mountains, and Canada (CGEU 2018). SoCalGas designs its facilities and supplies to provide continuous service during extreme peak demands and has identified the ability to meet peak demands through 2035 in its 2018 report (CGEU 2018).

## 5.5.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a significant adverse effect on energy if it would:

- E-1 Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- E-2 Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

## 5.5.5 METHODOLOGY

A number of factors are considered when weighing whether a project would use a proportionately large amount of energy or whether the use of energy would be wasteful in comparison to other projects. Factors such as the use of on-site renewable energy features, energy conservation features or programs, and relative use of transit are considered.

According to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, conserving energy is defined as decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Neither Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines nor Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3)<sup>1</sup> offer a numerical threshold of significance that might be used to evaluate the potential significance of energy consumption of a project; rather, the emphasis as set out in Section 21100(b)(3) is on reducing "the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy."

Construction activities would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy if construction equipment is old or not well maintained, if equipment is left to idle when not in use, if travel routes are not planned to minimize vehicle miles traveled, or if excess lighting or water is used during construction activities. Energy usage during project operation would be considered "wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary" if the project were to violate federal, state, and/or local energy standards, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, inhibit pedestrian or bicycle mobility, inhibit access to transit, or inhibit feasible opportunities to use alternative energy sources, such as solar energy, or otherwise inhibit the conservation of energy.

## 5.5.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT E-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DUE TO WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY RESOURCES, DURING PROJECT CONSTRUCTION OR OPERATION.

## Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

During construction of the proposed Project would consume energy in three general forms:

- 1. Petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Project sites, construction worker travel to and from the Project site, as well as delivery truck trips;
- 2. Electricity associated with providing temporary power for lighting and electric equipment; and
- 3. Energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass.

Construction activities related to the proposed business park buildings and the associated infrastructure is not expected to result in demand for fuel greater on a per-unit-of-development basis than other development projects in Southern California. Demolition of existing residential structures and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) describes that mitigation is required to minimize effects on the environment related to "wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy", but does not identify analysis methodology or a numeric threshold.

warehouse distribution facility structures that exists onsite would occur; however, because the existing onsite development is limited and much of the demolition materials can be recycled, the demolition needed to implement the proposed Project is not considered to be wasteful. Also, CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. In addition, the extent of construction activities that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project is limited. Construction would occur over a 24-month period, and the demand for construction-related electricity and fuels would be limited to that time frame. The Energy Analysis Report (included as Appendix H) details that the total Project construction electricity usage over the 24-month construction period would be approximately 626,547 kWh, which is summarized in Table 5.5-1.

Land Use	Proposed Building Square Footage (1,000 SF)	Electricity Usage (kWh)
High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	602.130	538,820
Industrial Park	1,426.460	83,508
Shopping Center	6.520	197
Fast-Food without Drive-Thru	6.520	133
Gas Station with Market	4.095	63
Fast-Food with Drive-Thru	4.275	3,826
Total Construction Electricity Usage (I	626,547	

Table 5.5-1: Estimat	ed Construction	<b>Electricity Usage</b>
----------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Also, as shown in Table 5.5-2, construction of the proposed Project is estimated to result in the need for 170,472 gallons of diesel fuel.

							Total Fuel
		HP		Usage	Load	HP-	Consumption
Activity/Duration	Equipment	Rating	Quantity	Hours	Factor	hrs/day	(gal. diesel fuel)
	Concrete/Industrial Saws	81	1	8	0.73	473	1,023
	Crushing/Processing						
	Equipment	85	1	8	0.78	530	1,147
Demolition	Excavators	158	2	8	0.38	961	2,077
(40 days)	Rubber Tired Dozers	247	2	8	0.40	1,581	3,418
Site Preparation	Crawler Tractors	212	4	8	0.43	2,917	12,615
(80 days)	Rubber Tired Dozers	247	3	8	0.40	2,371	10,254
· · · ·	Excavators	158	2	8	0.38	961	4,154
	Graders	187	4	8	0.41	2,453	10,609
	Rubber Tired Dozers	247	4	8	0.40	3,162	13,672
	Scrapers	367	4	8	0.48	5,637	24,377
Grading	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	97	2	8	0.37	574	2,483
(80 days)	Water Trucks	402	2	8	0.38	2,444	10,569
	Cranes	231	2	8	0.29	1,072	17,381
	Forklifts	89	3	8	0.20	427	6,928
Building	Generator Sets	84	2	8	0.74	995	16,128
Construction	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	97	3	8	0.37	861	13,968
(300 days)	Welders	46	2	8	0.45	331	5,371
	Pavers	130	2	8	0.42	874	1,889
Paving	Paving Equipment	132	2	8	0.36	760	1,644
(40 days)	Rollers	80	2	8	0.38	486	1,052
Architectural							
Coating							
(200 days)	Air Compressors	78	3	8	0.48	899	9,714
Construction Fuel Demand (Gallons Diesel Fuel)					170,472		

Table 5.5-2: Estimated Construction Fuel Consumption

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Table 5.5-3 shows that construction workers would use approximately 318,657 gallons of fuel to travel to and from the Project site. Tables 5.5-4 and 5.5-5 show that approximately 83,048 gallons of fuel would be used by medium high duty trucks, and 140,335 gallons of fuel would be used for hauling by heavy high duty trucks during construction of the proposed Project.

Construction Activity	Worker Trips / Day	Trip Length (miles)	Vehicle Miles Traveled	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Demolition					
(40 days)	15	14.7	8,820	32.53	271
Site Preparation					
(80 days)	18	14.7	21,168	32.53	651
Grading					
(80 days)	45	14.7	52,920	32.53	1,627
Building					
Construction					
(300 days)	2056	14.7	9,066,960	32.53	278,696
Paving					
(40 days)	15	14.7	8,820	32.53	271
Architectural					
Coating					
(200 days)	411	14.7	1,208,340	32.53	37,141
Total Construction Worker Fuel Consumption					318,657

Table 5.5-3: Estimated Construction Worker Fuel Consumption

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Table 5.5-4: Estimated Construction Vendor Fuel Consumption (Medium High Duty Trucks)

Activity/Duration	Vendor Trips / Day	Trip Length (miles)	Vehicle Miles Traveled	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Building Construction (300 days)	401.5	6.9	831,105	10.01	83,048

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Table 5.5-5: Estimated Construction Hauling Fuel Consumption (Heavy High Duty Trucks)

Construction Activity	Vendor/ Hauling Trips/ Day	Trip Length (miles)	Vehicle Miles Traveled	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Demolition (40 days)	1,365	20	27,300	7.10	3,845
Grading (80 days)	6,895	20	137,900	7.10	19,424
Total Construction	Total Construction Hauling Fuel Consumption				

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Construction contractors are required to demonstrate compliance with applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations governing the accelerated retrofitting, repowering, or replacement of heavyduty diesel on- and off-road equipment. In addition, compliance with existing CARB idling restrictions and the use of newer engines and equipment would reduce fuel combustion and energy consumption.

Overall, construction activities would require limited energy consumption, would comply with all existing regulations, and would therefore not be expected to use large amounts of energy or fuel in a wasteful manner. Thus, impacts related to construction energy usage would be less than significant.

## Operation

Once operational, the business park uses would generate demand for electricity, natural gas, as well as gasoline for motor vehicle trips. Operational use of energy includes the heating, cooling, and lighting of buildings, water heating, operation of electrical systems and plug-in appliances within buildings, parking lot and outdoor lighting, and the transport of electricity, natural gas, and water to the areas where they would be consumed. This use of energy is typical for urban development, and no operational activities or land uses would occur that would result in extraordinary energy consumption.

As detailed in Table 5.5-6, operation of the proposed Project is estimated to result in the annual use of 3,282,857 gallons of fuel. CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes. However, the air quality Mitigation Measure AQ-4 (detailed in Section 5.2, Air Quality) restrict idling to no more than 3 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged. The idling restrictions would preclude unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of trucks.

	Annual Miles	Average Vehicle Fuel	Estimated Annual Fuel			
Vehicle Type	Traveled	Economy (mpg)	Consumption (gallons)			
Business Park Uses Except Commercial						
Light Duty Autos	16,098,481	32.53	494,827			
Light Duty Trucks 1	1,095,845	27.20	40,289			
Light Duty Trucks 2	5,505,315	25.68	214,382			
Medium Duty Trucks	3,391,900	20.59	164,772			
Light Heavy Duty Trucks	4,507,049	14.27	315,797			
Medium Heavy Duty Trucks	3,068,553	10.01	306,626			
Heavy Heavy Duty Trucks	10,898,738	7.10	1,535,143			
Commercial Uses						
All Vehicle Types	6,865,240	32.53	211,020			
Total (All Vehicles)	51,431,121		3,282,857			

Table 5.5-6: Estimated Annual Operational Automobile Fuel Consumption

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

1 Vehicles under the LDT1 category have a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of less than 6,000 lbs. and equivalent test weight (ETW) of less than or equal to 3,750 lbs.

2 Vehicles under the LDT2 category have a GVWR of less than 6,000 lbs. and ETW between 3,751 lbs. and 5,750 lbs.

In addition, Table 5.5-7 details that operation of the proposed Project would use approximately 65,652,055.30 thousand British thermal units (kBTU) per year of natural gas, and approximately 55,305,634.40 kilowatt-hour (kWh) per year of electricity for operation. These estimates include the use of refrigerated warehouse space.

Natural Gas Demand	kBTU/year
High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	31,166,200.00
Industrial Park	31,510,500.00
Shopping Center	14,474.40
Fast-Food without Drive-Thru	1,782,830.00
Gas Station with Market	9,090.90
Fast-Food with Drive-Thru	1,168,960.00
Total Natural Gas Demand	65,652,055.30
Electricity Demand	kWh/year
High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	24,055,100.00
Industrial Park	30,312,300.00
Shopping Center	82,347.60
Fast-Food without Drive-Thru	309,570.00
Gas Station with Market	51,719.80
Fast-Food with Drive-Thru	202,977.00
Other Asphalt Surfaces	0.00
Parking Lot	291,620.00
Total Electricity Demand	55,305,634.40

Table 5.5-7: Estimated Annual Natural Gas and Electricity Consumption

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

The proposed Project would be required to meet the Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect during permitting of the Project. The City's administration of the Title 24 requirements includes review of design components and energy conservation measures that occurs during the permitting process, which ensures that all requirements are met. Typical Title 24 measures include insulation; use of energy-efficient heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment (HVAC); solar-reflective roofing materials; energy-efficient indoor and outdoor lighting systems; reclamation of heat rejection from refrigeration equipment to generate hot water; and incorporation of skylights, etc. In complying with the Title 24 standards, impacts to peak energy usage periods would be minimized, and impacts on statewide and regional energy needs would be reduced.

The proposed Project is within an area where existing infrastructure would provide for efficient delivery of electricity and natural gas to the Project area. The Project would also provide onsite sidewalks that are intended to reduce the onsite vehicle miles travelled, that would in-turn reduce vehicular related energy use. Additionally, as described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would implement the following project design features that promote energy efficiency and sustainability:

- Install drought-tolerant plants for landscaping.
- Install water-efficient irrigation systems, such as weather-based and soil-moisture-based irrigation controllers and sensors, for landscaping according to the California Department of Water Resources Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
- Buildings will be designed to provide CALGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) features for potential certification and will employ energy and water conservation measures in accordance with such standards. This includes design considerations related to the building envelope; heating, ventilating, and air conditioning; lighting; and power systems.
- Surface parking lots will be well-landscaped to reduce heat island effect. Parking lot landscaping will be planted with 15-gallon trees, at a rate of one per every four parking stalls. The trees may be clustered, but a minimum of one cluster will be provided for each 100 feet of parking row. Trees will be selected and placed to provide canopy and shade for the parking lots.

- The Project shall implement a recycling program in order to meet a 50 percent minimum waste diversion goal.
- Choose construction materials and interior finish products with zero or low emissions to improve indoor air quality.
- Provide adequate ventilation and high-efficiency in-duct filtration system.
- Use low or moderate water use plants, including native plant materials where appropriate; minimize turf areas.
- Use low volatile organic compound paints and wall coverings.
- Electrical outlets will be provided in loading dock areas to provide power for trucks.
- All outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) would be powered by non-diesel fueled engines and all indoor forklifts would be powered by electricity.

In addition, other existing and future regulations are likely to result in more efficient use of all types of energy, and reduction in reliance on non-renewable sources of energy within the Project area over the implementation period of the Project. These include the federal Energy Independence and Security Act, the state Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, SB 350 and AB 1007 (all described above), which are designed to reduce reliance on non-renewable energy resources and reduce demand by providing federal tax credits for purchasing fuel-efficient items, and providing goals for developing energy efficient buildings, and improving the renewable fuel, appliance, and lighting standards. Thus, operation of the proposed Project would not use large amounts of energy or fuel in a wasteful manner within buildings or other onsite operations, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT E-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT A STATE OR LOCAL PLAN FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

**No Impact.** As described previously, the proposed Project would be required to meet the CCR Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect during permitting of the Project. The City's administration of the CCR Title 24 requirements includes review of design components and energy conservation measures that occurs during the permitting process, which ensures that all requirements are met. In addition, as described in Section 5.2 *Air Quality*, the Project plans and specifications shall require signs at loading dock facilities that identify the anti-idling regulations. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the idling limits imposed by CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling. Furthermore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct opportunities to use renewable energy, such as solar energy. The proposed buildings would be solar ready. Although, the Project's future tenants are not currently known, and the use of solar panels is generally tailored to the electrical demands of the tenant, the building tenants would be able to install solar panels. Thus, the Project would not obstruct use of renewable energy or energy efficiency. Overall, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

## 5.5.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The geographic context for analysis of cumulative impacts regarding energy includes past, present, and future development within Southern California because energy supplies (including electricity, natural gas, and petroleum) are generated and distributed throughout the Southern California region.

All development projects throughout the region would be required to comply with the energy efficiency standards in the CCR Title 24 requirements. Additionally, some of the developments could provide for additional reductions in energy consumption by use of solar panels, sky lights, or other LEED type energy efficiency infrastructure. With implementation of the existing energy conservation regulations, cumulative electricity and natural gas consumption would not be cumulatively wasteful.

Petroleum consumption associated with the proposed warehouse/distribution, commercial, and office uses would be primarily attributable to transportation, especially vehicular use. However, state fuel efficiency standards and alternative fuels policies (per AB 1007) would contribute to a reduction in fuel use, and the federal Energy Independence and Security Act and the state Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan would reduce reliance on non-renewable energy resources. For these reasons, the consumption of petroleum would not occur in a wasteful manner and would be less than cumulatively considerable. Overall, impacts from cumulative projects associated with energy would be less than significant.

# 5.5.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

- California Green Building Standards Code
- CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits

## 5.5.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

As a result of compliance with existing regulatory requirements Impact E-1 and E-2 would be less than significant.

## 5.5.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

## 5.5.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to energy have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

## REFERENCES

Southern California Edison. Infrastructure Upgrades. (SCE 2019). Accessed at: <a href="http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability">http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability</a>.

California Gas and Electric Utilities 2018 California Gas Report (CGEU 2018). Accessed at: https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2018 California Gas Report.pdf. This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.6 Geology and Soils

## 5.6.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the proposed Project related to geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontological resources. The impacts examined include risks related to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, liquefaction, expansive soils; impacts on the environment related to soil erosion and sedimentation; and impacts related to paleontological resources. Information within this section includes data from the Geotechnical Investigation that was prepared by Southern California Geotechnical (GEO 2019), which is included as Appendix I; and the Paleontological Resources Assessment prepared by Material Culture Consulting (MCC 2019), which is provided as Appendix J.

## 5.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING

## Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act

The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act was enacted in 1997 to "reduce the risks to life and property from future earthquakes in the United States through the establishment and maintenance of an effective earthquake hazards and reduction program." To accomplish this, the Act established the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program that provides characterization, and prediction of hazards and vulnerabilities; improvement of building codes and land use practices; risk reduction through post-earthquake investigations and education; development and improvement of design and construction techniques; improvement of mitigation capacity; and accelerated application of research results. This Act designated the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as the lead agency of the program and assigns it several planning, coordinating, and reporting responsibilities. Programs under this Act provide building code requirements such as emergency evacuation responsibilities and seismic code standards such as those to which development under the proposed Project would be required to adhere.

## Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface fault rupture to structures used for human occupancy. The main purpose of the Act is to prevent the construction of buildings for human occupancy on top of the traces of active faults. It was passed into law following the February 1971 magnitude 6.5 San Fernando (Sylmar) Earthquake that resulted in over 500 million dollars in property damage and 65 deaths. Although the Act addresses the hazards associated with surface fault rupture, it does not address other earthquake-related hazards, such as seismically induced groundshaking, liquefaction, or landslides.

This Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones, now referred to as Earthquake Fault Zones, around the mapped surface traces of active faults, and to publish appropriate maps that depict these zones. Earthquake Fault Zone maps are publicly available and distributed to all affected cities, counties, and state agencies for their use in planning and controlling new or renewed construction. The Act requires local agencies to regulate development within Earthquake Fault Zones. Before a development project can be permitted within an Earthquake Fault Zone, a geologic investigation is required to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults. A site-specific evaluation and written report must be prepared by a licensed geologist. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the fault.

#### Seismic Hazards Mapping Act

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, which was passed by the California legislature in 1990, addresses earthquake hazards related to liquefaction and seismically induced landslides. Under the Act, seismic hazard zones are mapped by the State Geologist in order to assist local governments in land use planning. The Act states "it is necessary to identify and map seismic hazard zones in order for cities and counties to adequately prepare the safety element of their general plans and to encourage land use management policies and regulations to reduce and mitigate those hazards to protect public health and safety." Section 2697(a) of the Act states that "cities and counties shall require, prior to the approval of a project located in a seismic hazard zone, a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard."

## **California Building Code**

The California Building Code (CBC) is included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The CBC incorporates the International Building Code, a model building code adopted across the United States. Current State law requires every city, county, and other local public agency enforcing building regulations to adopt the provisions of the CBC within 180 days of its publication. The publication date of the CBC is established by the California Building Standards Commission. The current CBC was adopted by the City and is included in Title 8 of the City's Municipal Code. These codes provide standards to protect property and public safety. They regulate the design and construction of excavations, foundations, building frames, retaining walls, and other building elements, and thereby mitigate the effects of seismic shaking and adverse soil conditions. The codes also regulate grading activities, including drainage and erosion control.

#### **California Construction General Permit**

The State of California adopted a Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for General Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) on September 2, 2009 (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The last Construction General Permit amendment became effective on July 17, 2012. The Construction General Permit regulates construction site storm water management. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the general permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activity.

To obtain coverage under this permit, project operators must electronically file Permit Registration Documents, which include a Notice of Intent, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance-related documents, including a risk-level assessment for construction sites, an active storm water effluent monitoring and reporting program during construction, rain event action plans, and numeric action levels (NALs) for pH and turbidity, as well as requirements for qualified professionals to prepare and implement the plan. The Construction General Permit requires the SWPPP to identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented to reduce soil erosion. Types of BMPs include preservation of vegetation and sediment control (e.g., fiber rolls).

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policies contained in the Safety Element are relevant to the proposed project:

**Policy 2.2.1a:** Continue to require all new development to conform to the currently adopted Uniform Building Code and seismic safety regulations.

**Policy 2.2.1b:** Maintain a program to systematically mitigate existing seismic-related structural hazards (i.e. mitigation program for unreinforced masonry buildings).

**Policy 2.2.1c:** Give special consideration to hazardous structures deemed to be of historical value when determining whether alteration or destruction of these facilities is necessary in mitigating the identified geologic hazards.

**Policy 2.2.1d:** Require site-specific geologic engineering studies in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act as part of the development review process, especially in areas of high potential for liquefaction as presented in Exhibit 1 (Seismic Hazards Map).

## City of Norco Municipal Code

**Municipal Code Section 15.02.010.** Incorporates the California Building Code; these regulations reference applicable standards and documentation requirements found in the California Building Code that address seismic safety.

**Municipal Chapter 15.70.** Incorporates the requirements of the Riverside County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit [Order No. R8-2010-0033] issued by the RWQCB pursuant to Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act.

## 5.6.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### **Regional Setting**

The site is within the Corona North quadrangle, which is at the northern end of the Peninsular Ranges Province, located almost completely in the Perris Block, with the southwestern tip located in the Chino fault zone. The Perris Block is a structurally stable, internally cohesive mass of crustal rocks bounded on the east by the San Jacinto fault zone, bounded on the west by the Elsinore and Chino fault zones, on the north by the Cucamonga fault zone, and on the south by a series of sedimentary basins. The Project area is mapped as within an area of Quaternary alluvium Pliocene to Holocene aged alluvial deposits that typically consists of gravel, sand, and silt. (GEO 2019).

#### Faults and Groundshaking

In 1972, the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act was signed into law. In 1994, it was renamed the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (A-P Act). The primary purpose of the A-P Act is to mitigate the hazard of fault rupture by prohibiting the location of structures for human occupancy across the trace of an active fault. The A-P Act requires the State Geologist (Chief of the California Geology Survey) to delineate "Earthquake Fault Zones" along with faults that are "sufficiently active" and "well-defined." The boundary of an "Earthquake Fault Zone" is generally about 500 feet from major active faults and 200 to 300 feet from well-defined minor faults. The A-P Act dictates that cities and counties withhold development permits for sites within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone until geologic investigations demonstrate that the site zones are not threatened by surface displacements from future faulting.

There are no active faults known to occur within or adjacent to the Project area (GEO 2019). However, all of southern California is seismically active. The amount of motion expected at a building site can vary from none to forceful depending upon the distance to the fault, the magnitude of the earthquake, and the local geology. Greater movement can be expected at sites located on poorly consolidated material such as alluvium located near the source of the earthquake epicenter or in response to an earthquake of great

magnitude. The closest active fault is the Chino/Elsinore fault, which is located 3 miles from the Project site. The proximity of the site to the active fault would result in ground shaking during moderate to severe seismic events along the Chino/Elsinore fault.

#### Soils

The Geotechnical Investigation identified artificial fill soils extending to a depth of 2.5 feet below the existing grade. Alluvial soils underly the artificial fill to the maximum depth explored of 50 feet below the existing grade. The alluvial soils generally consist of loose to medium dense silty sand, clayey sands, and fine sandy silts. However, several areas of medium stiff to stiff clayey silts and silty clays are present. At depths greater than 12 feet, the soils consist of medium dense to very dense fine to medium sands and fine to coarse sands with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel. At these depths, several strata of stiff to very stiff clayey silts, silty clays, and sandy clays were also encountered (GEO 2019).

#### Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, Settlement, and Subsidence

Liquefaction occurs when vibrations or water pressure within a mass of soil cause the soil particles to lose contact with one another. As a result, the soil behaves like a liquid, has an inability to support weight, and can flow down very gentle slopes. This condition is usually temporary and is most often caused by an earthquake vibrating water-saturated fill or unconsolidated soil. Soils that are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, and uniformly graded fine-grained sands that lie below the groundwater table within approximately 50 feet below ground surface. Clayey (cohesive) soils or soils which possess clay particles in excess of 20 percent are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction, nor are those soils which are above the historic static groundwater table. Lateral spreading refers to spreading of soils in a rapid fluid-like flow movement similar to water.

The Geotechnical Investigation identifies that the Project site is located within an area mapped as having a medium to high liquefaction susceptibility. In addition, the depth of groundwater is in the range of 21 to 34 feet below ground surface (bgs) (GEO 2019). Thus, the site has the potential for liquefaction and the Geotechnical Investigation included a site-specific liquefaction analysis, which identified specific locations with potentially liquefiable soil conditions on the site.

The elevation of the site ranges from approximately 600 feet above mean sea level in the northeast corner of the site to approximately 582 feet above mean sea level in the south area of the site adjacent to 1st Street. The site slopes down to the south at less than a one percent gradient. There is approximately 18 feet of elevation differential across the subject site (GEO 2019). Due to the limited elevation change on the site, there is limited potential of lateral spreading to occur onsite during a liquefaction event (GEO 2019).

Settlement analyses were then conducted for each of the potentially liquefiable locations. The analysis identified that seismic and liquefaction inducted settlement onsite to be less than 1.25 inches over a distance of 100 feet, indicating a maximum angular distortion of less than  $0.002\pm$  inches per inch (GEO 2019).

Ground subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of the ground surface with little or no horizontal movement, and occur in areas with subterranean oil, gas, or groundwater. Effects of subsidence include fissures, sinkholes, depressions, and disruption of surface drainage. As detailed previously, the depth of groundwater is in the range of 21 to 34 feet bgs and the Geotechnical Investigation describes that minor ground subsidence of 1.2 inches has the potential to occur on the site (GEO 2019).

#### **Expansive Soils**

Expansive soils are soils containing water-absorbing minerals that expand as they take in water. These soils can damage buildings due to the force they exert as they expand. Expansive soils contain certain types of clay minerals that shrink or swell as the moisture content changes; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Arid or semiarid areas with seasonal changes of soil moisture experience a much higher frequency of problems from expansive soils than areas with higher rainfall and more constant soil moisture. The Project is in a semiarid region with marked seasonal changes in precipitation: most rain falls in winter, and there is a long dry season in summer and autumn. Therefore, the City's climate is such that a relatively high incidence of soil expansion is expected where soils contain the requisite clay minerals.

The soils within the Project site consist of variable materials ranging from sands and silty sands to clayey silts and silty clays. The Geotechnical Investigation conducted expansion index testing, which indicated that the soils possess very low to medium expansion potentials (GEO 2019).

#### Paleontological Resources

Paleontological resources include any fossilized remains, traces, or imprints of organisms, preserved in or on the earth's crust, that are of paleontological interest and that provide information about the history of life on earth, except that the term does not include any materials associated with an archaeological resource or any cultural item defined as Native American human remains. Significant paleontological resources are defined as fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, or important to define a particular time frame or geologic strata, or that add to an existing body of knowledge in specific areas, in local formations, or regionally.

The Riverside County General Plan and the Riverside County Land Information System identifies that the Project area has a "High A" potential for paleontological resources. These units include, but are not limited to, sedimentary formations which contain significant non-renewable paleontological resources and sedimentary rock units that have the potential for the preservation of fossils. High sensitivity includes not only the potential for yielding abundant vertebrate fossils, but also for production of a few significant fossils that may provide new and significant (taxonomic, phylogenetic, ecologic, and/or stratigraphic) data.

The paleontological records search conducted for the Project identified that the Project site is underlain by Pleistocene-aged alluvial deposits and that there are nearby resources in sedimentary deposits similar to those within the Project site. The closest vertebrate fossil was located south of the Project site, west of Cota Street between Railroad Street and Harrington Street, approximately 1 mile southwest of the Project site. The next closest fossil was located 4.5 miles north-northwest of the Project site, along Sumner Avenue north of Cloverdale Road (MCC 2019).

## 5.6.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- GEO-1 Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- GEO-1i 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. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 4),

- GEO-1ii Strong seismic ground shaking,
- GEO-1iii Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or
- GEO-1iv Landslides;
- GEO-2 Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- GEO-3 Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse;
- GEO-4 Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), 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 geologic feature

The Initial Study established that the project would result in no impact related to Thresholds GEO-1i, GEO-1ii, GEO-1iv, and GEO-5; no further assessment of these impacts is required in this EIR.

## 5.6.5 METHODOLOGY

**Geotechnical Investigation.** A Geotechnical Investigation was conducted for the Project site (GEO 2019), which included field exploration, exploratory soil borings, obtaining representative soil samples, laboratory testing, engineering analysis, and the review of pertinent geological literature. The laboratory testing determined the characteristics of the geology and soils that underlie the site. These subsurface conditions were then analyzed to identify potential significant impacts resulting from Project construction and operation in relation to geology and soils.

In determining whether a significant impact would result from the proposed Project, the analysis includes consideration of state law, including the California Building Code that is integrated into the City's Municipal Code, and implemented/verified during Project permitting approvals. In general, existing state law, building codes, and municipal codes that are implemented by the approving agency provide for an adequate level of safety or reduction of potential effects such that projects developed and operated to code reduce potential of impacts.

**Paleontological Field Survey.** A paleontological survey of the Project site was conducted on January 7 and 10, 2019. All undeveloped ground surface areas within the ground disturbance portion of the Project area were examined for native soils and fossils. Existing ground disturbances (e.g., cutbanks, ditches, animal burrows, etc.) were visually inspected as they offer a better view of the underlying sediment. No paleontological resources were observed during the field survey.

**Paleontological Records Search.** The paleontological records search included a geologic map review, literature search, and institutional records search at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County of Los Angeles in November 2018 that included identification of all known fossil localities within the Project area and a one-mile radius.

## 5.6.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT GEO-1iii: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CAUSE POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING SEISMIC-RELATED GROUND FAILURE, INCLUDING LIQUEFACTION.

Less than Significant Impact. As described previously, the Project site is located within an area mapped as having a medium to high liquefaction susceptibility. In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation identified that the site contains potentially liquefiable soils. However, structures built in the City are required to be built in compliance with the California Building Code (CBC [California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2]), as included in the City's Municipal Code as Section 15.02.010 (and EIR as PPP GEO-1), which regulates all building and construction projects within the City and implements a minimum standard for building design and construction that includes specific requirements for seismic safety, excavation, foundations, retaining walls and site demolition.

The Geotechnical Investigation (Geo 2019) prepared for the Project site provides CBC seismic structural design criteria that are specific to the onsite soils and potential liquefaction that includes: excavation, recompaction, and foundation systems. Compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, would require proper construction of building footings and foundations so that it would withstand the effects of potential ground movement, including liquefaction.

In addition, as described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the soils onsite would be excavated to a minimum of 5 feet below the bottom of the building foundations and 5 feet beyond the building perimeters, reconditioned to maintain moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum, and recompacted as engineered fill to support the proposed building structures. The compaction of fill would be in compliance with the CBC regulations and the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Project, as required by PPP GEO-1.

The CBC, as currently adopted in the City's Municipal Code Section 15.02.010, includes provisions to reduce impacts caused by potential major structural failures or loss of life resulting from geologic hazards. For example, the CBC requires that a California Certified Engineering Geologist or California-licensed civil engineer provide site-specific engineering data to demonstrate the satisfactory performance of proposed structures, which have been included in the Geotechnical Investigation. The City requires the project specific engineering design recommendations be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of development approval. Therefore, the development of the proposed Project would be required to conform to the seismic design parameters of the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, which are reviewed by the City for appropriate inclusion as part of the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC and City's municipal code for structural safety through implementation of as included as PPP GEO-1 would reduce hazards from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction to a less than significant level.

## IMPACT GEO-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL.

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction of the Project has the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading and excavation activities that would be required for the proposed Project would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water.

The City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70, City of Norco Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls, and Municipal Code Section 15.90.140 Erosion Control implements the requirements of

the California RWQCB Order No. R8-2010-0033, NPDES Permit No. CAS618033 for the portion of the Santa Ana River watershed located within Riverside County, which includes the City. All projects in the City are required to conform to the permit requirements, which includes installation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in compliance with the RWQCB permit, which establishes minimum stormwater management requirements and controls that are required to be implemented for the proposed Project. To reduce the potential for soil erosion and the loss of topsoil, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by the RWQCB regulations to be developed by a QSD (Qualified SWPPP Developer). The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to specific grading and construction activities. The SWPPP would identify potential sources of erosion and sedimentation loss of topsoil, such as use of silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding. With compliance with the City's Municipal Code, RWQCB requirements, and the BMPs in the SWPPP that is required to be prepared to implement the Project, construction impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

In addition, the proposed Project includes installation of landscaping, such that during operation of the Project substantial areas of loose topsoil that could erode would not exist. In addition, as described in Section 5.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the onsite drainage features that would be installed by the Project have been designed to slow, filter, and slowly discharge stormwater into the offsite drainage system, which would also reduce the potential for stormwater to erode topsoil during Project operations. Furthermore, implementation of the Project requires City approval of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which would ensure that the City's Municipal Code, RWQCB requirements, and appropriate operational BMPs would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur. As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT GEO-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT BE LOCATED ON A GEOLOGIC UNIT OR SOIL THAT IS UNSTABLE, OR THAT WOULD BECOME UNSTABLE AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT, AND POTENTIALLY RESULT IN ON- OR OFF-SITE LANDSLIDE, LATERAL SPREADING, SUBSIDENCE, LIQUEFACTION OR COLLAPSE.

Less than Significant Impact. As described previously, the elevation of the site ranges from approximately 600 feet above mean sea level in the northeast corner of the site to approximately 582 feet above mean sea level in the south area of the site adjacent to 1st Street. The site slopes down to the south at less than a one percent gradient. There is approximately 18 feet of elevation differential across the subject site (GEO 2019). Due to the limited elevation change on the site, there is limited potential of lateral spreading to occur onsite during a liquefaction event. Thus, impacts related to lateral spreading would be less than significant. In addition, the Project site is not adjacent to any hillsides. Thus, impacts related to landslides would not occur.

However, the Geotechnical Investigation identified that seismic and liquefaction inducted settlement onsite to be less than 1.25 inches over a distance of 100 feet, indicating a maximum angular distortion of less than  $0.002\pm$  inches per inch (GEO 2019a). These differential settlements are considered to be within the structural tolerances of a typical building supported on a shallow foundation system provided that structural measures are implemented. As described in the previous response, the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Project site provides CBC seismic structural design criteria that are specific to the onsite soils, including the soils settlement and minor ground subsidence conditions that exist. The Project includes excavation and recompaction of soils, and development of foundation systems in compliance with the CBC, as included as PPP GEO-1, which would require proper construction of building foundations to reduce impacts related to settlement and subsidence would not occur onsite.

The CBC, as currently adopted in the City's Municipal Code Section 15.02.010, the CBC requires that a California Certified Engineering Geologist or California-licensed civil engineer provide site-specific engineering data for the proposed structures, which are reviewed by the City for appropriate inclusion as part of the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC and City's municipal code for structural safety through implementation of as included as PPP GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

#### IMPACT GEO-4: THE PROJECT WOULD BE LOCATED ON EXPANSIVE SOIL, AS DEFINED IN TABLE 18-1-B OF THE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE (1994) BUT WOULD NOT CREATE SUBSTANTIAL RISKS TO LIFE OR PROPERTY.

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site contains several areas of medium stiff to stiff clayey silts and silty clays. The Geotechnical Investigation conducted expansion index testing, which indicated that the soils possess very low to medium expansion potentials (GEO 2019). However, as described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the soils onsite would be excavated to a minimum of 5 feet below the bottom of the building foundations and 5 feet beyond the building perimeters, reconditioned, and recompacted as engineered fill to support the proposed building structures. As part of reconditioning the compacted engineered fill, the soils would be moisture conditioned to maintain moisture content of 2 to 4 percent above the Modified Proctor optimum, as required by the CBC for expansive soils (GEO 2019). In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation includes soil moisture control recommendations, that are required to be included in the Project by PPP GEO-1, and consistent with drainage requirements that are described previously in the discussion related to Impact GEO-2, which include use of catch basins, storm drain lines, and infiltration basins; regular maintenance of drainage devices (which is required to be implemented by the WQMP); and avoidance of erosion.

Furthermore, prior to approval of construction of each structure, an engineering level design geotechnical report is required to be prepared and submitted to the City that details the project designs that have been included to address potential geotechnical and soil conditions pursuant to the CBC requirements, that are included in the City's Municipal Code Section 15.02.010, and implemented by PPP GEO-1. Compliance with the CBC, through design level geotechnical specifications that would be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer, per PPP GEO-1 would ensure that potential impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

## IMPACT GEO-6:THE PROJECT WOULD NOT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DESTROY A UNIQUE<br/>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE OR SITE OR UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Although the Project area has been heavily disturbed by previous development activity, the Project area as a "High A" potential for paleontological resources. The is underlain by Pleistocene-aged alluvial deposits that are considered highly sensitive as they often contain significant vertebrate fossils. Because construction of the proposed Project would include excavation of native soils, impacts to paleontological resources could occur during implementation of the proposed Project. As a result, Mitigation Measure PAL-1 has been included to monitor any excavations at or below 5 feet in depth and deposit any fossils uncovered during construction in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations, which would reduce the potential impacts related to destruction of a unique paleontological resource to a less than significant level.

## 5.6.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The potential cumulative exposure of people or structures to unstable geologic units and/or expansive soils that have the potential to result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction,

movement, or collapse tend to be region wide in nature, even though each site-specific development has unique geologic considerations. Site-specific development projects within Norco are subject to uniform sitedevelopment policies and construction standards imposed by the City that are based on the state requirements in the CBC and site-specific geotechnical studies prepared to define site-specific conditions that might pose a risk to safety, such as those described previously for the proposed Project. While increases in the number of people and structures subject to unstable geologic units and soils would increase in the Norco area with cumulative development, given the application of CBC requirements by the City through the construction permitting process, the cumulative effects of development related to unstable geologic units and/or expansive soils; including landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, movement, or collapse would be less than significant.

**Paleontological Resources:** Mitigation is included that would avoid direct impacts to paleontological resources that have the potential to exists 5 feet below the ground surface within the region. Implementation of Mitigation Measure PAL-1 would reduce the potential of the proposed Project to result in impacts to paleontological resources that could cumulatively combine with impacts other projects. The mitigation measure would provide that the Project would not contribute to a cumulative loss of paleontological resources; therefore, impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.

# 5.6.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

**PPP GEO-1: CBC Compliance.** The Project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code as included in the City's Municipal Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. California Building Code related and geologist and/or civil engineer specifications for the proposed Project shall be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of construction permit approval.

## 5.6.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts GEO1iii, GEO-2, GEO-3, and GEO-4 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, Impact GEO-6, related to paleontological resources would be **potentially significant**.

## 5.6.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

## Mitigation Measure PAL-1: Paleontological Resources

Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the City of Norco Building and Safety Division, or designee, from a paleontologist selected from the roll of qualified paleontologists maintained by Riverside County, stating that the paleontologist has been retained to provide services for the Project. The paleontologist shall develop a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) to mitigate the potential impacts to unknown buried paleontological resources that may exist onsite for the review and approval by the City. The PRIMP shall require that the paleontologist be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance. The PRIMP shall require paleontological monitoring of excavation that exceeds depths of five feet. The PRIMP shall state that the Project paleontologist may re-evaluate the necessity for paleontological monitoring after 50 percent or greater of the excavations deeper than four feet have been completed. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered, ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area of the discovery shall cease. The paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered.

Criteria for discard of specific fossil specimens will be made explicit. If a qualified paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by project planning, then recovery may be applied. Actions may include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction, monitoring work and halting construction if an important fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging specimens for curation and research purposes. Recovery, salvage and treatment shall be done at the applicant's expense. All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the paleontologist. Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. The paleontologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource.

## 5.6.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The mitigation measure identified above, and existing regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts associated with a unique paleontological resource for Impact GEO-6 to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to paleontological resources would occur.

## REFERENCES

Geotechnical Investigation and Liquefaction Evaluation. Prepared by Southern California Geotechnical. 2019 (GEO 2019).

Response Report Prepared by Southern California Geotechnical. 2019 (GEO 2019a).

Material Culture Consulting. 2019 (MCC 2019). Paleontological Resources Assessment

State Water Resources Control Board Construction Storm Water Program. Accessed: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml

Riverside County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit. Accessed: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water\_issues/programs/stormwater/riverside\_permit.html

This page intentionally left blank.
## 5.7 Greenhouse Gases

## 5.7.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR evaluates greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the proposed Project and its contribution to global climate change. Specifically, this section evaluates the extent to which GHG emissions from the Project contributes to elevated levels of GHGs in the Earth's atmosphere and consequently contributes to climate change. This section also addresses the Project's consistency with applicable plans, policies, and public agency regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The analysis within this section is based on the Greenhouse Gas Analysis prepared for the Project by Urban Crossroads (UC 2019), provided is Appendix I.

## 5.7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### California Assembly Bill 1493 (Chapter 200, Statutes of 2002)

In 2002, the California Legislature adopted AB 1493 requiring the adoption of regulations to reduce GHG emissions in the transportation sector. In September 2004, pursuant to AB 1493, the CARB approved regulations to reduce GHG emissions from new motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year (Pavley Regulations). In September 2009, CARB adopted amendments to the Pavley Regulations to reduce GHG from 2009 to 2016. CARB, EPA, and the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) have coordinated efforts to develop fuel economy and GHG standards for model 2017-2025 vehicles. The GHG standards are incorporated into the "Low Emission Vehicle" (LEV) Regulations.

#### California Executive Order S-3-05 – Statewide Emission Reduction Targets

Executive Order S-3-05 was signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in June 2005. Executive Order S-3-05 establishes statewide emission reduction targets through the year 2050:

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

#### California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006)

In furtherance of the goals established in Executive Order S-3-05, the Legislature enacted AB 32 (Health and Safety Code Section 38500 et seq.) to mandate the quantification and reduction of GHGs to 1990 levels by the year 2020. The law establishes periodic targets for reductions and requires certain facilities to report emissions of GHGs annually. The legislation authorizes CARB to reduce emissions from certain sectors that contribute the most to statewide emissions of GHGs.

Under AB 32, CARB must adopt regulations requiring the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. This program will be used to monitor and enforce compliance with the established standards. CARB is also required to adopt rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. AB 32 allows CARB to adopt market-based compliance mechanisms to meet the specified requirements. Also, CARB is ultimately responsible for monitoring compliance and

enforcing any rule, regulation, order, emission limitation, emission reduction measure, or market-based compliance mechanism adopted.

The first action under AB 32 resulted in the adoption of a report listing early action GHG emission reduction measures on June 21, 2007. The early actions include three specific GHG control rules. On October 25, 2007, CARB approved an additional six early action GHG reduction measures under AB 32. The three original early-action regulations meeting the narrow legal definition of "discrete early action GHG reduction measures" include:

- A low-carbon fuel standard to reduce the "carbon intensity" of California fuels.
- Reduction of refrigerant losses from motor vehicle air conditioning system maintenance to restrict the sale of "do-it-yourself" automotive refrigerants.
- Increased methane capture from landfills to require broader use of state-of-the-art methane capture technologies.

The additional six early-action regulations, which were also considered "discrete early action GHG reduction measures," consist of:

- Reduction of aerodynamic drag, and thereby fuel consumption, from existing trucks and trailers through retrofit technology.
- Reduction of auxiliary engine emissions of docked ships by requiring port electrification.
- Reduction of PFCs from the semiconductor industry.
- Reduction of propellants in consumer products (e.g., aerosols, tire inflators, and dust removal products).
- Requirements that all tune-up, smog check, and oil change mechanics ensure proper tire inflation as part of overall service in order to maintain fuel efficiency.
- Restriction on the use of SF6 from non-electricity sectors if viable alternatives are available.

As required under AB 32, on December 6, 2007, CARB approved the 1990 GHG emissions inventory, thereby establishing the emissions limit for 2020. The 2020 emissions limit was set at 427 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent). In addition to the 1990 emissions inventory, CARB also adopted regulations requiring mandatory reporting of GHGs for large facilities that account for 94 percent of GHG emissions from industrial and commercial stationary sources in California. About 800 separate sources fall under the new reporting rules and include electricity generating facilities, electricity retail providers and power marketers, oil refineries, hydrogen plants, cement plants, cogeneration facilities, and other industrial sources that emit CO<sub>2</sub> in excess of specified thresholds.

On December 11, 2008, CARB approved the "Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change" to achieve the goals of AB 32. The Scoping Plan establishes an overall framework for the measures that will be adopted to reduce California's GHG emissions. The Scoping Plan evaluates opportunities for sector-specific reductions, integrates all CARB and Climate Action Team early actions and additional GHG reduction measures by both entities, identifies additional measures to be pursued as regulations, and outlines the role of a cap-and-trade program. The key elements of the Scoping Plan include:

- Expanding and strengthening existing energy efficiency programs as well as building and appliance standards.
- Achieving a statewide renewables energy mix of 33 percent.
- Developing a California cap-and-trade program that links with other Western Climate Initiative partner programs to create a regional market system and caps sources contributing 85% of California's GHG emissions.

- Establishing targets for transportation-related GHG emissions for regions throughout California and pursuing policies and incentives to achieve those targets.
- Adopting and implementing measures pursuant to existing state laws and policies, including California's clean car standards, goods movement measures, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS).
- Creating targeted fees, including a public goods charge on water use, fees on high global warning potential (GWP) gases, and a fee to fund the administrative costs of the State of California's long-term commitment to AB 32 implementation.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions because local governments have the primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions. The Scoping Plan also relies on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (discussed below) to align local land use and transportation planning for achieving GHG reductions.

The Scoping Plan must be updated every five years to evaluate AB 32 policies and ensure that California is on track to achieve the 2020 GHG reduction goal. In 2014, CARB released the First Update to the Scoping Plan, which builds upon the Initial Scoping Plan with new strategies and recommendations. The First Update identifies opportunities to leverage existing and new funds to further drive GHG emission reductions through strategic planning and targeted low carbon investments. This update defines CARB's climate change priorities for the next five years and sets the groundwork to reach long-term goals set forth in Executive Order S-3-05. The update highlights California's progress toward meeting the "near-term" 2020 GHG emission reduction goals in the original 2008 Scoping Plan. It also evaluates how to align the state's "longer-term" GHG reduction strategies with other state policy priorities for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation, and land use.

On January 20, 2017, CARB released the proposed Second Update to the Scoping Plan, which identifies the State's post-2020 reduction strategy. The Second Update would reflect the 2030 target of a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels, set by Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by SB 32. Key programs that the proposed Second Update builds upon include the Cap-and-Trade Regulation, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and much cleaner cars, trucks and freight movement, utilizing cleaner, renewable energy, and strategies to reduce methane emissions from agricultural and other wastes. The proposed Second Update is undergoing a review period and has not yet been adopted.

#### Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008)

In August 2008, the Legislature passed, and on September 30, 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger signed, SB 375, which addresses GHG emissions associated with the transportation sector through regional transportation and sustainability plans. Regional GHG reduction targets for the automobile and light-truck sector for 2020 and 2035, as determined by CARB, are required to consider the emission reductions associated with vehicle emission standards (see SB 1493), the composition of fuels (see Executive Order S-1-07), and other CARB-approved measures to reduce GHG emissions. Regional metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) will be responsible for preparing a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) within their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The goal of the SCS is to establish a development plan for the region, which, after considering transportation measures and policies, will achieve, if feasible, the GHG reduction targets. If an SCS is unable to achieve the GHG reduction target would be achieved through alternative Planning Strategy demonstrating how the GHG reduction target would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. SB 375 provides incentives for streamlining CEQA requirements by substantially reducing the requirements for "transit priority projects," as specified in SB 375, and eliminating the analysis of the impacts of certain residential projects on global warming and the growth-inducing impacts of those projects when the projects

are consistent with the SCS or Alternative Planning Strategy. On September 23, 2010, CARB adopted the SB 375 targets for the regional MPOs.

#### Executive Order B-30-15 – 2030 Statewide Emission Reduction Target

Executive Order B-30-15 was signed by Governor Jerry Brown on April 29, 2015, establishing an interim statewide GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, which is necessary to guide regulatory policy and investments in California in the midterm, and put California on the most cost-effective path for long-term emission reductions. Under this Executive Order, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions are required to continue to develop and implement emissions reduction programs to reach the state's 2050 target and attain a level of emissions necessary to avoid dangerous climate change. According to the Governor's Office, this Executive Order is in line with the scientifically established levels needed in the United States to limit global warming below 2°C - the warming threshold at which scientists say there will likely be major climate disruptions such as super droughts and rising sea levels.

#### Senate Bill 32 (Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016)

Senate Bill 32 was signed on September 8, 2016 by Governor Jerry Brown. SB 32 requires the state to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, a reduction target that was first introduced in Executive Order B-30-15. The new legislation builds upon the AB 32 goal of 1990 levels by 2020 and provides an intermediate goal to achieving S-3-05, which sets a statewide GHG reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. A related bill that was also approved in 2016, AB 197 (Chapter 250, Statutes of 2016) creates a legislative committee to oversee regulators to ensure that ARB is not only responsive to the Governor, but also the Legislature.

#### AB 398 – Extension of Cap and Trade Program to 2030 (Chapter 617, Statutes of 2017)

AB 398was signed by Governor Brown on July 25, 2017 and became effective immediately as urgency legislation. AB 398, among other things, extending the cap and trade program through 2030.

#### Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, Statutes of 2007)

SB 97 (Health and Safety Code Section 21083.5) was adopted in 2007 and required the Office of Planning and Research to prepare amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for the mitigation of GHG impacts. The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. The CEQA Amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. A new section, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, was added to assist agencies in determining the significance of GHG emissions. The CEQA Section gives discretion to the lead agency whether to: (1) use a model of methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; or (2) rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. CEQA does not provide guidance to determine whether the project's estimated GHG emissions are significant or cumulatively considerable.

Also amended were CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.4 and 15130, which address mitigation measures and cumulative impacts respectively. However, GHG mitigation measures are referenced in general terms, and no specific measures are identified. Additionally, the revision to the cumulative impact discussion requirement (Section 15130) simply directs agencies to analyze GHG emissions in an EIR when a project's incremental contribution of emissions may be cumulatively considerable, however it does not answer the question of when emissions are cumulatively considerable.

Section 15183.5 permits programmatic GHG analysis and later project-specific tiering, as well as the preparation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans. Compliance with such plans can support a determination

that a project's cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable, according to proposed Section 15183.5(b).

## California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

CCR Title 24, Part 6 provides efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings. The standards are updated periodically to allow for incorporation of new energy efficient technologies and methods. The existing Title 24 regulations became effective on January 1, 2017. The 2019 Title 24 standards go into effect on January 1, 2020 and are applicable to building permit applications submitted on or after that date. The 2019 Title 24 standards require updated indoor and outdoor lighting for nonresidential buildings. The CEC anticipates that non-residential buildings built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 30 percent less energy compared to the buildings built under the 2016 standards.

#### **City of Norco General Plan**

The following goal and policies contained in the Conservation Element are relevant to the proposed Project.

Goal 2.5: Use of Energy Resources Goal - Encourage the Efficient Use of Energy Resources.

#### Policy 2.5.1: Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Policy

**Policy 2.5.1a.** Encourage new construction and project design that uses, or takes advantage of renewable energy resources, including but not limited to solar energy design.

**Policy 2.5.1b.** Provide updated energy information documents for builders as needed to reflect the most recent Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and standards and other applicable new laws, requirements, and feasible building standards as may be available.

**Policy 2.5.2f.** Support alternative modes of transportation as feasible including the equestrian trail system, public transportation, bicycles, etc. to reduce the demand on non-renewable energy resources.

## 5.7.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called GHGs. The major concern with GHGs is that increases in their concentrations are contributing to global climate change. Global climate change is a change in the average weather on Earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the rate of global climate change and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most in the scientific community agree that there is a direct link between increased emissions of GHGs and long-term global temperature increases.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). Because different GHGs have different warming potential, and CO<sub>2</sub> is the most common reference gas for climate change, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). For example, SF<sub>6</sub> is a GHG commonly used in the utility industry as an insulating gas in circuit breakers and other electronic equipment. SF<sub>6</sub>, while comprising a small fraction of the total GHGs emitted annually world-wide, is a much more potent GHG, with 22,800 times the global warming potential as CO<sub>2</sub>. Therefore, an emission of one metric ton (MT) of SF<sub>6</sub> could be reported as an emission of 22,800 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Large emission sources are reported in million metric tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e. The principal GHGs are described below, along with their global warming potential.

**Carbon dioxide:** Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is an odorless, colorless, natural GHG. Carbon dioxide's global warming potential is 1. Natural sources include decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of

bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic (manmade) sources are from burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood.

**Methane:** Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is a flammable gas and is the main component of natural gas. It has a lifetime of 12 years, and its global warming potential is 28. Methane is extracted from geological deposits (natural gas fields). Other sources are landfills, fermentation of manure, and decay of organic matter.

**Nitrous oxide:** Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) (laughing gas) is a colorless GHG that has a lifetime of 121 years, and its global warming potential is 265. Sources include microbial processes in soil and water, fuel combustion, and industrial processes.

**Sulfur hexafluoride:** Sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>) is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, and nontoxic, nonflammable gas that has a lifetime of 3,200 years and a high global warming potential of 23,500. This gas is manmade and used for insulation in electric power transmission equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas.

**Perfluorocarbons:** Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) have stable molecular structures and only break down by ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above Earth's surface. Because of this, they have long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Their global warming potential ranges from 7,000 to 11,000. Two main sources of perfluorocarbons are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.

**Hydrofluorocarbons:** Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are a group of GHGs containing carbon, chlorine, and at least one hydrogen atom. Their global warming potential ranges from 100 to 12,000. Hydrofluorocarbons are synthetic manmade chemicals used as a substitute for chlorofluorocarbons in applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.

Some of the potential effects in California of global warming may include loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more forest fires, and more drought years. Globally, climate change has the potential to impact numerous environmental resources through potential, though uncertain, impacts related to future air temperatures and precipitation patterns. The projected effects of global warming on weather and climate are likely to vary regionally, but are expected to include the following direct effects:

- Higher maximum temperatures and more hot days over nearly all land areas;
- Higher minimum temperatures, fewer cold days and frost days over nearly all land areas;
- Reduced diurnal temperature range over most land areas;
- Increase of heat index over land areas; and
- More intense precipitation events.

Also, there are many secondary effects that are projected to result from global warming, including global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity. While the possible outcomes and the feedback mechanisms involved are not fully understood and much research remains to be done, the potential for substantial environmental, social, and economic consequences over the long term may be great.

GHGs are produced by both direct and indirect emissions sources. Direct emissions include consumption of natural gas, heating and cooling of buildings, landscaping activities and other equipment used directly by land uses. Indirect emissions include the consumption of fossil fuels for vehicle trips, electricity generation, water usage, and solid waste disposal.

#### **Existing Project Site Conditions**

The Project site for is currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse distribution facility. GHG emissions associated with the existing uses are shown below in Table 5.7-1.

	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
Emission Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH₄	N₂O	Total CO2E1
Existing Development	4,599.8 8	3.22	0.03	4,689.8 4
Total CO2E (Existing Development)	4,689.84			

Table 5.7-1: Existing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Generated at the Project Site

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### 5.7.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- GHG-1 Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- GHG-2 Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

The City of Norco has not adopted any numeric threshold of significance for determining impacts with respect to GHG emissions. Nor have the SCAQMD, OPR, CARB, CAPCOA, or any other state or regional agency adopted a numeric significance threshold for assessing GHG emissions that is applicable to the Project.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 provides discretion to the lead agency whether to: (1) use a model of methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; or (2) rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. In addition, CEQA does not provide guidance to determine whether the project's estimated GHG emissions are significant, but recommends that lead agencies consider several factors that may be used in the determination of significance of project related GHG emissions, including:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
- Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project.
- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

As the proposed Project would implement the City's General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan and GHG emissions from implementing the planned land uses is unavoidable, and no applicable adopted numeric threshold exists, the significance for Impact GHG-1 is based upon a qualitative analysis and meeting performance-based standards, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4. However, a quantification of the GHG emissions that would be generated from the Project is also provided in the analysis below.

Note: It should be noted that the Total CO<sub>2</sub>E represents the total carbon dioxide equivalent values of the individual CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O values. CalEEMod automatically factors the CH4 and N2O values in terms of CO2E. Additionally, any values reported as "0" should be considered negligible as they are not quantified by CalEEMod.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) describes that the effects of GHG emissions are by their very nature cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)3 states that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides requirements to avoid or lesson the cumulative problem.

## 5.7.5 METHODOLOGY

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) v2016.3.1 has been used to determine construction and operational GHG emissions for buildout of the proposed Project, based on the maximum development assumptions outlined in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, which includes refrigerated warehouse uses.

The purpose of this model is to calculate construction-source and operational-source GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources; and quantify applicable air quality and GHG reductions achieved from measures incorporated into the Project to reduce or minimize GHG emissions. For construction phase project emissions, GHGs are quantified and, per SCAQMD methodology, the total GHG emissions for construction activities are divided by 30-years, and then added to the annual operational phase of GHG emissions.

In addition, CEQA requires the lead agency consider the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. Therefore, this section addresses whether the Project complies with various programs and measures designed to reduce GHG emissions. There is no Statewide program or regional program or plan that has been adopted with which all new development must comply; Thus, this analysis has identified the most relevant to the City of Norco and the proposed Project.

### 5.7.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT GHG-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE GHG EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from construction activities, operational transportation, energy, waste disposal, and area sources (such as onsite equipment and refrigerated warehouses. Construction related to build out of the Project would generate approximately 23,628.64 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year from energy, waste, onsite equipment, refrigeration, and water usage, which are for purposes of this analysis amortized over a 30 year period. In addition, the proposed Project's long-term operations would generate 35,101.05 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year from mobile sources, and additional operational emissions mostly due to energy consumption, all of which are listed in Table 5.7-2. With subtraction of the existing emissions from the current uses on the Project site (4,689.84 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year), the Project would generate a total increase of 54,039.84 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year, as shown on Table 5.7-2.

Table 5.7-2: Project Generated	Greenhouse Emissions
--------------------------------	----------------------

Emission Source

Emissions (metric tons per year)

	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH4	N <sub>2</sub> O	Total CO <sub>2</sub> E <sup>2</sup>
Annual construction-related	262.11	0.02	0.00	262.71
emissions amortized over 30 years				
Area (Industrial Uses)	0.05	1.30E-04	0.00	0.05
Area (Commercial Uses)	0.05	1.40E-04	0.00	0.06
Energy (Industrial Uses)	20,667.28	0.78	0.21	20,749.13
Energy (Commercial Uses)	457.72	0.02	0.01	459.73
Mobile (Passenger Cars)	7,852.71	0.17	0.0	7,856.99
Mobile (Trucks)	22,549.45	0.10	0.00	22,552.07
Mobile (Commercial Uses)	4,688.02	0.16	0.00	4,691.99
On-Site Equipment	406.34	0.13	0.00	409.62
Waste (Industrial Uses)	473.95	28.01	0.00	1,174.18
Waste (Commercial Uses)	26.64	1.57	0.00	66.01
Water Usage (Industrial Uses)	379.10	2.36	0.06	455.49
Water Usage (Commercial Uses)	42.30	0.29	0.01	51.67
Total Project Generated CO <sub>2</sub> E (All Sources)		58,7	29.68	
Existing CO <sub>2</sub> E (Table 5.7-1)	4,689.84			
Project Generated Increase CO <sub>2</sub> E	2E 54,039.84			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

The proposed Project would incorporate a number of sustainable design features that would reduce GHG emissions, which include:

- Installation of drought-tolerant plants for landscaping.
- Installation of water-efficient irrigation systems, such as weather-based and soil-moisture-based irrigation controllers and sensors, for landscaping according to the California Department of Water Resources Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
- Designing buildings to provide CALGreen Standards with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design features for potential certification and would employ energy and water conservation measures in accordance with such standards. This includes design considerations related to the building envelope; heating, ventilating, and air conditioning; lighting; and power systems.
- Installation of landscaping in surface parking lots to reduce heat island effect. Parking lot landscaping would be planted with 15-gallon trees, at a rate of one per every four parking stalls. The trees may be clustered, but a minimum of one cluster would be provided for each 100 feet of parking row. Trees would be selected and placed to provide canopy and shade for the parking lots.
- Implementation of a recycling program in order to meet a 50 percent minimum waste diversion goal.
- Utilization of construction materials and interior finish products with zero or low emissions to improve indoor air quality;
- Provision of adequate ventilation and high-efficiency in-duct filtration system;
- Installation of low or moderate water use plants, including native plant materials where appropriate; minimize turf areas;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Note: It should be noted that the Total CO<sub>2</sub>E represents the total carbon dioxide equivalent values of the individual CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O values. CalEEMod automatically factors the CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O values in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>E. Additionally, any values reported as "0" should be considered negligible as they are not quantified by CalEEMod.

- Use of low volatile organic compound paints and wallpapers;
- Provision of electrical outlets in loading dock areas to power trucks.; and
- Powering all outdoor cargo handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, and forklifts) by non-diesel fueled engines and all indoor forklifts would be powered by electricity.

However, there are no feasible Project measures that would reduce vehicular emissions, and more than 59 percent of all GHG emissions (by weight) would be generated by Project mobile sources (vehicle trips). Neither the Project Applicant nor the Lead Agency (City of Norco) can substantively or materially affect reductions in Project mobile-source emissions.

As explained previously, compliance with GHG emissions reduction plans would result in a less than significant impact. The Project would be developed and operated in compliance with the regulatory requirements, such as Title 24/CalGreen Building requirements and with the sustainability design features, listed above. The CEC anticipates that nonresidential buildings built with the 2019 Title 24/CalGreen standards will use approximately 30 percent less energy compared to development under the 2016 standards. Compliance with Title 24 is enforced through the building permit process. The following Title 24 standards are applicable to the proposed Project:

- Short-term bicycle parking. If a commercial project is anticipated to generate visitor traffic, provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 200 feet of the visitors' entrance, readily visible to passers-by, for 5 percent of visitor motorized vehicle parking capacity, with a minimum of one two-bike capacity rack.
- Long-term bicycle parking. For new buildings with 10 or more tenant-occupants, provide secure bicycle parking for 5 percent of tenant-occupied motorized vehicle parking capacity, with a minimum of one space.
- Designated parking. Provide designated parking in commercial projects for any combination of lowemitting, fuel-efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles.
- Recycling by Occupants. Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of nonhazardous materials for recycling.
- Construction waste. A minimum 65 percent diversion of construction and demolition waste from landfills.
- Wastewater reduction. Each building shall reduce the generation of wastewater by either installing water-conserving fixtures or using non-potable water systems.
- Water use savings. 20 percent mandatory reduction of indoor water use.
- Water meters. Separate water meters for buildings in excess of 50,000 sf or buildings projected to consume more than 1,000 gallons per day.
- Irrigation efficiency. Moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscaped areas.
- Materials pollution control. Utilize low pollutant emitting interior finish materials such as paints, carpet, vinyl flooring, and particleboard.

• Building commissioning. Mandatory inspections of energy systems (i.e., heat furnace, air conditioner, mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 sf to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity according to their design efficiencies.

The City does not have an applicable adopted threshold related to the quantification of GHG emissions, and neither the City or the Applicant have regulatory control over vehicular emissions that consist of over 59 percent of the Project-related GHG emissions. However, because the Project would be in compliance with GHG-related regulatory requirements (described previously and further detailed in Impact GHG-2 below), Project generated GHG emissions would be less than significant.

# IMPACT GHG-2:THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH ANY APPLICABLE PLAN, POLICY<br/>OR REGULATION OF AN AGENCY ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REDUCING<br/>THE EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES.

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the City Norco does not have any locally adopted plan, policy, or regulation relating to the reduction of GHG emissions.

According to research conducted by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and supported by the CARB, California, under its existing and proposed GHG reduction policies, is on track to meet the 2020 reduction targets under AB 32 and could achieve the 2030 goals required under SB 32 (UC 2019).

The proposed Project would not interfere with the state's implementation of Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030; or Executive Order S-3-05's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 because it does not interfere with implementation of the GHG reduction measures listed in CARB's 2007 Scoping Plan or CARB's Updated Scoping Plan (2017). CARB's Updated Scoping Plan reflects the 2030 target of a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels, set by Executive Order S-3-05, and codified by AB 32.

As listed previously in Impact GHG-1, the Project includes sustainable design features related to reduction of GHG emissions that exceed existing regulatory requirements (such as provision of electrically powered equipment including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts; electrical connections at loading docks; and designated parking). In addition, both of CARB's Scoping Plans (the 2007 and 2017) provide strategies to reduce GHG emissions, which the Project is consistent with as discussed below and detailed in Tables 5.7-3 and 5.7-4. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the CARB Scoping Plans and related regulations.

- Pavley emissions standard and Low Carbon Fuel Standard: Pavley emissions standards (AB 1493) apply to all new passenger vehicles starting with model year 2009, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard became effective in 2010 and regulates the transportation fuel used. The second phase of implementation of the Pavley regulations per AB 1493 is referred to as the Advanced Clean Car program, which combines the control of smog-causing pollutants and GHG emissions into a single coordinated package of requirements for model years 2017 through 2025. The regulation will reduce GHGs from new cars by 34 percent from 2016 levels by 2025. The Project is consistent with these requirements as they apply to all new passenger vehicles and vehicle fuel purchased in California.
- Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicle Regulations: Medium/heavy-duty vehicle regulations are implemented by the State to reduce emissions from trucks. Since the proposed Project has a large truck component, these regulations will aid in reducing GHG emissions from the Project. The Project is consistent with

this measure and its implementation as medium and heavy-duty vehicles associated with construction and operation of the Project would be required to comply with the requirements of this regulation.

- Tractor-Trailer Greenhouse Gas Regulation: Tractor-trailers subject to this State regulation are primarily 53-foot or longer box-type trailers, are required to be either use EPA SmartWay certified tractors and trailers or retrofit their existing fleet with SmartWay verified technologies. The Project is consistent with this regulation, as it applies to specific trucks that are used throughout the State.
- Energy Efficiency Title 24/CalGreen: The proposed Project is subject to the CalGreen Code Title 24 building energy efficiency requirements that offer builders better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features as listed in Impact GHG-1 that reduce energy consumption. Compliance with the CalGreen standards would be verified by the City during building permitting process.
- Renewable Portfolio Standard. As a customer of Southern California Edison (SCE), the development within Project area would purchase from an increasing supply of renewable energy sources and more efficient baseload generations, reduce GHG emissions, and be consistent with this requirement.
- Million Solar Roofs Program: The Project is consistent with this scoping plan measure as the Project would provide solar ready roofs.
- Water Efficiency and Waste Diversion: Development and operation of the proposed Project would be implemented in consistency with water conservation requirements (as included in Title 24) and solid waste recycling and landfill diversion requirements of the State.

Action	Supporting Measures <sup>3</sup>	Consistency				
Cap-and-Trade Program		<b>Not applicable.</b> These programs involve capping emissions from electricity generation, industrial facilities, and broad scoped fuels. Caps do not directly affect business park and commercial projects.				
Light-Duty Vehicle Standards	T-1	<b>Not applicable.</b> While these are CARB-enforced measures that are not directly applicable to the Project, vehicles that access the Project are required to comply with the standards and will comply with this strategy. Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations are required to be installed on site per the 2019 Title 24 standards.				
	E-1					
Energy Efficiency	E-2	Consistent. The Project would include a variety of building, water, and soli				
	CR-1	waste efficiencies consistent with the most current CALGreen requirements.				
	CR-2					
Renewables Portfolio Standard	E-3	Not applicable. Establishes the minimum statewide renewable energy mix.				
Low Carbon Fuel Standard	T-2	Not applicable. Establishes reduced carbon intensity of transportation fuels.				
Regional Transportation- Related GHG Targets	T-3	<b>Not applicable.</b> This is a statewide measure and is not within the purview of this Project.				
Vehicle Efficiency Measures	T-4	<b>Not applicable.</b> Identifies measures such as minimum tire-fuel efficiency, lower friction oil, and reduction in air conditioning use.				
Goods Movement	T-5					

#### Table 5.7-3: Project Consistency with the CARB 2007 Scoping Plan

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Supporting measures can be found at the following link: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013\_update/appendix\_b.pdf

Action	Supporting Measures <sup>3</sup>	Consistency				
	T-6	<b>Not applicable.</b> Identifies measures to improve goods movement efficiencies such as advanced combustion strategies, friction reduction, waste heat recovery, and electrification of accessories. While these measures are not directly applicable to the Project, any activity associated with Goods Movement would be required to comply with these measures as adopted. As such, the Project would not interfere with their implementation.				
Million Solar Roofs (MSR) Program	E-4	<b>Consistent.</b> The MSR program sets a goal for use of solar systems throughout the state as a whole. While the Project currently does not include solar energy generation, the building roof structure would be designed to support solar panels in the future, consistent with Title 24 requirements.				
	T-7	Not applicable. MD and HD trucks and trailers for industrial uses are be				
Medium- & Heavy- Duty Vehicles	T-8	subject to aerodynamic and hybridization requirements as established by CARB; the Project would not interfere with implementation of these requirements and programs.				
	I-1					
	I-2	Net applicable. These measures are applicable to large industrial facilities.				
Industrial Emissions	I-3	Not applicable. These measures are applicable to large industrial facilit (> $500,000 \text{ MTCO}_{2e}/\text{yr}$ ) and other intensive uses such as refineries.				
	I-4					
	I-5					
High Speed Rail	T-9	Not applicable. Supports increased mobility choice.				
Green Building Strategy	GB-1	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would include a variety of building, water, and solid waste efficiencies consistent with the current CALGreen requirements.				
	H-1					
	H-2	Not applicable. The Project is not a substantial source of high GWP emis				
High Global	H-3					
Warming Potential	H-4	and would comply with any future changes in air conditioning, fire protection				
Gases	H-5	suppressant, and other requirements.				
	H-6					
	H-7					
Recycling and	RW-1	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would be required recycle a minimum of 65 percent				
Waste	RW-2	from construction activities and Project operations per State and City				
	RW-3	requirements.				
Sustainable Forests	F-1	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would increase carbon sequestration by increasing on-site trees per the Project landscaping plan.				
	W-1					
	W-2					
Water	W-3	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would include use of low-flow fixtures and efficient				
	W-4	landscaping per State requirements.				
	W-5					
	W-6					
Agriculture	A-1	Not applicable. The Project is not an agricultural use.				

#### Table 5.7-4: Project Consistency with the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan

Action	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Consistency
Implement SB 350 by 2030		

Action	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Consistency
Increase the Renewables Portfolio Standard to 50 percent of retail sales by 2030 and ensure grid reliability.		<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would use energy from SCE, which has committed to diversify its portfolio of energy sources by increasing energy from wind and solar sources. The Project would not interfere with or obstruct SCE energy source diversification efforts.
Establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction that will achieve a cumulative doubling of statewide energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas end uses by 2030.	CPUC, CEC, CARB	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would be designed and constructed to implement the energy efficiency measures for new developments and would include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption. The Project would not interfere with or obstruct policies or strategies to establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction.
Reduce GHG emissions in the electricity sector through the implementation of the above measures and other actions as modeled in Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) to meet GHG emissions reductions planning targets in the IRP process. Load-serving entities and publicly- owned utilities meet GHG emissions reductions planning targets through a combination of measures as described in IRPs.		<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would be designed and constructed to implement energy efficiency measures acting to reduce electricity consumption. The Project includes energy efficient lighting and fixtures that meet the current Title 24 Standards. Also, the Project would incorporate energy efficient boilers, heaters, and air conditioning systems.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy (Cleaner T	echnology and Fuels)	
At least 1.5 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2025.		<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB zero emission and plug- in hybrid light-duty electric vehicle 2025 targets.
At least 4.2 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2030.	CARB, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA),	<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB zero emission and plug- in hybrid light-duty electric vehicle 2030 targets.
Further increase GHG stringency on all light- duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean cars regulations.	Strategic Growth Council (SGC), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), CEC,	<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to further increase GHG stringency on all light-duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean cars regulations.
Medium- and Heavy-Duty GHG Phase 2.	OPR, Local Agencies	<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to implement Medium- and Heavy-Duty GHG Phase 2
Innovative Clean Transit: Transition to a suite of to-be-determined innovative clean transit options. Assumed 20 percent of new urban buses purchased beginning in 2018 will be zero emission buses with the penetration of zero-emission technology ramped up to 100		<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts improve transit- source emissions.

Action	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Consistency
percent of new sales in 2030. Also, new natural gas buses, starting in 2018, and diesel buses, starting in 2020, meet the optional heavy-duty low-NO <sub>x</sub> standard.		
Last Mile Delivery: New regulation that would result in the use of low NOx or cleaner engines and the deployment of increasing numbers of zero-emission trucks primarily for class 3-7 last mile delivery trucks in California. This measure assumes ZEVs comprise 2.5 percent of new Class 3–7 truck sales in local fleets starting in 2020, increasing to 10 percent in 2025 and remaining flat through 2030.		<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to improve last mile delivery emissions.
Further reduce VMT through continued implementation of SB 375 and regional Sustainable Communities Strategies; forthcoming statewide implementation of SB 743; and potential additional VMT reduction strategies not specified in the Mobile Source Strategy but included in the document "Potential VMT Reduction Strategies for Discussion."		<b>Consistent.</b> The Project implements Transportation Demand Measures (TDMs) that would act to reduce VMT. Please refer to the Project VMT Assessment and EIR Section 4.2 Transportation.
Increase stringency of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (2035 targets).	CARB	<b>Consistent.</b> This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to Increase stringency of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (2035 targets).
By 2019, adjust performance measures used to select and design transportation facilities. Harmonize project performance with emissions reductions and increase competitiveness of transit and active transportation modes (e.g. via guideline documents, funding programs, project selection, etc.).	CalSTA, SGC, OPR, CARB, Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO- Biz), California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IBank), Department of Finance (DOF), California Transportation Commission (CTC), Caltrans	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to harmonize transportation facility project performance with emissions reductions and increase competitiveness of transit and active transportation modes.
By 2019, develop pricing policies to support low-GHG transportation (e.g. low-emission vehicle zones for heavy duty, road user, parking pricing, transit discounts).	CalSTA, Caltrans, CTC, OPR,	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to develop pricing policies to support low-GHG transportation.

Action	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Consistency
	SGC, CARB	
Implement California Sustainable Freight Acti	on Plan	l
Improve freight system efficiency.	CalSTA, CalEPA, CNRA,	<b>Consistent.</b> This measure would apply to all trucks accessing the Project site, this may include existing trucks or new trucks that are part of the statewide goods movement sector. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to Improve freight system efficiency.
Deploy over 100,000 freight vehicles and equipment capable of zero emission operation and maximize both zero and near-zero emission freight vehicles and equipment powered by renewable energy by 2030.	CARB, Caltrans, CEC, GO-Biz	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to deploy over 100,000 freight vehicles and equipment capable of zero emission operation and maximize both zero and near-zero emission freight vehicles and equipment powered by renewable energy by 2030.
Adopt a Low Carbon Fuel Standard with a Carbon Intensity reduction of 18 percent.	CARB	<b>Consistent.</b> When adopted, this measure would apply to all fuel purchased and used by the Project in the state. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to adopt a Low Carbon Fuel Standard with a Carbon Intensity reduction of 18 percent.
Implement the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant S	Strategy (SLPS) by 2030	
40 percent reduction in methane and hydrofluorocarbon emissions below 2013 levels.	CARB, CalRecycle, CDFA,	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would be required to comply with this measure and reduce any Project-source SLPS emissions accordingly. The Project would not obstruct or interfere
50 percent reduction in black carbon emissions below 2013 levels.	Local Air Districts	agency efforts to reduce SLPS emissions.
By 2019, develop regulations and programs to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383.	CARB, CalRecycle, CDFA SWRCB, Local Air Districts	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would implement waste reduction and recycling measures consistent with State and City requirements. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383.
Implement the post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program with declining annual caps.	CARB	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would be required to comply with any applicable Cap-and-Trade Program provisions. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to implement the post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program.

## By 2018, develop Integrated Natural and Working Lands Implementation Plan to secure California's land base as a net carbon sink

					CNRA,	Consistent. The Project site is designated for
Protect	land	from	conversion	through	Departments Within	industrial uses. The Project does not propose
conservo	ition ea	sements	and other inc	entives.	CDFA,	land conversion. The Project would not

Action	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	Consistency
	CalEPA, CARB	obstruct or interfere agency efforts to protect land from conversion through conservation easements and other incentives.
Increase the long-term resilience of carbon storage in the land base and enhance sequestration capacity		<b>Consistent.</b> The Project site is vacant disturbed property and does not comprise an area that would effectively provide for carbon sequestration. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to increase the long-term resilience of carbon storage in the land base and enhance sequestration capacity.
Utilize wood and agricultural products to increase the amount of carbon stored in the natural and built environments		<b>Consistent.</b> Where appropriate, Project designs would incorporate wood or wood products. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to encourage use of wood and agricultural products to increase the amount of carbon stored in the natural and built environments.
Establish scenario projections to serve as the foundation for the Implementation Plan		<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to establish scenario projections to serve as the foundation for the Implementation Plan.
Establish a carbon accounting framework for natural and working lands as described in SB 859 by 2018	CARB	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to establish a carbon accounting framework for natural and working lands as described in SB 859 by 2018.
Implement Forest Carbon Plan	CNRA, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), CalEPA and Departments Within	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to implement the Forest Carbon Plan.
Identify and expand funding and financing mechanisms to support GHG reductions across all sectors.	State Agencies & Local Agencies	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to identify and expand funding and financing mechanisms to support GHG reductions across all sectors.

Overall, the Project is consistent with AB 32 and SB 32 through implementation of measures that address GHG emissions related to building energy, solid waste management, wastewater, and water conveyance. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with the State's requirements for GHG reductions.

In addition, the City has identified the efficient use of energy resources as a goal it the General Plan Conservation Element. As detailed in Table 5.7-5 below, the Project would not conflict with the relevant General Plan goal and policies.

General Plan Goal/Policy	Consistency
<b>Goal 2.5:</b> Use of Energy Resources Goal – Encourage the Efficient Use of Energy Resources.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in previously, the proposed Project includes sustainable design features that promote energy efficiency and sustainability. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Goal 2.5.
<b>Policy 2.5.1a:</b> Encourage new construction and project design that uses, or takes advantage of renewable energy resources, including but not limited to solar energy design.	<b>Consistent.</b> While the Project currently does not include solar energy generation, the building roof structures would be designed to support solar panels in the future, consistent with Title 24 requirements. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 2.5.1a.
<b>Policy 2.5.1b:</b> Provide updated energy information documents for builders as needed to reflect the most recent Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and standards and other applicable new laws, requirements, and feasible building standards as may be available.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would comply with all CalGreen (Title 24) Building Codes relative to energy efficiency, which would be provided in Project construction and design documents and verified by the City during the building permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 2.5.1b.
<b>Policy 2.5.2f:</b> Support alternative modes of transportation as feasible including the equestrian trail system, public transportation, bicycles, etc. to reduce the demand on non-renewable energy resources	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , sidewalks would be installed on the western side of Pacific Avenue, along both sides of Palomino Way, and along Mountain Avenue within the Project area. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. These facilities would facilitate alternative transportation. In addition, the Corona Cruiser route runs adjacent to the south of the site and the RTA bus route is 0.25 mile from the Project site. The location of the Project facilitates use of these existing routes. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 2.5.2f.

Table 5.7-5: Pro	iect Consistenc	v with the Norco	<b>General Plan</b>	Conservation	<b>Element Policies</b>
		,	•••••••		

Overall, the proposed Project would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The Project would be implemented in compliance with state energy standards provided in Title 24, in addition to provision of sustainable design features. The Project would not interfere with the state's implementation of Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030; or Executive Order S-3-05's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 because it would be consistent with the CARB 2007 and 2017 Scoping Plans, which are intended to achieve the reduction targets required by the state. In addition, the Project would be consistent with the relevant City General Plan goal and policies. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and impacts would not occur.

## 5.7.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

GHG emissions impacts are assessed in a cumulative context, since no single project can cause a discernible change to climate. Climate change impacts are the result of incremental contributions from natural processes, and past and present human-related activities. Therefore, the area in which a proposed Project in combination with other past, present, or future projects, could contribute to a significant cumulative climate change impact would not be defined by a geographical boundary such as a project site or combination of sites, city or air basin. GHG emissions have high atmospheric lifetimes and can travel across the globe over a period of 50 to 100 years or more. Even though the emissions of GHGs cannot be defined by a geographic boundary and are effectively part of the global issue of climate change, CEQA places a boundary for the analysis of impacts at the state's borders. Thus, the geographic area for analysis of cumulative GHG emissions impacts is the State of California.

Executive Order S-3-05, Executive Order B-30-15, AB 32, and SB 32 recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions and recognizes the significance of the cumulative impact of GHG emissions from sources throughout the state and sets performance standards for reduction of GHGs.

The analysis of GHG emission impacts under CEQA contained in this EIR effectively constitutes an analysis of a project's contribution to the cumulative impact of GHG emissions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b) states that compliance with GHG related plans can support a determination that a project's cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable. As the Project would be implemented in compliance with applicable plans for the reduction of GHG emissions, detailed previously, the contribution of the Project to significant cumulative GHG impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable.

# 5.7.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

#### State

- Assembly Bill 1493 California Executive Order S-3-05
- Assembly Bill 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)
- Senate Bill 375
- California Executive Order B-30-15
- Senate Bill 32
- California Energy Code (Code of Regulations, Title 24 Part 6)
- California Green Building Standards Code

#### Local

Norco General Plan Conservation Element

## 5.7.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

As a result of compliance with existing regulatory requirements Impacts GHG-1 and GHG-2 would be less than significant.

## 5.7.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required. Additionally, more than 59 percent of the Project's GHG emissions would be from vehicular trips (mobile sources). There is no feasible mitigation available to the Lead Agency or Applicant to reduce GHG emissions from vehicles.

## 5.7.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to GHG emissions have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

### REFERENCES

Greenhouse Gas Analysis, prepared by Urban Crossroads (UC 2019).

## 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

## 5.8.1 INTRODUCTION

This section considers the nature and range of foreseeable hazardous materials and physical hazards/ impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed Project. It identifies the ways that hazardous materials and other types of hazards could expose people and the environment to various health and safety risks during construction activities and operation of proposed land uses.

This section also describes routine hazardous materials that are likely to be used, handled, or processed within the Project area, and the potential for upset and accident conditions in which hazardous materials could be released. The impact analysis identifies ways in which hazardous materials might be routinely used, stored, handled, processed, or transported, and evaluates the extent to which existing and future populations could be exposed to hazardous materials.

The term "hazardous material" is defined as any material that, because of quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment.<sup>1</sup>

The analysis in this section is based in part the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by Partner Engineering and Science in 2017 (Partner 2017) and the Phase I ESA prepared by Hillman Consulting in 2019 (Phase I 2019), provided in Appendix L of this EIR.

## 5.8.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### Hazardous Materials Management

The primary federal agencies responsible for hazardous materials management include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

#### Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

Federal hazardous waste regulations are generally promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Pursuant to RCRA, the USEPA regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste in a "cradle to grave" manner. RCRA was designed to protect human health and the environment, reduce/eliminate the generation of hazardous waste, and conserve energy and natural resources.

The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 both expanded the scope of RCRA and increased the level of detail in many of its provisions, reaffirming the regulation from generation to disposal and to prohibiting the use of certain techniques for hazardous waste disposal. The USEPA has largely delegated responsibility for implementing the RCRA program in California to the State, which implements this program through the California Hazardous Waste Control Law.

RCRA regulates landfill siting, design, operation, and closure (including identifying liner and capping requirements) for licensed landfills. In California, RCRA landfill requirements are delegated to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>State of California, Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95, Section 25501(o).

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), which is discussed in detail below.

RCRA allows the USEPA to oversee the closure and post-closure of landfills. Additionally, the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, 40 CFR Part 141, gives the USEPA the power to establish water quality standards and beneficial uses for waters from below- or above-ground sources of contamination. For the Project area, water quality standards are administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

RCRA also allows the USEPA to control risk to human health at contaminated sites. Vapor intrusion presents a significant risk to human populations overlying contaminated soil and groundwater and is considered when conducting human health risk assessments and developing Remedial Action Objectives.

#### **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970**

Federal and state occupational health and safety regulations also contain provisions regarding hazardous waste management through the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (amended), which is implemented by OSHA. Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations (29 CFR) requires special training of handlers of hazardous materials; notification to employees who work in the vicinity of hazardous materials; acquisition from the manufacturer of material safety data sheets (MSDS), which describe the proper use of hazardous materials; and training of employees to remediate any hazardous material accidental releases. OSHA regulates administration of 29 CFR.

OSHA also establishes standards regarding safe exposure limits for chemicals to which construction workers may be exposed. Safety and Health Regulations for Construction (29 CFR Part 1926.65 Appendix C) contains requirements for construction activities, which include occupational health and environmental controls to protect worker health and safety. The guidelines describe the health and safety plan(s) that must be developed and implemented during construction, including associated training, protective equipment, evacuation plans, chains of command, and emergency response procedures.

Adherence to applicable hazard-specific OSHA standards are required to maintain worker safety. For example, methane is regulated by OSHA under 29 CFR Part 1910.146 with regard to worker exposure to a "hazardous atmosphere" within confined spaces where the presence of flammable gas vapor or mist is in excess of 10 percent of the lower explosive limit. Title 49 of the CFR governs the manufacture of packaging and transport containers, packing and repacking, labeling, and the marking of hazardous material transport. Title 42, Part 82 governs solid waste disposal and resource recovery.

#### Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

The transportation of hazardous materials is regulated by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA), which is administered by the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT). The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act provides USDOT with a broad mandate to regulate the transport of hazardous materials, with the purpose of adequately protecting the nation against risk to life and property, which is inherent in the commercial transportation of hazardous materials. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act governs the safe transportation of hazardous materials by all modes, excluding bulk transportation by water. The Research and Special Programs Administration carries out these responsibilities by prescribing regulations and managing a userfunded grant program for planning and training grants for states and Indian tribes. USDOT regulations that govern the transported or shipped, or are involved in any way with the manufacture or testing of hazardous materials packaging or containers. USDOT regulations pertaining to the actual movement govern every aspect of the movement, including packaging, handling, labeling, marking, placarding, operational standards, and highway routing. Additionally, USDOT is responsible for developing curriculum

to train for emergency response and administers grants to states and Indian tribes for ensuring the proper training of emergency responders. Hazardous Materials Transportation Act was enacted in 1975 and was amended and reauthorized in 1990, 1994, and 2005.

#### Hazardous Materials Management and Waste Handling

In the regulation of hazardous waste management, California law often mirrors or is more stringent than federal law. The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) are the primary state agencies responsible for hazardous materials management. Additionally, the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) administers the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), which is a branch of CalEPA, regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal hazardous waste, as well as the investigation and remediation of hazardous waste sites. The California DTSC program incorporates the provisions of both federal (RCRA) and State hazardous waste laws.

Excavated soil containing hazardous substances and hazardous building materials would be classified as a hazardous waste if they exhibit the characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3). State and federal laws require detailed planning to ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled, used, stored, and disposed of, and in the event that such materials are accidentally released, to prevent or to mitigate injury to health or the environment. These laws and regulations are overseen by a variety of state and local agencies. The California Integrated Waste Management Board and the RWQCB specifically address management of hazardous materials and waste handling in their adopted regulations (CCR, Title 14 and CCR, Title 27).

In the City of Norco, the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health is designated as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) responsible for implementing the following program elements:

- Hazardous Materials Disclosure Programs;
- Business Emergency Plans;
- Underground Storage Tanks
- Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Program (Hazardous Materials Disclosure or "Community-Right-to Know");
- California Accidental Release Prevention Program (Cal ARP); and
- Uniform Fire Code Plans and Inventory Requirements.

The laws and regulations that established these programs require that businesses that use or store certain quantities of hazardous materials submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) that describes the hazardous materials usage, storage, and disposal to the local oversight agency (CUPA).

#### Hazardous Waste Control Act

The Hazardous Waste Control Act was passed in 1972 and established the California Hazardous Waste Control Program within the Department of Health Services. California's hazardous waste regulatory effort became the model for the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). California's program, however, was broader and more comprehensive than the federal system, regulating wastes and activities not covered by the federal program. California's Hazardous Waste Control Law was followed by emergency regulations in 1973 that clarified and defined the hazardous waste program, as follows:

- Included definitions of what was a waste and what was hazardous as well as what was necessary for appropriate handling, processing, and disposal of hazardous and extremely hazardous waste in a manner that would protect the public, livestock, and wildlife from hazards to health and safety.
- The early regulations also established a tracking system for the handling and transportation of hazardous waste from the point of waste generation to the point of ultimate disposition, as well as a system of fees to cover the costs of operating the hazardous waste management program.
- Advancing the newly developing awareness of hazardous waste management issues, the program established a technical reference center for public and private use dealing with all aspects of hazardous waste management.

#### California Government Code Section 65962.5 (a), Cortese List

The Hazardous Waste and Substance Sites List (Cortese List) is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List.

#### Hazardous Materials Business Plans

Article 1 of Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code (Sections 25500–25520) requires that any business that handles, stores, or disposes of a hazardous substance at a given threshold quantity must prepare a hazardous materials business plan (HMBP). HMBPs are intended to minimize hazards to human health and the environment from fires, explosions, or an unplanned release of hazardous substances into air, soil, or surface water. The HMBP must be carried out immediately whenever a fire, explosion, or unplanned chemical release occurs. An HMBP includes three sections: (1) an inventory of hazardous materials, including a site map, which details their location; (2) an emergency response plan; and (3) an employee-training program. HMBPs serve as an aid to employers and employees in managing emergencies at a given facility. They also help better prepare emergency response personnel for handling a wide range of emergencies that might occur at the facility.

HMBPs are submitted to the State Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division. The plans must be resubmitted, reviewed, revised, or amended as necessary every 3 years. The HMBP must also be amended within 30 days whenever there are changes in the amount or location of stored hazardous chemicals on a site. The Hazardous Materials Division conducts routine inspections at businesses required to submit business plans. The purpose of these inspections is to (1) ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations concerning HMBP requirements, (2) identify existing safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release, and (3) suggest preventative measures designed to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous materials. After initial submission of an HMBP, the business must review and recertify the HMBP every year.

#### **Risk Management Plans**

Article 2 of Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code (Sections 25531–25543.3) requires the owner or operator of a stationary source (non-transportation), with more than a threshold quantity of a regulated substance, to prepare a risk management plan. The state statutes and regulations combine

federal and state program requirements for the prevention of accidental releases of listed substances into the atmosphere, which is called the CalARP program. CalARP requires that a risk management plan include a hazard assessment program, an accidental release prevention program, and an emergency response plan. The risk management plan must be revised every 5 years or as necessary. Typical facilities or businesses that are required to prepare risk management plans include: ammonia refrigeration facilities and facilities that store flammable chemicals such as fuel and propane.

#### Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and Hazardous Waste Control Law, Chapter 6.5

The Department of Toxic Substances Control regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste under RCRA and the California Hazardous Waste Control Law. Both laws impose "cradle-to-grave" regulatory systems for handling hazardous waste in a manner that protects human health and the environment. CalEPA has delegated some of its authority under the Hazardous Waste Control Law to county health departments and other Certified Unified Program Agencies.

#### Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations, Underground Storage Tank Regulations

The Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 regulations are intended to protect waters of the state from discharges of hazardous substances from underground storage tanks. These regulations establish construction requirements for new underground storage tanks; establish separate monitoring requirements for new and existing underground storage tanks; establish uniform requirements for unauthorized release reporting, and for repair, upgrade, and closure of underground storage tanks.

#### Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, Solid Waste

Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations contains a waste classification system that applies to solid wastes that cannot be discharged directly or indirectly to waters of the State and which therefore must be discharged to waste management sites for treatment, storage, or disposal. CalRecycle and its certified Local Enforcement Agency regulate the operation, inspection, permitting, and oversight of maintenance activities at active and closed solid waste management sites and operations.

#### **California Human Health Screening Levels**

The California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs or "Chisels") are concentrations of 54 hazardous chemicals in soil or soil gas that CalEPA considers to be below thresholds of concern for risks to human health. The CHHSLs were developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of CalEPA. The CHHSLs were developed using standard exposure assumptions and chemical toxicity values published by the EPA and CalEPA. The CHHSLs can be used to screen sites for potential human health concerns where releases of hazardous chemicals to soils have occurred. Under most circumstances, the presence of a chemical in soil, soil gas, or indoor air at concentrations below the corresponding CHHSL can be assumed to not pose a significant health risk to people who may live or work at the site. There are separate CHHSLs for residential and commercial/industrial sites.

#### Accidental Release Prevention Law/CalARP

The CalARP program (CCR Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5) covers certain businesses that store or handle more than a certain volume of specific regulated substances. CalARP defines regulated substances as chemicals that pose a threat to public health and safety or the environment because they are highly toxic, flammable, or explosive. A list of regulated substances is provided in Article 8, Section 2770.5 of the CalARP program regulations. The businesses that use or handle potentially harmful quantities of a regulated substance must implement an accidental release prevention program and may be required to complete a Risk Management Plan (RMP). An RMP is a detailed engineering analysis of the potential

accident factors present at a business and the mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce this accident potential. The purpose of an RMP is to decrease the risk of release of a regulated substance that might harm the environment and community. An RMP includes safety information, hazard review, operating procedures, training, maintenance, compliance audits, and incident investigation. In addition, the RMP is required to consider proximate sensitive populations, such as residential areas and schools.

#### Occupational Safety: Title 8 – CalOSHA

CalOSHA administers federal occupational safety requirements and additional state requirements in accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 8. CalOSHA requires preparation of an Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP), which is an employee safety program of inspections, procedures to correct unsafe conditions, employee training, and occupational safety communication. This program is administered via inspections by the local CalOSHA enforcement unit.

CalOSHA regulates lead exposure during construction activities under CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1, Lead, which establishes the rules and procedures for conducting demolition and construction activities such that worker exposure to lead contamination is minimized or avoided.

Compliance with CalOSHA regulations and associated programs would be required for the proposed Project due to the potential hazards posed by onsite construction activities and contamination from former uses.

#### **Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents**

California has developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local government, and private agencies. The plan is administered by the California Emergency Management Agency and includes response to hazardous materials incidents. The California Emergency Management Agency coordinates the response of other agencies, including CalEPA, California Highway Patrol, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, South Coast Air Quality Management District, County Fire Department, and the County Health Department.

#### South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 461

SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Storage and Dispensing, governs the transfer of gasoline from any truck or trailer into a storage tank and the transfer of gasoline from the storage tank into a vehicle fuel tank. This includes regulations related to equipment and operations, such as requiring California Air Resource Board (CARB) certified enhanced vapor recovery systems, testing and reporting, and maintenance and inspection protocols.

#### South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403

SCAQMD Rule 1403 governs the demolition of buildings containing asbestos materials. Rule 1403 specifies work practices to minimize asbestos emissions during building demolition and renovation activities, including the removal and associated disturbance of asbestos containing materials. The requirements for demolition and renovation activities include asbestos surveying, notification, asbestos containing materials removal procedures and time schedules, handling and cleanup procedures, storage, and disposal requirements for asbestos containing waste materials.

#### California Emergency Services Act

The California Emergency Services Act (Government Code Section 8550 et seq.) was adopted to establish the State's roles and responsibilities during human-made or natural emergencies that result in conditions of

disaster and/or extreme peril to life, property, or the resources of the State. This act is intended to protect health and safety by preserving the lives and property of the people of the State.

#### **Emergency Response**

The City of Norco contracts with the County of Riverside Fire and Sheriff Departments for coordination of emergency response to the City. The Standardized Emergency Management System is required under Government Code Section 8607(a) for managing responses to multiagency and multi-jurisdiction emergencies in the State. The Standardized Emergency Management System was established to standardize key elements of the emergency management system, so that mobilization, deployment, utilization, tracking, and demobilization of mutual aid resources are implemented effectively. Mutual aid is voluntary aid and assistance by the provision of services and facilities, including fire, sheriff, medical, health, communication, transportation, and utilities.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following goal and policies contained in the Safety Element are relevant to the proposed Project:

**Goal 2.8:** Protect life and property from adverse risk from the transporting, storage, treating, and disposing of hazardous materials and waste materials within the City.

**Policy 2.8.1 a.** For businesses or individuals involved in the use of hazardous materials require proof of compliance with all jurisdictional agencies (federal, state, and local) prior to issuance or renewal of a business license.

**Policy 2.8.1 b.** When determined feasible and/or necessary by the Fire Department require established routes of transport or disposal of hazardous materials to avoid potential impact to sensitive land uses from materials being routinely transported.

### 5.8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project area has historically been, and is currently, used for a variety of uses including agricultural operations, residential, and a Hidden Villa Ranch distribution facility. In addition, the Project site includes vacant unpaved land and former chicken raising areas with concrete pads. Onsite operations consist of residential and farm/ranch activities; as well as receiving, cleaning, inspecting, repackaging and distribution of fresh eggs, cleaning of egg liquid containers, distribution of dairy products and typical residential, rural residential, animal care (stables, kennels, and poultry) activities. Hidden Villa Ranch also performs limited fueling and vehicle repair activities for its fleet of delivery trucks and trailers. Due to the existing and historic uses of the site, there are several areas of potential concern related to existing hazardous materials onsite that are described below.

Recent operations at the Hidden Villa Ranch facility includes: receiving, cleaning, inspecting, repackaging, and distribution of fresh eggs, and distribution of dairy products. In addition, Hidden Villa Ranch performs limited fueling and vehicle repair activities for its fleet of delivery trucks and trailers.

Historically the Hidden Villa Ranch area of the Project site was the Norco Egg Ranch, which housed one million hens and processed 540,000 eggs per day. The main hazard concern from the previous egg ranch uses is related to discharged wastewater from egg washing operations and dumping of wastes including feathers, bones, and wastewater from processing and from egg washing and separating activities (Partner 2017). Prior to 1980, the wastewater was discharged to groundwater surface to percolate and to an onsite septic system with an underground tank and leaching field, which was removed in 2011. Soil and

groundwater testing occurred in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2011. The results of the testing did not identify hazardous materials that would pose an environmental or public health concern (Partner 2017).

The Phase I ESA describes that the southern portion of the Project site appears to have been utilized as a junkyard from circa 1948 to circa 1975. As a result, there is the potential for undocumented spills and releases to have occurred during the operation of the junkyard (Phase I 2019).

#### **Underground Storage Tanks**

The Project site historically operated five onsite USTs, which were previously excavated and removed. After their removal soil and groundwater sampling was conducted in 2011, which did not reveal any evidence of releases from the USTs and a closure letter was issued by Riverside County Department of Environmental Health. Based on the removal of the tanks, the analytical results, and the regulatory closure, the areas where the former USTs existed does not contain hazardous materials that could result an impact (Partner 2017).

The Project site currently has two 20,000-gallon USTs and one 10,000-gallon UST installed that contain diesel fuel. The USTs are located to the northwest of the Hidden Villa Ranch facility and were installed in 1999 and 1993. Soil borings were advanced in the area around the existing USTs in 2011 and groundwater samples were collected which did not identify any hazardous leaks. In addition, tank integrity testing completed in November of 2016 indicates the USTs remain sealed (Partner 2017).

#### Asbestos

Asbestos is a naturally-occurring fibrous material that was used as a fireproofing and insulating agent in building construction before such uses were banned by the USEPA in the 1970s, although some nonfriable<sup>2</sup> use of asbestos in roofing materials still exists. The presence of asbestos can be found in materials such as ducting insulation, wallboard, shingles, ceiling tiles, floor tiles, insulation, plaster, floor backing, and many other building materials. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulation 29 CFR 1926.1101 requires certain construction materials to be presumed to contain asbestos, for purposes of this regulation. All thermal system insulation), surfacing material, and asphalt/vinyl flooring that are present in a building constructed prior to 1981 and have not been appropriately tested are "presumed asbestos-containing material".

Asbestos and asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) are considered both a hazardous air pollutant and a human health hazard. The risk to human health is from inhalation of airborne asbestos, which commonly occurs when ACMs are disturbed during such activities as demolition and renovation. The buildings within the Project site were constructed from the 1920s through the 1980s when asbestos containing materials were commonly used and the Phase I identified suspected asbestos containing material throughout the Hidden Villa Ranch facility.

#### Lead

In 1978, the Consumer Product Safety Commission set the allowable lead levels in paint at 0.06 percent by weight in a dry film of newly applied paint. In the 1970s, the chief concern for lead-based paint was its cumulative effect on body systems, primarily when paint chips containing lead were ingested by children. Research in the early 1980s showed that lead dust is of special concern because the smaller particles are more easily absorbed by the body. Common methods of paint removal, such as sanding, scraping, and burning, create excessive amounts of dust. Lead dust is especially hazardous to young children because they play on the floor and engage in a great deal of hand-to-mouth activity, increasing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Nonfriable asbestos refers to ACMs that contain asbestos fibers in a solid matrix that does not allow for them to be easily released.

their potential for exposure. Lead-based paints were commonly used in buildings built prior to 1970s; thus, due to the age of the onsite buildings, it is possible that lead-based paint and other lead containing materials are present in the buildings on the Project site.

## 5.8.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- HAZ-1 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials;
- HAZ-2 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- HAZ-3 Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school;
- HAZ-4 Be located on a site that 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;
- HAZ-5 Result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, be within 2 miles of a public airport use airport or public use airport;
- HAZ-6 Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- HAZ-7 Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in no impact related to Thresholds HAZ-5 and HAZ-7; no further assessment of these impacts is required in this EIR.

## 5.8.5 METHODOLOGY

This evaluation of the significance of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials considers both direct effects to the resource and indirect effects in a local or regional context. Potentially significant impacts would generally result in the loss or degradation of public health and safety or conflict with local, state, or federal agency regulations. Information for this section was obtained, in part, from the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Partner 2017), which was prepared in accordance with the Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments. In addition, the Phase I ESAs include review of regulatory agency databases for the Project site and surrounding areas.

### 5.8.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT HAZ-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

The proposed construction activities would involve the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, oils, grease, and caulking during construction activities. In addition, hazardous materials would routinely be needed for fueling and servicing construction equipment on the site. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are regulated by federal and state regulations that are implemented by the City of Norco during building permitting for construction activities. As a result, hazardous material impacts related to construction materials would be less than significant.

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment determined that asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint may exist due to the date of construction of the existing buildings. Therefore, asbestos surveys and abatement would be required prior to demolition or renovation of the existing building pursuant to the existing South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Cal/OSHA, and the sections of the California Health and Safety Code, which are described above in the Regulatory Setting. These requirements were developed to protect human health and the environment from the hazards associated with exposure to lead based materials and airborne asbestos fibers. Compliance with these existing regulations, as ensured through the permitting process and included as PPP HAZ-1 and PPP HAZ-2, would reduce impacts related to routine transport and disposal of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint during construction activities to a less than significant level.

#### Operation

**Business Park.** The future building occupants of the business park are not yet identified. Future uses on-site are assumed to be any of those uses permitted by the Industrial and Commercial Gateway Specific Plan District designations.

The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Industrial District is intended to facilitate the economic development of the City by creating an expanded employment base. The District provides or the development of light industrial land uses, which generally include research and development facilities, light manufacturing activities, wholesaling, with related office and administrative functions. The Specific Plan states that the Commercial District is intended to facilitate development of underutilized and vacant parcels of land in a way that will contribute to the economic development of the City. Thus, a variety of uses would be accommodated within the proposed buildings.

Hazardous materials commonly associated with industrial, commercial, and office uses include industrial cleaning, janitorial products, solvents paints, pesticides, batteries, and aerosol cans. Although the Project would utilize common types of hazardous materials, normal routine use of these products pursuant to existing regulations would not result in a significant hazard to residents or workers in the vicinity of the Project.

Additionally, federal and state laws and regulations are in place that require businesses to plan and prepare for possible hazardous materials spills, releases, or emergencies. Any business that occupies a building within the Project that handles, stores, transports, or disposes of a substantial amount of hazardous materials or acute hazardous materials would require a permit from the Riverside Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. Such businesses also are required to comply with California's Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law, which requires immediate reporting to the Riverside County Fire Department and the state Office of Emergency Services regarding any release or threatened release of a hazardous material, regardless of the amount handled by the business, and prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan that would provide a written set of procedures and information created to limit the effects and extent of a potential release of a hazardous material.

**Gas Station.** The Project includes development and operation of a gas station that would include underground storage tanks (USTs) for gasoline storage and dispensing. The gasoline USTs would consist of double walled, fiberglass fuel storage tanks with leak detection sensors. A California Water Resources Control Board permit to operate the UST system is required per California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, which also mandates testing and frequent inspections of the USTs, in addition to providing emergency response procedures to be followed should an unauthorized release occur from a UST.

Additionally, gas stations are required by the SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Storage and Dispensing, to include an enhanced vapor recovery and diagnostic system to collect and store gasoline vapors during deliveries and vehicle dispensing. Fuel dispensing systems are required to include dripless nozzles that seal to the vehicle during filling. A vacuum system forces the vapors created by the vehicle filling back to the UST. The storage tank is vented by a mechanical filtration system that scrubs and neutralizes the vapors before their release.

Similarly, during gasoline deliveries operations, the delivery truck's filling tubes are sealed to the storage tank and all vapors are returned to the UST. This process stems the release of vapors. The vapors created by the filling operation are then subject to mechanical scrubbing and neutralization prior to release. The final component of the vapor recovery process is the diagnostic system. This electronic system provides 24-hour monitoring of the vapor recovery system, including collection of vapors during fueling operations and assurances that vapors in the UST are not leaking. The system identifies failures automatically, notifies the station operator, and reduces emissions by early detection and prompt repair.

The Project would be required to comply with the provisions established by Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 related to USTs and SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Storage and Dispensing (included as PPP HAZ-3) related to gas station operations, the California Safety and Health Code Regulations, the California Fire Code; Hazardous Materials Transportation Act requirements; and the Riverside County Fire and Environmental Health Departments requirements. Collectively, the routine inspection of the gas station, the USTs, and all associated fuel delivery infrastructure, along with the continued mandated compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations, would ensure that the gas station proposed as part of the Project is operated in a non-hazardous manner and that impacts would be less than significant.

Overall, compliance with existing regulations related to hazardous materials, which would be implemented during the City's permitting review, would reduce the potential of Project operations to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, to a less than significant level.

#### IMPACT HAZ-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH REASONABLY FORESEEABLE UPSET OR ACCIDENT CONDITIONS INVOLVING THE RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Accidental Releases. While the routine use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials in accordance with applicable regulations during demolition, excavation, grading, and construction activities would not pose health risks or result in significant impacts; improper use, storage, transportation and

disposal of hazardous materials and wastes could result in accidental spills or releases, posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. Thus, implementation of the proposed Project could potentially result in the accidental release of hazardous materials. The use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit (and included as PPP WQ-1) would minimize potential adverse effects to workers, the public, and the environment. Construction contract specifications would include strict on-site handling rules and BMPs that include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a dedicated area for fuel storage and refueling activities that includes secondary containment protection measures and spill control supplies;
- Following manufacturers' recommendations on the use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- Avoiding overtopping construction equipment fuel tanks;
- Properly containing and removing grease and oils during routine maintenance of equipment; and
- Properly disposing of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

**Underground Storage Tanks.** As described previously, the Project site contains two 20,000-gallon USTs and one 10,000-gallon UST that are used for diesel fuel. The USTs are located to the northwest of the Hidden Villa Ranch facility. Implementation of the proposed Project would require removal and disposal of these USTs. The Hazardous Materials Management Branch of the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health regulates and oversees the removal of UST systems through a plan check and permit process that requires approval of a work plan for removal of the USTs. In addition, contractors who remove USTs and piping are required to have a Hazardous Substance Certification to ensure appropriate training related to hazardous materials.

All potentially hazardous materials are required to be removed and handled according to the provisions of Title 22, Chapter 6.5 of the California Code of Regulations. In addition, soil sampling and testing of the UST sites is required to occur in accordance with Article 5 of the California Underground Storage Tank Regulations within Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, California Code of Regulations. All of the existing requirements related to UST removals are listed in the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health Underground Storage Tank Guidelines and are implemented through a work plan that is required for receipt of permits, included as PPP HAZ-4. The required work plan details compliance with existing regulations and the process for handling, testing, and disposal of the USTs and any related hazardous materials pursuant to the applicable regulations. Compliance with these existing regulations, as implemented through the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health permitting process and included as PPP HAZ-4 would ensure that the Project applicant/proponent submits verification to the City that the appropriate activities related to removal of the USTs have occurred, which would reduce the potential of upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials from the USTs to a less than significant level.

Asbestos Containing Materials. Buildings in the Project area date back to a period when many structures were constructed with what are now recognized as hazardous building materials, such as lead and asbestos. Demolition of these older structures could result in the release of hazardous materials. However, asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in California Code of Regulations Sections 1529, and 341.6 through 341.14 as implemented by SCAQMD Rule 1403 to ensure that asbestos removed during demolition or redevelopment of the existing buildings is transported and disposed of at an appropriate facility. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a Hazardous Waste Manifest which details the hauling of the material from the site and the disposal of it. Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requires that local agencies not issue demolition permit until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under

applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. These requirements are included as PPP HAZ-1 to ensure that the Project applicant submits verification to the City that the appropriate activities related to asbestos have occurred, which would reduce the potential of impacts related to asbestos to a less than significant level.

Lead Based Materials. Lead-based materials may also be located within existing structures in the Project area. The lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provide regulations related to the handling and disposal of lead-based products. Federal regulations to manage and control exposure to lead-based paint are described in Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1926.62, and state regulations related to lead are provided in the California Code of Regulations Title 8 Section 1532.1, as implemented by Cal-OSHA. These regulations cover the demolition, removal, cleanup, transportation, storage and disposal of lead-containing material. The regulations outline the permissible exposure limit, protective measures, monitoring and compliance to ensure the safety of construction workers exposed to lead-based materials. Cal/OSHA's Lead in Construction Standard requires project applicants to develop and implement a lead compliance plan when lead-based paint would be disturbed during construction or demolition activities. The plan must describe activities that could emit lead, methods for complying with the standard, safe work practices, and a plan to protect workers from exposure to lead during construction activities. In addition, Cal/OSHA requires 24-hour notification if more than 100 square feet of lead-based paint would be disturbed. These requirements are included as PPP HAZ-2 to ensure that the Project applicant submits verification to the City that the appropriate activities related to lead have occurred, which would reduce the potential of impacts related to leadbased materials to a less than significant level.

**Undocumented Hazardous Materials.** As described previously, the Project site has a long history of various uses that include storage and utilization of hazardous materials. In addition, the Phase I ESA describes that the southern portion of the Project site appears to have been utilized as a junkyard from circa 1948 to circa 1975 (Phase I 2019). As a result, there is the potential for undocumented spills and releases to have occurred during the operation of the previous uses, including the junkyard. However, the existing federal and state regulations related to hazardous materials and construction includes procedures to follow in the case hazardous materials are uncovered during construction activities.

Excavated soil containing hazardous substances and hazardous building materials would be classified as a hazardous waste if they exhibit the characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3). State and federal laws require detailed planning to ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled, used, stored, and disposed of, and in the event that such materials are accidentally released, to prevent or to mitigate injury to health or the environment. These regulations are detailed previously and include, but are not limited to, the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the Occupational Safety and Health Act that is implemented by OSHA, and the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act. Additionally, the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the RWQCB specifically address management of hazardous materials and waste handling in their adopted regulations (CCR, Title 14 and CCR, Title 27). Thus, with implementation of existing regulations, impacts related to excavation including hazardous substances and materials would be less than significant.

#### Operation

As described above, the risks related to upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be adequately addressed through compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations. Development under the proposed Project would involve light industrial, warehousing/distribution, commercial, and office uses that would use and store common hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, and cleaning products. Also, building mechanical systems and grounds

and landscape maintenance could also use a variety of products formulated with hazardous materials, including fuels, cleaners, lubricants, adhesives, sealers, and pesticides/herbicides. In addition, gas station is proposed, which would store gasoline within USTs.

The environmental and health effects of different chemicals are unique to each chemical and depend on the extent to which an individual is exposed. The extent and exposure of individuals to hazardous materials would be limited by the relatively small quantities of these materials that would be stored, used, and handled. Additionally, any business or facility which uses, generates, processes, produces, packages, treats, stores, emits, discharges, or disposes of hazardous material (or waste) would require a hazardous materials handler permit from the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health and would be required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan to minimize the effects and extent of a potential release of a hazardous material. Similarly, the proposed gas station would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 461 (included as PPP HAZ-3) that requires gas stations to have CARB certified enhanced vapor recovery systems, testing and reporting, and routine maintenance and inspection protocols.

Through existing City and County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health permitting and occupancy procedures, hazardous materials would be used and stored in accordance with applicable regulations and such uses would be required to comply with federal and state laws to reduce the potential consequences of hazardous materials accidents. In addition, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required to be implemented for the Project (as further discussed in Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality and included as PPP WQ-2) The BMPs that would be implemented as part of the WQMP would protect human health and the environment should any accidental spills or releases of hazardous materials occur during operation of the Project.

As a result, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in 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, and impacts would be less than significant.

# IMPACT HAZ-3:THE PROJECT WOULD NOT EMIT HAZARDOUS EMISSIONS OR HANDLE<br/>HAZARDOUS OR ACUTELY HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUBSTANCES OR<br/>WASTE WITHIN 0.25 MILE OF AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL.

**Less than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located 0.14 mile east of three schools: George Washington Elementary, Victress Bower Elementary, and Auburndale Intermediate School are all located across Parkridge Avenue, west of the Project site.

#### Construction

As described in the previous responses, Project construction would involve the use and disposal of various hazardous materials. However, all storage, handling, use, and disposal of these materials are regulated by federal and state regulations that are implemented by the City of Norco during construction permitting, such as those included as PPP HAZ-1 through PPP HAZ-4. In addition, the hazardous materials would travel to and from the site from the I-15 freeway, via Second Street, which is to the east of the Project site and the opposite direction of the school facilities. Thus, the hazardous materials handled during construction of the Project would not travel past the school facilities and potential impacts to the schools related to transport of hazardous materials would not occur.

#### Operation

As described in the previous response to Impact HAZ-1, the future building occupants of the business park are not yet identified. However, the common types of hazardous materials that may be used are regulated by existing federal and state regulations related to use and disposal. Additionally, federal and state laws and regulations are in place that require businesses to plan and prepare for possible hazardous materials spills, releases, or emergencies. Any business that handles, stores, transports, or disposes of substantial amounts or acute hazardous materials would require a permit from the Riverside Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch and to implement a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan. Overall, compliance with existing regulations related to hazardous materials, which would be implemented during the City's permitting review, would reduce the potential of Project operations to pose a hazard to nearby schools to a less than significant level.

In addition, any hazardous materials that are needed or transported for operation of the Project would travel to and from the site from the I-15 freeway, via Second Street, which is to the east of the Project site and the opposite direction of the school facilities. Thus, the hazardous materials would not travel past the school facilities. Overall, potential impacts to schools from hazardous materials handled during Project operations would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT HAZ-4: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT BE LOCATED ON A SITE THAT 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.

**No Impact.** The Phase I Environmental Site Assessments that was conducted database searches to determine if the Project area or any nearby properties are identified as currently having hazardous materials. The record searches determined that although the site has a history of various uses the Project area is not located on or near by a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites (Partner 2017).

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment did not identify any nearby or surrounding area sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and as a result, impacts related to hazards from being located on or adjacent to a hazardous materials site would not occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### IMPACT HAZ-6: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT IMPAIR IMPLEMENTATION OF, OR PHYSICALLY INTERFERE WITH, AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN OR EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN.

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City of Norco through contract with the City of Riverside Fire and Sheriff Departments are responsible for coordination of emergency response to the Project area. Additionally, the City has adopted a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) in March 2017 that includes mitigation strategies to limit the loss of life and property during emergencies.

#### Construction

The proposed construction activities, including equipment and supply staging and storage, would occur within and adjacent to the Project area and would not restrict access of emergency vehicles to the Project site or adjacent areas. As provided in the Project Description, construction of the proposed Project would include half-width improvements along the roadways adjacent to the Project site that would require the temporary closure of travel lanes, but full roadway closure and traffic detours are not expected to be necessary. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate measures to facilitate the safe passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required temporary road restrictions in accordance with the requirements in the International Fire Code and Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9), which

requires that prior to any activity that would encroach into a right-of-way, the area of encroachment be safeguarded through the installation of safety devices that would be specified by the City's Building and Safety Division during the construction permitting process to ensure that construction activities would not physically interfere with emergency access in the site vicinity or implementation of the Norco LHMP. Implementation of the Project through the City's permitting process would reduce potential construction related physical interference impacts to emergency access to a less than significant level.

#### Operation

The Project would include at least 10 driveways to provide vehicular access to the site. Five driveways would provide access to the eastern portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, at least 3 driveways would provide access to the western portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, and 2 driveways would provide access to the site from First Street. As described in Section 5.13, *Traffic and Circulation*, these driveways would provide adequate and safe circulation to, from, and through the Project site and would provide a variety of routes for emergency responders to access the Project site and surrounding areas.

During operation of the Project, building tenants would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required and verified by the City and the Riverside Fire Department. Because the Project is required to comply with all applicable City codes, as verified by the City and Fire Department, potential impacts related to emergency evacuation or emergency response plans would be less than significant.

## 5.8.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative land use changes within the City would have the potential to expose future area residents, employees, and visitors to chemical hazards through redevelopment of sites and structures that may be contaminated from either historic or ongoing uses. The severity of potential hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. All hazardous materials users and transporters, as well as hazardous waste generators and disposers are subject to regulations that require proper transport, handling, use, storage, and disposal of such materials to ensure public safety. Thus, if hazardous materials are found to be present on present or future project sites appropriate remediation activities would be required pursuant to standard federal, state, and regional regulations. Compliance with the relevant federal, state, and local regulations during the construction and operation of related projects would ensure that cumulative impacts from hazardous materials would be less than significant.

# 5.8.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

#### Federal

- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 42, Sections 9601 et seq.: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act and Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 42, Sections 6901 et seq.: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 42, Sections 11001 et seq.: Emergency Planning & Community Right to Know Act
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Parts 101 et seq.: Regulations implementing the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 49 Sections 5101 et seq.)
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 15, Sections 2601 et seq.: Toxic Substances Control Act
- US Environmental Protection Agency Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act, 40 United States Code of Regulations Section 763

#### State

- California Health and Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and 19 California Code of Regulations Section 2729: Business Emergency Plans and chemical inventory reporting
- California Occupational Safety and Health Administration Regulation 29, CFR Standard 1926.62
- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 2: California Building Code
- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 9: California Fire Code
- California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1532.1, Lead in Construction Standard
- California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1529: Asbestos
- Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1: Lead

#### Regional

- South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403: Asbestos
- South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 461: Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing

#### Plans, Program and Policies (PPPs) and Standard Conditions

The following Plans, Programs, and Policies (PPP) related to hazards and hazardous materials are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program:

**PPP HAZ-1: SCAQMD Rule 1403.** Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project applicant shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that an asbestos survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If asbestos is found, the Project applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule (SCAQMD) 1403. Rule 1403 regulations require that the following actions be taken: notification of SCAQMD prior to construction activity, asbestos removal in accordance with prescribed procedures, placement of collected asbestos in leak-tight containers or wrapping, and proper disposal.

**PPP HAZ-2: Lead.** Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project applicant shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that a lead-based paint survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the Project site. If lead-based paint is found, the Project applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations for proper removal and disposal of the lead-based paint. Cal-OSHA has established limits of exposure to lead contained in dusts and fumes. Specifically, CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1 provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, and respiratory protection, and mandates good working practices by workers exposed to lead.

**PPP HAZ-3: SCAQMD Rule 461.** Prior to issuance of operational permits for the gas station facility, the Project applicant or proponent shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 461 has occurred. been conducted at

all existing buildings located on the Project site. Rule 461 regulations require gas station facilities to have California Air Resource Board (CARB) certified enhanced vapor recovery systems, testing and reporting, and routine maintenance and inspection protocols.

**PPP HAZ-4: USTs.** Prior to issuance of grading permits or permits related to removal of the existing diesel Underground Storage Tanks (USTs), the Project applicant or proponent shall submit verification to the City Building and Safety Division that compliance with existing regulations, as implemented through the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health permitting process has occurred. This includes development of a work plan for removal of the existing diesel USTs and soil sampling and testing of the UST sites in accordance with Article 5 of the California Underground Storage Tank Regulations within Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16, California Code of Regulations.

**PPP WQ-1: NPDES/SWPPP.** Prior to issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the applicant shall provide the City Building and Safety Division evidence of compliance with the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or larger. The Project applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

**PPP WQ-2: WQMP.** Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the City Building and Safety Division. The WQMP shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design. Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.

## 5.8.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3, HAZ-4, and HAZ-6 would be less than significant.

## 5.8.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

## 5.8.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Compliance with existing regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts associated with potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would occur.

### REFERENCES

Air Quality Management District Rule 461. Accessed at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-461.pdf

City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan. Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/planning/plans/gateway.asp County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health Underground Storage Tanks. Accessed at: http://www.rivcoeh.org/HazMat/ust

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, 2017. Prepared by Partner Engineering and Science (Partner 2017).

Phase | Environmental Site Assessment Report, 2019. Prepared by Hillman Consulting (Phase | 2019).

This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

## 5.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing hydrology and water quality conditions and potential impacts from implementation of the Project. The analysis in this section is based in part on the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared by Charles Marr Consulting in 2019 (WSA 2019), included as Appendix M, and a Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Michael Baker International in 2019 (WQMP 2019) included as Appendix N.

## 5.9.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) established the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into "waters of the U.S." The Act specifies a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. Key components of the Clean Water Act that are relevant to the proposed Specific Plan are:

- Sections 303 and 304, which provide for water quality standards, criteria, and guidelines. Section 303(d) requires the state to develop lists of water bodies that do not attain water quality objectives (are impaired) after implementation of required levels of treatment by point-source dischargers (municipalities and industries). Section 303(d) also requires that the state develop a Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for each of the listed pollutants. The TMDL is the amount of pollutant loading that the water body can receive and still be in compliance with water quality objectives. After implementation of the TMDL, it is anticipated that the contamination that led to the 303(d) listing would be remediated. Preparation and management of the Section 303(d) list is administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs).
- Section 401 requires activities that may result in a discharge to a federal water body to obtain a water quality certification to ensure that the proposed activity would comply with applicable water quality standards.
- Section 402 regulates point- and nonpoint-source discharges to surface waters through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) oversees the NPDES program, which is administered by the local RWQCBs. The NPDES program provides both general permits (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual permits.

#### National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

The NPDES permit program under the Clean Water Act controls water pollution by regulating point- and nonpoint-sources that discharge pollutants into "waters of the U.S." California has an approved state NPDES program. The USEPA has delegated authority for NPDES permitting to the SWRCB, which has nine regional boards. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality in the Norco area. Discharge of stormwater runoff from construction areas of one acre or more requires either an individual permit issued by the RWQCB or coverage under the statewide Construction General Stormwater Permit for stormwater discharges (discussed below). Specific industries and public facilities,

including wastewater treatment plants that have direct stormwater discharges to navigable waters, are also required to obtain either an individual permit or obtain coverage under the statewide General Industrial Stormwater Permit.

#### Porter-Cologne Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969, codified as Division 7 of the California Water Code, authorizes the SWRCB to provide comprehensive protection for California's waters through water allocation and water quality protection. The SWRCB implements the requirement of CWA Section 303, establishing that water quality standards have to be set for certain waters by adopting water quality control plans under the Porter-Cologne Act. The Porter-Cologne Act establishes the responsibilities and authorities of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards, including preparing water quality plans for areas in the region, and identifying water quality objectives and waste discharge requirements (WDRs). Water quality objectives are defined as limits or levels of water quality constituents and characteristics established for reasonable protection of beneficial uses or prevention of nuisance. Beneficial uses consist of all the various ways that water can be used for the benefit of people and/or wildlife. The Porter-Cologne Act has been amended to provide the authority delegated from the EPA to issue NPDES permits regulating discharges to surface waters of the U.S.

The City of Norco is in the Santa Ana River Basin, Region 8, in the Upper Santa Ana Watershed. The Water Quality Control Plan for this region was adopted in 1995. This Basin Plan gives direction on the beneficial uses of the state waters within Region 8, describes the water quality that must be maintained to support such uses, and provides programs, projects, and other actions necessary to achieve the established standards.

#### California Anti-Degradation Policy

A key policy of California's water quality program is the State's Anti-Degradation Policy. This policy, formally known as the Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California (SWRCB Resolution No. 68-16), restricts degradation of surface and ground waters. In particular, this policy protects water bodies where existing quality is higher than necessary for the protection of beneficial uses. Under the Anti-Degradation Policy, any actions that can adversely affect water quality in all surface and ground waters must (1) be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state; (2) not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of the water; and (3) not result in water quality less than that prescribed in water quality plans and policies (i.e., will not result in exceedances of water quality objectives).

#### **California Construction General Permit**

The State of California adopted a Statewide NPDES Permit for General Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) on September 2, 2009 (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The last Construction General Permit amendment became effective on July 17, 2012. The Construction General Permit regulates construction site stormwater management. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the general permit for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility.

To obtain coverage under this permit, project operators must electronically file Permit Registration Documents, which include a Notice of Intent (NOI), a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance-related documents, including a risk-level assessment for construction sites, an active stormwater effluent monitoring and reporting program during construction, rain event action plans, and numeric action levels (NALs) for pH and turbidity, as well as requirements for qualified professionals to prepare and implement the plan.

The Construction General Permit requires project applicants to file a NOI with the SWRCB to discharge stormwater, and to prepare and implement a SWPPP for projects that will disturb 1 or more acre of soil. The SWPPP would include a site map, description of stormwater discharge activities, and best management practices (BMPs) taken from the menu of BMPs set forth in the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) BMP Handbook that will be employed to prevent water pollution. It must describe BMPs that will be used to control soil erosion and discharges of other construction-related pollutants (e.g., petroleum products, solvents, paints, cement) that could contaminate nearby water bodies. It must demonstrate compliance with local and regional erosion and sediment control standards, identify responsible parties, provide a detailed construction timeline, and implement a BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule. The Construction General Permit requires the SWPPP to identify BMPs that will be implemented to reduce control (e.g., preservation of vegetation), sediment control (e.g., fiber rolls), non-stormwater management (e.g., water conservation), and waste management. The SWPPP also includes descriptions of BMPs to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges after all construction phases have been completed at the site (post-construction BMPs).

#### California Water Resources Control Board Low Impact Development Policy

The SWRCB adopted the Low Impact Development (LID) Policy which, at its core, promotes the idea of "sustainability" as a key parameter to be prioritized during the design and planning process for future development. The SWRCB has directed its staff to consider sustainability in all future policies, guidelines, and regulatory actions. LID is a proven approach to manage stormwater. The RWQCBs are advancing LID in California in various ways, including provisions for LID requirements in renewed NPDES Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit.

#### Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)

The City of Norco is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. The RWQCB sets water quality standards for all ground and surface waters within its region through implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan describes existing water quality conditions and establishes water quality goals and policies. The Basin Plan is also the basis for the Regional Board's regulatory programs. To this end, the Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term "water quality standards," as used in the federal Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality which must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions that are necessary to achieve and maintain target water quality standards. The Santa Ana Basin Plan has been in place since 1995, (with updates in 2008, 2011, 2016, and 2019) with the goal of protecting the public health and welfare and maintaining or enhancing water quality potential beneficial uses of the water.

#### **Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit**

The RWQCB Order R8-2010-0033, as amended by Order R8-20130024 (NPDES Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the County of Riverside, and the Cities of Riverside County within the Santa Ana Region) otherwise known as

the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit. The City of Norco is a co-permittee under the Riverside County MS4 permit. One component of the MS4 permit requires the development of site-specific WQMPs for new development and significant redevelopment projects. WQMPs include site design, source control, and treatment elements to reduce stormwater pollution from urban runoff.

#### **Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan**

The Riverside County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP) includes programs and policies to manage urban runoff. The DAMP includes development review procedures for co-permittees, required construction BMPs and inspection frequency, annual reporting and evaluation framework, and TMDL implementation strategies. The DAMP is the primary document outlining compliance procedures for co-permittees to adhere to the requirements of the MS4 Permit in Riverside County.

#### **Riverside County Watershed Action Plan**

The Riverside County Watershed Action Plan is intended enable co-permittees under the Riverside County MS4 Permit to address watershed-level water quality impacts associated with urbanization. The Watershed Action Plan describes the Santa Ana Watershed, applicable MS4 programs (e.g., the DAMP, WQMPs), and the development review process for new development and redevelopment projects.

#### **Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices**

Developed in 2011 by the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFCWCD), the Design Handbook for Low Impact Development Best Management Practices describes low-impact development (LID) guidelines for projects to reduce downstream erosion by more closely mimicking preproject hydrology and minimizing pollutant runoff. The Handbook details strategies for selecting appropriate LID BMPs, design capture volume requirements for BMPs, and sizing calculation methodology for BMP implementation in specific watersheds in the County.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policy contained in the Conservation Element is relevant to the proposed Project:

**Policy 2.2.3a:** Protect water resources from pollutants through enforcement of the Clean Water Act with the issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for new development, as applicable, including Storm Water Pollution Protection Plans (SWPPP) during construction, and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) post construction.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

**Municipal Chapter 15.70.** Incorporates the requirements of the Riverside County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit [Order No. R8-2010-0033] issued by the RWQCB pursuant to Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act.

## 5.9.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Regional Hydrology

The City of Norco is located within the Santa Ana River Basin, a 2,700-square-mile area in the Coastal Range Province of Southern California located roughly between Los Angeles and San Diego. The upper Basin drainage in southwestern San Bernardino County consists mainly of snowmelt and storm runoff from the San Gabriel Mountains.

#### Watershed

The City of Norco is in the Santa Ana Watershed, which is southern California's largest watershed, covering nearly 3,000 square miles of mountains, foothills and valleys. This watershed area contains portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and Orange counties. The flow of the Santa Ana River begins in the San Bernardino Mountains and discharges into the ocean at Huntington Beach.

#### Groundwater Basin

The majority of the City of Norco, including the Project area overlies the Temescal Groundwater Basin. The Temescal basin encompasses an area of approximately 26 square miles bound by the Santa Ana River, La Sierra Hills, El Sobrante Hills and the Santa Ana Mountains. Typical depths for the City's wells in the Temescal basin range from 180 to 1,100 feet.

#### Water Quality

Elevated nitrate concentrations have been documented in the Temescal basin since at least the 1950s. Groundwater quality from City wells in the Temescal basin typically does not meet the EPA and Division of Drinking Water (DDW) maximum contaminant levels (MCL) for nitrate (45 mg/L), fluoride (2 mg/L), arsenic, and secondary standards for iron and manganese. Therefore, the groundwater requires treatment prior to distribution for potable uses (UWMP 2015).

Stormwater in the City of Norco includes a variety of common contaminants including primarily suspended sediments, fertilizers, pesticides, animal waste, and contaminants that are commonly associated with automobiles (e.g., petroleum compounds such as oil, grease, and hydrocarbons). Temescal Creek, Reach 1, to which the Project area drains to is currently listed as impaired (303(d) list) for high pH levels; and the Santa Ana River Reaches 2 and 3, to which the Project area ultimately drains into, is currently listed as impaired (303(d) list) for indicator bacteria and high copper, lead, pathogens levels (WQMP 2019).

#### Water Supply and Groundwater

The City's local groundwater provides approximately 38 percent of the City's water demands and imported water from the Municipal Water District of Southern California (MWD) accounting for the remaining 62 percent of the water demand. During 2017, groundwater supplied in the City of Norco was approximately 84.1 percent purchased treated groundwater and 15.9 percent groundwater from Norco's Temescal groundwater basin wells (WSA 2019). The City of Corona completed a Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP) for the Temescal Basin that includes identified strategies for managing the groundwater system while maintaining groundwater production. The GWMP concluded that, assuming no significant changes in current water extraction practices, average pumping totals of about 12,000 AFY in the Temescal basin would result in no significant loss of groundwater storage (WSA 2019).

#### Storm Drainage Facilities

The existing topography of the project site is relatively flat and generally drains in a northeast to southwest direction. Currently, the Project conveys stormwater flows through a series of earthen ditches and drainage facilities that include pipes and concrete ditches. Several existing drainage features are adjacent to the Project area. Existing stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. In addition, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. Off-site flows enter the Project site from the culverts on Mountain Avenue to the culvert crossings on First Street. The channel meanders through

the site as an unimproved, natural channel. Currently, most of the Project site (approximately 90 to 95 percent) is tributary to the South Norco Channel. The remaining area flows to the north and is tributary to the North Norco Channel.

## 5.9.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- WQ-1 Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality;
- WQ-2 Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin;
- WQ-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 result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
- WQ-4 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 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;
- WQ-5 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 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;
- WQ-6 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 impede or redirect flood flows;
- WQ-7 In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation; or
- WQ-8 Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to Threshold WQ-7. No further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

## 5.9.5 METHODOLOGY

This evaluation of the significance of potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality is based on a review of published information and reports regarding regional hydrology, groundwater conditions, and surface water quality. The potential impacts on hydrology and water quality were evaluated by considering the general type of pollutants that operation of the Project would generate during construction and operation. In determining the level of significance, the analysis recognizes that development under the proposed Project would be required to comply with relevant federal, state, and regional laws and regulations that are designed to ensure compliance with applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Because the regional and local regulations related to water quality standards have been developed to reduce the potential of pollutants in the water resources (as described in the Regulatory Setting Section above), and are implemented to specific waterbodies, such as 303(d) TMDL requirements, or development projects such as grading and construction permit regulations, implementation of all relevant water quality and hydrology requirements would limit the potential of the proposed Project to a less than significant impact.

## 5.9.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACTS WQ-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT VIOLATE ANY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS OR OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE SURFACE OR GROUND WATER QUALITY.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Implementation of the proposed Project includes development involving demolition of the existing structures, site preparation, construction of new buildings, and infrastructure improvements. Demolition of existing structures, removal of existing contaminated soils, grading, stockpiling of materials, excavation and the import/export of soil and building materials, construction of new structures, and landscaping activities would expose and loosen sediment and building materials, which have the potential to mix with stormwater and urban runoff and degrade surface and receiving water quality.

Additionally, construction generally requires the use of heavy equipment and construction-related materials and chemicals, such as concrete, cement, asphalt, fuels, oils, antifreeze, transmission fluid, grease, solvents, and paints. In the absence of proper controls, these potentially harmful materials could be accidentally spilled or improperly disposed of during construction activities and could wash into and pollute surface waters or groundwater, resulting in a significant impact to water quality.

Pollutants of concern during construction activities generally include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. Each of these pollutants on its own or in combination with other pollutants can have a detrimental effect on water quality. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (such as paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked during construction, which would have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into nearby receiving waters and eventually may affect surface or groundwater quality. During construction activities, excavated soil would be exposed, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to occur compared to existing conditions. In addition, during construction, vehicles and equipment are prone to tracking soil and/or spoil from work areas to paved roadways, which is another form of erosion that could affect water quality.

However, the use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the NPDES General Construction Permit and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 would serve to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant. Furthermore, an Erosion and Sediment Transport Control Plan prepared by a qualified SWPPP developer (QSD) is required to be included in the SWPPP for the Project, and typically includes the following types of erosion control methods that are designed to minimize potential pollutants entering stormwater during construction:

- Prompt revegetation of proposed landscaped/grassed swale areas;
- Perimeter gravel bags or silt fences to prevent off-site transport of sediment;

- Storm drain inlet protection (filter fabric gravel bags and straw wattles), with gravel bag check dams within paved roadways;
- Regular sprinkling of exposed soils to control dust during construction and soil binders for forecasted wind storms;
- Specifications for construction waste handling and disposal;
- Contained equipment wash-out and vehicle maintenance areas;
- Erosion control measures including soil binders, hydro mulch, geotextiles, and hydro seeding of disturbed areas ahead of forecasted storms;
- Construction of stabilized construction entry/exits to prevent trucks from tracking sediment on City roadways;
- Construction timing to minimize soil exposure to storm events; and
- Training of subcontractors on general site housekeeping.

Therefore, compliance with the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit requirements, the City's Municipal Code, and other applicable requirements, which would be verified during the City's construction permitting process, would ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

#### Operation

Under the existing conditions, existing land uses (e.g., egg distribution and residential uses) contribute to surface and groundwater quality degradation. The proposed Project would develop urban uses including installation of water quality treatment facilities. The proposed business park would increase impermeable surfaces that would result in an increase in the volume of surface runoff and potential pollutants from vehicles. Operation of the proposed land uses could generate pollutants including trash, debris, oil residue, and other residue that could be deposited on streets, sidewalks, driveways, paved areas, and other surfaces and wash into receiving waters. The pollutants that could be released include bacteria, nutrients, oil and grease, metals, organics, and pesticides. Nutrients in post-construction stormwater include nitrogen and phosphorous from fertilizers from landscaping areas. Excess nutrients can impact water quality by promoting excessive and/or rapid growth of aquatic vegetation and algae growth, which reduces water clarity and results in oxygen depletion. Pesticides can be toxic to aquatic organisms and bioaccumulate in larger species such as birds and fish and result in harmful effects. Oil and grease may end up in stormwater from leaking vehicles, and metals may enter stormwater as surfaces corrode, decay, or leach and from roadway runoff.

The City of Norco Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 incorporates the requirements of the Riverside County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, which requires new development projects to prepare a WQMP (per the Regional MS4 Permit) that would comply with the Riverside County DAMP, and not result in a degradation of the quality of receiving waters (South/North Norco Channel and the Santa Ana River). WQMPs are required to include BMPs for source control, pollution prevention, site design, and structural treatment control BMPs. WQMPs are also required to include control measures for any listed pollutants to an impaired waterbody on the 303(d) list such that the discharge shall not cause or contribute to an exceedance of receiving water quality objectives.

In addition, the Riverside County DAMP, requires that all development incorporate all feasible LID BMPs to reduce potential pollutants from leaving the Project site. The LID site design/BMP features that would be constructed with the Project include three onsite infiltration basins: one basin near south of First Street, and the other basins near the northwest corner of the Project site adjacent to Second Street and Pacific Avenue. These basins would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through storm drain connections

to the off-site storm drains. In addition, landscaped areas within the Project site would receive runoff from impervious surfaces that would capture, retain, and infiltrate the runoff.

Implementation of the proposed Project would comply with BMPs pursuant to NPDES requirements, and the City's Municipal Code. As part of the permitting approval process, construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations to minimize the potential of the Project to result in a degradation of the quality of receiving waters (e.g., South/North Norco Channel and the Santa Ana River). Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation of the Project.

Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the City's Municipal Code would ensure that Project impacts related to degradation of water quality from operational activities would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT WQ-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY DECREASE GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES OR INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUCH THAT THE PROJECT MAY IMPEDE SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT OF THE BASIN

Less than Significant Impact. As described previously, the majority of the City of Norco, including the Project area, overlies the Temescal Groundwater Basin, and approximately 15.9 percent of the City's groundwater supplies are from Norco's Temescal groundwater basin wells (WSA 2019). The City of Corona completed a GWMP for the Temescal Basin that includes identified strategies for managing groundwater production such that, average pumping totals of about 12,000 AFY in the Temescal basin would result in no significant loss of groundwater storage (WSA 2019). As shown on Table 5.9-1, the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) shows that the anticipated production of groundwater would remain steady from 2025 through 2040.

	Projected (AFY)				
	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Demand					
Potable	6,808	6,970	6,982	6,894	6,956
Recycled	844	844	844	844	844
Total Water Demand	7,652	7,814	7,826	7,738	7,800
Supply					
Local Groundwater Production Rights	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Desalter and Imported Water	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Total Potable Supply	9,000	9,200	9,200	9,200	9,200
Total Recycled Supply	1,825	1,825	1,825	1,825	1,825
Total Water Supply	10,825	11,025	11,025	11,025	11,025
Potable Water Supply Surplus	3,173	3,211	3,199	3,287	3,225

Table 5.9-1:	Projected Water	Demand and	Supply for	City of Norco
--------------	-----------------	------------	------------	---------------

Source: WSA 2019.

Also, as detailed in Section 5.15, Utilities and Service Systems, the supply of water listed in Table 5.9-1 would be sufficient during both normal years and multiple dry year conditions between 2020 and 2040 to meet all of the City's estimated needs, which includes the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project would not result in changes to the projected groundwater pumping that would decrease groundwater supplies. Thus, impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant.

The Project site is partially developed and currently contains approximately 1,682,723 square feet of impervious surfaces (WQMP 2019). The proposed Project would develop the site with approximately 2,744,848 square feet of impervious surfaces (WQMP 2019); thus, resulting in a substantial increase of impervious surfaces on the site. However, the MS4 Permit requires that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture, infiltrate, and filter the 85th percentile of a 24-hour precipitation event. This would reduce runoff and recharge the groundwater basin. As detailed in the WQMP, included as Appendix N, the Geotechnical Investigation for the Project determined that the locations of the proposed infiltration basins have favorable infiltration rates (e.g., 4 inches/hour and 11.8 inches/hour) and have been sized to accommodate the Project. In addition, ornamental landscaping has also been incorporated into the design to capture and infiltrate stormwater. All stormwater runoff from the site will be conveyed to infiltration basins or landscaped areas that would allow for recharge of the basin. Therefore, compliance with the MS4 Permit requirements, the City's Municipal Code, and other applicable requirements implemented through the WQMP, which would be verified during the City's permitting process, would ensure that Project impacts related to groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT WQ-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION ON- OR OFF-SITE.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

As described previously, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys offsite flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. Construction of the structures proposed by the Project would require demolition and removal of existing structures, buildings, and infrastructure on the site. Additionally, excavation, grading, and other site preparation activities would loosen soils, which has the potential to result in erosion and the loss of topsoil. Because the Project site is flat and does not contain substantial slopes, the large majority of soil disturbance would be related to excavation and backfill for installation of building foundations and underground utilities, and improvements to the South Norco Channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan as directed by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

The existing NPDES Construction General Permit, as included in the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70, requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP by a Qualified SWPPP Developer for the proposed construction activities. The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to potential sources of sedimentation and erosion and would list the required BMPs that are necessary to reduce or eliminate the potential of erosion or alternation of a drainage pattern during construction activities. Common types of construction BMPs include:

- Silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags
- Street sweeping and vacuuming
- Storm drain inlet protection
- Stabilized construction entrance/exit
- Vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling
- Hydroseeding
- Material delivery and storage
- Stockpile management

- Spill prevention and control
- Solid waste management
- Concrete waste management

In addition, a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) is required to ensure compliance with the SWPPP through regular monitoring and visual inspections during construction activities. The SWPPP would be amended and BMPs revised, as determined necessary through field inspections, in order to protect against substantial soil erosion, the loss of topsoil, or alteration of the drainage pattern. Compliance with the Construction General Permit and a SWPPP prepared by a QSD and implemented by a QSP would prevent construction-related impacts related to potential alteration of a drainage pattern or erosion from development activities. Overall, with implementation of the existing construction regulations that would be verified by the City during the permitting approval process, impacts related to alteration of an existing drainage pattern during construction that could result in substantial erosion, siltation, and increases in stormwater runoff would be less than significant.

#### Operation

As described previously, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys offsite flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. The Project proposes to maintain the existing drainage pattern on the site and provide improvements that include and onsite storm drain system with three infiltration basins, landscaping areas, and increasing the capacity of the channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan.

The onsite storm drain system is sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the Project area and would maintain the existing drainage pattern of the site. Runoff from the planned system would discharge into one of three onsite infiltration basins, which would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through new storm drain connections to the improved off-site infrastructure, and which would not result in erosion or siltation. In addition, landscaped areas would accept runoff water from impervious surfaces, which would reduce the potential for erosion.

The MS4 permit and DAMP require new development projects to prepare a WQMP that is required to include BMPs to reduce the potential of erosion and/or sedimentation through site design and structural treatment control BMPs. Implementation of the proposed Project would comply with these requirements through compliance with the existing regulations. As part of the permitting approval process, the proposed drainage and water quality design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the City's Public Works to ensure that it limits the potential for erosion and siltation. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations would ensure that Project impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern and erosion/siltation from operational activities would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT WQ-4: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER, OR THROUGH THE ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE RATE OR AMOUNT OF SURFACE RUNOFF IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN FLOODING ON- OR OFF-SITE.

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. The Project proposes to maintain the existing drainage pattern on the site and

provide improvements that include and onsite storm drain system with three infiltration basins, landscaping areas, and increasing the capacity of the South Norco Channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan.

The proposed onsite storm drain system has been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the Project area and would maintain the existing drainage pattern of the site. Runoff from the planned system would discharge into one of three onsite infiltration basins, which would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through new storm drain connections to the improved off-site infrastructure. In addition, landscaped areas would accept runoff water from impervious surfaces.

Use of the infiltration basins and landscaping would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. In addition, the drainage facilities proposed for the Project have been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the proposed Development and are consistent with the the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan. Thus, development in accordance with the proposed Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, such that flooding would occur.

#### IMPACT WQ-5: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH THE ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD 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.

Less than Significant Impact. Development of the Project includes installation of a subsurface storm drain system that would capture runoff from impervious areas, and drain it into one of three onsite infiltration basins that have been designed to accommodate the anticipated runoff from the Project site, and would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through storm drain connections to off-site drainage infrastructure. In addition to the storm drain system, landscaped areas within the Project site would receive runoff water from impervious surfaces and infiltrate it into the site soils.

As described previously, the City of Norco Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 incorporates the requirements of the Riverside County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, which requires new development projects to prepare a WQMP (per the Regional MS4 Permit) that would comply with the Riverside County DAMP. WQMPs are required to include BMPs for source control, pollution prevention, site design, and structural treatment control BMPs. As part of the permitting approval process, construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations to minimize the potential of the Project to result in a degradation of water quality. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the City's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation of the Project. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the City's Municipal Code would ensure that Project impacts related to storm water drainage and polluted runoff would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT WQ-6: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH THE ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD IMPEDE OR REDIRECT FLOOD FLOWS.

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is partially developed and currently contains approximately 1,682,723 square feet of impervious surfaces (WQMP 2019). The proposed Project would develop the site with approximately 2,729,417square feet of impervious surfaces (WQMP 2019). Also, as described above, the South Norco Channel, which is currently a natural soft bottomed drainage, conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction.

The Project proposes to maintain the existing drainage pattern on the site and provide improvements that include and onsite storm drain system with three infiltration basins, landscaping areas, and increasing the capacity of the South Norco Channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan.

The proposed onsite storm drain system is sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the Project area and would maintain the existing drainage pattern of the site. Runoff from the planned system would discharge into one of three onsite infiltration basins, which would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through new storm drain connections to the improved off-site infrastructure. In addition, landscaped areas would accept runoff water from impervious surfaces.

Use of the infiltration basins would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. In addition, the drainage facilities proposed for the Project have been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the proposed Development and are consistent with the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan. Thus, although the proposed Project would result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces on the site, the proposed drainage infrastructure would maintain the existing drainage pattern and accommodate flows, such that storm flows would not be impeded or redirected. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT WQ-8: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF A WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN OR SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.

**Less than Significant Impact.** As described previously, use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the NPDES Construction General Permit and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 would serve to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant. Thus, construction of the Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

Also, as described previously, new development projects are required to implement a WQMP (per the Regional MS4 Permit) that would comply with the Riverside County DAMP. The WQMP and applicable BMPs are verified as part of the permitting approval process, and construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not conflict of obstruct with a water quality control plan.

In addition, as detailed previously, the GWMP for the Temescal Basin includes strategies for managing groundwater production such that, the anticipated average pumping totals would result in no significant loss of groundwater storage and that the anticipated production of groundwater would remain steady from 2025 through 2040. As described previously and further detailed in Section 5.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the City's supply of water listed in Table 5.9-1 would be sufficient during both normal years and multiple dry year conditions between 2020 and 2040 to meet all of the City's estimated needs, which includes the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the groundwater management plan and would not conflict with or obstruct its implementation. Thus, impacts related to water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would be less than significant.

## 5.9.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The areas considered for cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality are the Santa Ana Watershed for drainage and water quality impacts, and the Temescal Basin for groundwater impacts.

**Water Quality:** The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality includes the Santa Ana Watershed because cumulative projects and developments pursuant to the proposed Project could incrementally exacerbate the existing impaired condition and could result in new pollutant related impairments.

Related developments within the watershed would be required to implement water quality control measures pursuant to the same NPDES General Construction Permit that requires implementation of a SWPPP (for construction), a WQMP (for operation) and BMPs to eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater discharges, reduce runoff, reduce erosion and sedimentation, and increase filtration and infiltration. The NPDES permit requirements have been set by the State Water Board and implemented by the RWQCB (and the City's Municipal Code within Norco) to reduce incremental effects of individual projects so that they would not become cumulatively considerable. Therefore, overall potential impacts to water quality associated with present and future development in the watershed would not be cumulatively considerable with compliance with all applicable laws, permits, ordinances and plans. As detailed previously, the proposed Project would be implemented in compliance with all regulations, as would be verified during the permitting process. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

**Drainage:** The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to stormwater drainage includes the geographic area served by the existing stormwater infrastructure for the Project area, from capture of runoff through final discharge points. As described above the proposed Project includes installation of infiltration basins that would retain, slow, filter, infiltrate, and discharge runoff through storm drain connections to the off-site infrastructure. These facilities would retain runoff and reduce erosion and siltation. In addition, pursuant to state and regional regulations that require development projects to maintain pre-project hydrology, no net increase of off-site stormwater flows would occur. As a result, the proposed Project would not generate runoff that could combine with additional runoff from cumulative projects that could cumulatively combine to impact erosion, siltation, flooding, and water quality. Thus, cumulative impacts related to drainage would be less than significant.

**Groundwater Basin:** The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to the groundwater basin is the Temescal Basin. As described above the proposed Project includes installation of infiltration basins that would recharge stormwater into the groundwater basin. In addition, the volume of water that would be needed by the Project is within the anticipated groundwater pumping volumes. Therefore, the Project would not result in changes to the projected groundwater pumping that would decrease groundwater basin that have the potential to combine with effects from other projects to become cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to the groundwater basin would be less than significant.

# 5.9.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### Existing Regulations

State

- Construction General Permit, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ
- California Water Resources Control Board Low Impact Development (LID) Policy
- Regional MS4 Permit (Order No. R8-20100036)

#### City

• Municipal Code Chapter 15.70

#### Plans Programs and Policies

The following Plans Programs and Policies (PPPs) that are listed below would reduce impacts related to hydrology and water quality. These actions will be included in the project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program:

**PPP WQ-1:** A hydrology study and drainage analysis prepared and signed by a Civil Engineer registered in the State of California in accordance with the Riverside County Hydrology Manual and the City of Norco's Standards and Guidelines is required. Additional drainage facilities may be required as a result of the findings of this study.

**PPP WQ-2:** A SWPPP Plan. All projects that develop one 1 acre or more of total land area or which are part of a large phased development that will disturb at least one acre of land are required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) utilizing the model form in Appendix B of the 2003 CASQA Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP) Handbook for Construction and submit a copy of the plan to the City Engineering Department for review. A copy of the adopted SWPPP shall be kept in the construction site office at all times during construction.

**PPP WQ-3:** Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Public Works Department. The WQMP shall be submitted using the Riverside County Stormwater Program's model form and shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.

## 5.9.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impact WQ-1, WQ-2, WQ-3, WQ-4, WQ-5, WQ-6, and WQ-8 would be less than significant.

## 5.9.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

## 5.9.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

### REFERENCES

City of Norco 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP 2015). Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/pw/urban\_water\_management\_plan.asp

State Water Resources Control Board Construction Stormwater Program. Accessed: <u>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml.</u>

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region Basin Plan. Accessed: <u>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water issues/programs/basin plan/index.shtml.</u>

Water Supply Assessment for the Palomino Business Park. Prepared by Charles Marr Consulting, 2019 (WSA 2019).

## 5.10 Land Use and Planning

## 5.10.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an analysis of the consistency of the proposed Project with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations that guide development of the Project site and evaluates the relationship of the Project with surrounding land uses. The analysis in this section is based in part on the City of Norco General Plan, the Gateway Specific Plan, the City of Norco Municipal Code, and the Corona Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

## 5.10.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### SCAG Regional Transportation Plan

On April 7, 2016 SCAG's Regional Council adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS). Most of the plan's goals are related to transportation and the efficiency of transportation. Because the proposed project does not involve transportation, many of the goals are not relevant to the proposed Project. However, the goals that are related to the proposed Project are listed below:

#### Goals

- 1. Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.
- 2. Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.
- 3. Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.
- 4. Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.
- 6. Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).
- 7. Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.

#### **Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission**

The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission governs 16 airports in Riverside County, including Corona Municipal Airport in the City of Corona. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Corona Municipal Airport establishes land use, noise, and safety policies for projects in the vicinity of the airport, including compatibility criteria and maps for the influence areas of individual airports. The Land Use Plan also establishes procedural requirements for compatibility review of development proposals related to the Airport Influence Area.

#### Corona Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

The Corona Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) reduces potential conflict between the Airport and surrounding land uses. As required by state law, the ALUCP provides guidance to affected local jurisdictions with regard to airport land use compatibility matters. The main objective of the ALUCP is to avoid future compatibility conflicts rather than to remedy existing incompatibilities. The ALUCP is aimed at addressing future land uses and development, not airport activity. The ALUCP does not place any restrictions on the present and future role, configuration, or use of the airport.

#### The City of Norco General Plan

The Norco General Plan is made up of seven elements, which are listed below:

- 1. The Land Use Element designates the distribution, location, and balance of land uses.
- 2. The Circulation Element provides for a safe, functional, and integrated circulation system for all forms of transportation.
- 3. The Conservation Element provides direction to the City regarding the preservation, development, and utilization of natural resources that include water, energy, soils, minerals, and wildlife.
- 4. The Housing Element analyzes existing and future housing needs; addresses constraints to meeting local housing needs; identifies land, financial, and administrative resources for housing; sets forth goals and policies to meet community housing needs; and establishes housing programs and an implementation plan.
- 5. The Noise Element provides the guidelines for establishing ordinances and policies that protect sensitive land uses and citizens from other more intensive land uses, and from point sources that produce high levels of noise. Based on the Noise Element policy statements and standards, the noise ordinance will provide the enforceable codes that will insure, to the best level that can be obtained, that noise nuisances are eliminated or at least controlled to acceptable levels.
- 6. The Open Space Element provides a framework to provide the recreational and open space needs of the community, enhance the distinctive character, and provide linkages among trail and wildlife corridors.
- 7. The Safety Element provides the goals and policies for responding to potential natural hazards from earthquakes, flooding and fire to providing community protection services. Goals and policies for each of these public safety issues offer a specific framework that allows the City to monitor and evaluate its efforts in the provision of public safety services.

#### **Gateway Specific Plan**

The majority of the Project site is located within the Gateway Specific Plan area, which encompasses 317 acres and is largely developed. The Gateway Specific Plan area is located in the southern portion of the City of Norco, to the west of I-15, and on both sides of Hamner Avenue. Existing land uses within the Specific Plan area include residential, commercial, industrial, and vacant land. The goals of the Gateway Specific Plan include the following:

- **Goal:** To expand the economic base of the Project Area the community as a whole through the active promotion and encouragement of commercial and industrial development in appropriate parts of the Project Area.
- **Goal:** To encourage the development and revitalization of economically viable commercial land uses along Hamner Avenue.
- **Goal:** Provide a high level of public services and utilities to all properties within the Project Area.
- **Goal:** Develop a circulation system which facilitates efficient and safe vehicular, equestrian, and pedestrian traffic, along with the enhancement of the community design character.
- **Goal:** Create a community design image for the Project Area that expresses and enhances the unique character and identity of Norco.

• **Goal:** To improve the relationship of differing land uses through physical and functional separation.

The Gateway Specific Plan identifies land uses for each parcel within the Plan Area and includes specific design guidelines, development standards, and development regulations for development projects within the Plan Area, including the following:

**Commercial District:** The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Commercial District is intended to facilitate the development of underutilized and vacant parcels of land in such a way that they will contribute to the economic development of the City. Every lot in the Commercial District shall be a minimum of 13,125 square feet and have a minimum frontage on a dedicated street of 75 feet. Building Structures within the Commercial District shall not exceed a height of 35 feet. Buildings utilizing a parapet wall in order to hide rooftop equipment or buildings incorporating rooftop architectural features shall not exceed 50 feet at the highest point. Building heights may be increased through the provision of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at the discretion of the City's Planning Commission. In addition, the Gateway Specific Plan includes requirements related to building setbacks and landscaping within the setbacks.

**Industrial District:** The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Industrial District is intended to facilitate the economic development of the City by creating an expanded employment base. This District provides for the development of light industrial land uses which generally includes research and development facilities, light manufacturing activities, custom manufacturing, assembly, fabrication and wholesaling with related office and administrative functions. Every lot in the Industrial District shall be a minimum of 43,560 square feet (1.0 acre). Minimum width shall be 125 feet; minimum depth shall be 250 feet. No building or structure within the Industrial District shall exceed a height of 35 feet, however that building utilizing a parapet wall in order to hide rooftop equipment shall not exceed 40 feet. For buildings located within 75 feet of Pacific Avenue right-of-way, a 1-story or 20-foot building height limitation shall apply. In addition, the Gateway Specific Plan includes requirements related to building setbacks and landscaping within the setbacks.

**Residential District:** The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Residential District will consist of lowdensity housing (A-1-20 and A-1-40). Most of the proposed housing will be located along Parkridge Avenue south of First Street. To a lesser extent housing is to be located along Second Street near Mountain Avenue. Development shall be governed by requirements of underlying zone.

**Gateway Specific Plan Parking Requirements:** Table 6 of the Gateway Specific Plan provides off-street parking requirements, which include the following land uses that would be developed by the Project:

Land Use	Parking Requirement	
Light Manufacturing & Light Industrial	1 space/400 square feet of gross floor area devoted to manufacturing	
	plus 1 space for every 250 square feet of office floor area.	
Research and Development	1 space/400 square feet of gross floor area. 1 space for every 250 feet	
(office with on-site testing facilities)	of office floor area.	
Warehouse	1 space for every 750 square feet of warehouse or storage floor area.	
Store, Shops, Other Commercial	1 space/250 square feet of gross floor area or portion thereof.	
Offices	1 space for every 250 feet of office floor area.	

Table 5.10-1: Gateway	Specific Plan	Parking Requirements
-----------------------	---------------	----------------------

Source: Gateway Specific Plan Table 6, Automobile Off-Street Parking Spaces Required

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

Housing Development Overlay Zone: Chapter 18.64, Housing Development Overlay (HDO) Zone. The HDO zone applies to specific properties within the City. Development of HDO zoned parcels requires a HDO Site Plan and are required to meet the requirements for residential development before non-residential uses, per the underlying zoning, are allowed.

A portion of the Project site on the east side of Mountain Avenue is within the HDO zone, which provides for high-density affordable housing and allows for a mixture of residential and non-residential development. The HDO zone identifies residential development at 20-30 dwelling units per acre; or up to 35 units per acre if a density bonus is utilized. A density bonus is for developments that provide equestrian facilities or parkland/open space beyond the requirements outlined in the City's zoning code. The City's Housing Element identified (on page 89) that approximately 224 units can be accommodated on the Project site and that the site is ideal for lower income housing, in that is it situated close to major roadways with transit options, commercial centers offering goods, services, and employment opportunities.

Municipal Code Chapter 18.64 describes that after the City's lower income regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) requirement has been met any remaining acreage may be identified for the development as permitted by the underlying zone. All parcels approved as a HDO zone must meet the requirements for residential development before nonresidential uses, as permitted in the underlying zoning, are allowed.

The City's Housing Element describes that the City has a formal monitoring program in place to ensure sufficient residential capacity to accommodate the identified regional need for lower-income households is maintained within the HDO zone. The program provides that where an approval of a development (residential, commercial or mixed-use) on an identified site results in a reduction of potential affordable units below the residential capacity assumed in Table 6-7 of the Housing Element, the City will identify and designate additional sites for rezoning to ensure that no net loss occurs. This means that if any one of the identified sites is not developed in accordance with the development requirements outlined for the HDO zone, an alternative site or sites must be identified and rezoned to maintain the overall affordable unit capacity.

## 5.10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Project Area

The 110-acre Project site consists of 65 parcels that are currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility for Hidden Villa Ranch. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility is located on the northern central portion of the site on the west side of Mountain Avenue and south of Second Street and is served by a parking lot on the east side Mountain Avenue. Operations at the Hidden Villa Ranch facility as an egg processing plant are ongoing. Operations at the facility include: receiving, cleaning, inspecting, repackaging, and distribution of fresh eggs, and distribution of dairy products. In addition, Hidden Villa Ranch performs limited fueling and vehicle repair activities for its fleet of delivery trucks and trailers.

Residential structures are located along First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue, some of which are occupied, and some are vacant. Several of the onsite residential parcels contain chickens, horses, goats, ponies, and dog raising activities; however, none are commercial operations. The site also includes several dilapidated former farm buildings, stables, chicken sheds, and concrete pads from previous uses.

Additionally, a large portion of the site consists of undeveloped vacant land, a portion of which includes remnants of building foundations.

An existing equestrian trail runs along Pacific Avenue and Second Street. In addition, the South Norco Channel, which is a natural soft bottomed drainage, stormwater flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. The drainage channel passes through culverts in First Street and Mountain Avenue.

#### Surrounding Areas

The surrounding land uses are described below and shown on Figure 4-1, Section 4.0, Environmental Setting.

- North: Second Street followed by single-family residential uses. General Plan Land Use designation of Residential Agricultural (RA) and Zoned Agricultural Low Density 20,000 square feet (A-1-20).
- West: Pacific Avenue and single-family residential uses. General Plan Land Use designation of Residential Agricultural (RA) and Zoned Agricultural Low Density 20,000 square feet (A-1-20).
- South: First Street and single-family residential. General Plan Land Use designation of Residential Agricultural (RA) and Zoned Agricultural Low Density 20,000 square feet (A-1-20) and Gateway Specific Plan designation of Residential (R).
- **East:** A portion of Mountain Avenue, single-family residential, and industrial development. Gateway Specific Plan designation of Industrial (I) with a Housing Development Overlay (HDO).

#### General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations

A 104.4-acre portion of the 110-acre Project site is designated by the General Plan as Specific Plan (SP). The remaining 4-parcel, 5.6-acre area located south of First Street that is not within the Gateway Specific Plan is designated by the General Plan for Residential Agricultural (RA) development and has a zoning designation of Agricultural – Low Density 20,000 square feet (A-1-20) as shown in Figures 4-2, General Plan Designations and Figure 4-3, Existing Zoning Designations Within Project Site, Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting.

The RA land use designation is intended to provide for development of agriculturally oriented low-density living. Similarly, the A-1-20 zoning designation allows for detached single-family dwellings and agricultural uses on lots that are a minimum of 20,000-square-feet.

#### Gateway Specific Plan Designations

The General Plan states that the Gateway Specific Plan is an area for community and sub-regional growth for expansion of the community's economic base. In addition, it states that the primary purpose of the Gateway Specific Plan is to facilitate private development projects, public infrastructure and roadway improvement projects.

A 104.4-acre portion of the Project site is within the Gateway Specific Plan. The Gateway Specific Plan is a land use planning document that was originally approved in 1991. The Gateway Specific Plan area encompasses 317 acres in an area that is generally bounded by Second Street to the north, Pacific Avenue on the west, Parkridge Avenue to the southwest, I-15 to the southeast, and Hamner Avenue on the east. See Figure 4-4, Gateway Specific Plan Land Use Map. The Gateway Specific Plan divides lands into districts. As shown on Figure 4-2, the majority of the Project site is within the Industrial District. However, an approximately 4-acre area of Commercial District is on the northwest corner of Mountain Avenue and First Street, and approximately 5-acre area of Residential District is located in the northwestern portion of the site on Second Street to the east of Pacific Avenue. The designations for these land use districts are described below:

- **Commercial District:** The General Plan Land Use Element describes that the Gateway Specific Plan Commercial District is designed to promote diverse and unique shopping environments that would range in size, type, and character, based upon their respective relationship and location to the freeway, other roadways, and market conditions.
- Industrial District: The General Plan Land Use Element describes that the Gateway Specific Plan Industrial District is intended to facilitate the economic development by creating an expanded employment base. This district provides for the development of light industrial land uses which generally includes research and development facilities, light manufacturing activities, custom manufacturing, assembly, fabrication and wholesaling, with related office and administrative functions.
- **Residential District:** The General Plan Land Use Element describes that the Gateway Specific Plan Residential District is intended to be consistent with nearby residences.

#### Housing Overlay

The Norco General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan designates a portion of the Project site that is designated for industrial uses, east of Mountain Avenue, as a Housing Development Overlay area (shown on Figure 4-3). The Housing Development Overlay, as outlined in Chapter 18.64 of the Norco Municipal Code, is intended to facilitate development of affordable housing within a mixed-use context. Residential development allowed within this overlay may include development of housing at a density of 20 to 30 dwelling units per acre, including single-family, multi-family homes, condominiums, townhomes, and courtyard residential projects.

#### **Corona Municipal Airport Influence Area**

Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Project site. The Corona Municipal Airport is a recreational airport with no commercial flights that is operated by the City of Corona. The airport has approximately 50,000 annual operations (Corona 2019). The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) provides for land use compatibility between the operation of the airport and surrounding land uses. The geographic scope of the ALUCP is the Airport Influence Area, which is the area that current and future airport-related noise, safety, airspace protection and/or overflight factors may affect land uses or impose restrictions on those uses. The western portion of the Project site is located within the Influence Area of the Corona Municipal Airport.

The Riverside County ALUCP designates various Compatibility Zones within the Airport Influence Area. The western portion of the Project site is within Compatibility Zone E, which is identified as an area that has occasional overflights but is beyond the Airport's 55 CNEL noise contour. The safety risk within Compatibility Zone E is low (RIV ALUC 2004a). This zone does not require airspace review or provide limitations on the heights of structures or types of land uses.

## 5.10.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- LU-1 Physically divide an established community; or
- LU-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.

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in no impact related to Threshold LU-1; no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

## 5.10.5 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of impacts to land use and planning is based on a comparison of the proposed Project to the applicable plans, policies, and regulations to determine if implementation of the Project would conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

## 5.10.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

# Impact LU-2: THE PROJECT WOULD 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.

#### Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

The proposed Project would redevelop the Project site in compliance with the existing Gateway Specific Plan land use designations with approximately 1,936,245 square feet of industrial, office, and commercial uses within 35 industrial business park buildings and 3 commercial buildings that would include 6,520 square feet of retail, 6,520 square feet of fast-food restaurant uses without drive-through window, 4,275 square feet of fast-food restaurant with drive-through window, and a 12-vehicle fueling position gas station with a 4,095 square foot convenience market.

**Gateway Specific Plan Land Use Designations.** As described previously, a majority of the Project site is designated for Industrial District uses by the Gateway Specific Plan. The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Industrial District is intended to facilitate the economic development of the City by creating an expanded employment base. The District provides or the development of light industrial land uses, which generally include research & development facilities, light manufacturing activities, wholesaling, with related office and administrative functions. The proposed Project is consistent with the intention of the Industrial District designation by developing 35 industrial business park buildings that would expand the employment base within the City. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the Industrial District Specific Plan designation.

The Project site includes approximately 4-acre area at the northwest corner of Mountain Avenue and First Street that is designated as Commercial District. The Gateway Specific Plan states that the Commercial District is intended to facilitate development of underutilized and vacant parcels of land in a way that will contribute to the economic development of the City. The Project is consistent with the Commercial District designation and proposes to develop the portion of the site designated as Commercial District with 3 commercial buildings that would provide restaurant, retail, drive-through, and gas station uses. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the Commercial District Specific Plan designation.

Gateway Specific Plan Amendment of Parking Standards. As part of the proposed Project an amendment to update the Gateway Specific Plan's parking requirements to reduce the parking spaces required for warehouse uses to reflect the expected parking demands of a contemporary industrial

business park. As shown in Table 5.10-1, the existing parking requirement for warehouse land uses is one space for every 750 square feet of warehouse or storage floor area. The Project proposes to amend the requirement to one space for every 1,000 square feet of the first 20,000 square feet of warehouse or storage floor area and one space for every 2,000 square feet for warehouse area over 20,000 square feet.

**Conditional Use Permit for Height Standards.** In addition, the Project includes an CUP pursuant to the Gateway Specific Plan and Chapter 18.45 of the Norco Municipal Code to increase the maximum allowable building height from 35 feet to 50 feet for approximately 50 percent of the site. The 15-foot height increase is being proposed to allow for flexibility in final building design for the larger industrial warehousing buildings in the interior of the site and to accommodate architectural treatments such as roof parapets. As detailed in Section 5.1, *Aesthetics*, the Project would be consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan design standards, which provides that the bulk of building to be visually broken, as well as the clustering of groups of buildings to be connected visually by open space, covered walkways, trellises. In addition, the Project would implement the Specific Plan's landscape standards that includes installation of trees that would visual reduce the height of building structures. Furthermore, the buildings proposed for a 15-foot height increase would be located in the interior of the site, surrounded by the other Project structures and buffered from off-site views, which also reduces the visual height of the buildings. Therefore, the CUP to increase the height of interior industrial warehousing buildings by 15-feet would result in a less than significant environmental impact.

**Zone Change for Housing Development Overlay.** A portion of the site is within the HDO zone. Phase 2 of the Project, which would develop the HDO area for industrial warehousing uses, includes a Zone Change to remove the HDO designation. As described previously, the Housing Element identified (on page 89) that approximately 224 units can be accommodated within the HDO area on the Project site to assist in meeting the City's lower income RHNA requirement.

Municipal Code Chapter 18.64 describes that where an approval of a development on an HDO identified site occurs, the City shall identify sites for affordable units to ensure that the overall affordable unit capacity assumed in the Housing Element is met. The City's 2014-2021 Housing Element identifies 5 development sites to accommodate the City's required Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for lower income residential units, which are listed in Table 5.10-2. Since adoption of the Housing Element, Site 4 at Fifth Street and Horseless Carriage Drive, has been developed with non-residential uses and is no longer available for lower income housing.

The Housing Element identifies that each HDO site will accommodate residential densities of 30 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the default density to accommodate lower income housing (page 80). Although, the Housing Element (Tables 6-2 through 6-6) identified build out of the HDO parcels at 20 units per acre and that 50 percent of each site would be developed for lower density residential, the actual capacity of the HDO parcels (per the default density to accommodate lower income housing) is much higher.

As shown in Table 5.10-2, with removal of the HDO designation on the Project site and development of the proposed business park uses, the remaining HDO designated parcels would continue to be able to accommodate the lower housing RHNA requirement. Therefore, the overall affordable unit capacity assumed in the Housing Element would be able to be met, and impacts related to the Zone Change to remove the HDO designation would be less than significant.

Site	Location	Site Acreage	Housing Element	Actual Capacity at
			Identified Capacity	30 Units Per Acre
1	Hamner Ave. and Fourth Street	18.6	186	558
2	Hamner Ave. and Third Street	18.4	184	552
3	Beacon Hill	19.4	194	582
4	Fifth Street and Horseless	22.9	229	0
	Carriage Drive			
5	Mountain Avenue (Project Site)	22.4	224	0*
Total			1,017	1,692

Table 5.10-2: Housing Element Identified Sites for	r Lower Income Residential Development
--	--

\*With implementation of the proposed Project.

**SCAG Regional Transportation Plan Policies.** As described above, SCAG RTP policies focus largely on transportation and the efficiency of transportation, which are not applicable to the proposed Project. However, the proposed Project would implement and are consistent with the SCAG policies that are listed in Table 5.10-3. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in conflict with SCAG policies, and impacts related to a SCAG RTP policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur.

RT	P Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
1.	Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would provide a Business Park including industrial, commercial, and office uses that would improve regional economics by providing an increase of employment and providing additional goods and services within the Norco region. The proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 1.
2.	Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would provide a Business Park including industrial, commercial, and office uses near the I-15 freeway that would increase the accessibility of goods in the region due to access to regional transportation facilities. The proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 2.
3.	Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project does not involve regional travel improvements, but does provide street improvements, driveway accessibility, and a safe onsite circulation system (as detailed in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> that provides for reliable safe travel within and adjacent to the Project site. The proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 3.
4.	Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described above, the proposed Project does not involve regional travel improvements, but does provide improvements within and adjacent to the site that provide connections to regional transportation systems. The proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 4.
5.	Maximize the productivity of our transportation	Consistent. The proposed Project would develop a

Table 5.10-3: Project Consistency with Applicable SCAG Regional Transportation Plan

RT	P Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	system.	business park that does not involve maximizing the productivity of the transportation system. However, as described above, the proposed Project includes street improvements, driveway design, and site access planning to efficiently utilize surrounding roadways.
6.	Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project includes a pedestrian circulation system comprised of interconnected sidewalks within roadway rights-of-ways. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails. Thus, proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 6.
7.	Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the proposed Project includes design features that promote energy efficiency and sustainability. The proposed Project is consistent with RTP Policy 7.
8.	Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and active transportation.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , sidewalks would be installed on the western side of Pacific Avenue, along both sides of Palomino Way, and along Mountain Avenue within the Project area. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. These facilities would facilitate active transportation. In addition, the Corona Cruiser route runs adjacent to the south of the site and the RTA bus route is 0.25 mile from the Project site. The location of the Project
9.	Maximize the security of the regional transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.	Not Applicable. The proposed Project would develop industrial, commercial, and office uses that do not involve the security of the regional transportation system, or regional transportation system planning.

**City of Norco General Plan Policies.** The proposed Project has been prepared in conformance with the goals and policies of the City of Norco General Plan. Table 5.10-4 lists the General Plan policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The table evaluates the Project's compliance with each policy. As described, the proposed Project would be consistent with most of the applicable General Plan policies; however, the Project would conflict with policies related to preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources and significant impacts related to historic resources would occur, as detailed below in Table 5.10-4. As a result, a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would occur.

As detailed in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, mitigation is required; however, impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to historic resources and conflict with policies related to preservation of historic resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy		
Land Use Element			
<b>Policy 2.1.1:</b> Land Use Compatibility. The City needs to maintain a land use plan that keeps commercial development and traffic routes as separate as possible from the City's animal keeping residential areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would route traffic to and from the site via Second Street, Mountain Avenue, and/or First Street to I-15. These roadways are not developed with animal keeping residential areas. The proposed Project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.1.1.		
<b>Policy 2.1.2:</b> Limitations on Future Growth. The City of Norco is nearing build out conditions and has a limited supply of commercial and industrial zoned properties.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would develop the Project site pursuant to the existing General Plan and Specific plan land use and zoning designations for commercial and industrial uses. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.1.2.		
<b>Policy 2.3.1b:</b> All commercial facilities shall be built and maintained in accordance with Health and Safety Code Requirements and shall meet seismic safety regulations and environmental regulations including noise, air quality, water, and other environmental resources as they apply.	<b>Consistent.</b> The commercial facilities developed by the Project would be maintained in accordance with all health, safety, and seismic, and environmental regulations that would be ensured through construction and operational permitting by the City. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.3.1b.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1c:</b> Street and on-site landscaping shall be provided in such a way so as to create pleasing site-related aesthetics, but also to maintain visual corridors and vista points on a neighborhood and community scale as much as possible.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project landscaping plan has been designed and would be implemented pursuant to the requirements of the Gateway Specific Plan, which have been designed to create pleasing aesthetics and maintain visual corridors within the Project area. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1c.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1f:</b> New office, research, and industrial projects shall be developed in accordance with approved guidelines and/or within height limits to minimize encroachment into expansive views of the horizon.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed previously, the proposed Project would be developed in accordance with the Gateway Specific Plan. The Project does include a CUP to increase the maximum allowable building height from 35 feet to 50 feet for approximately 50 percent of the site. As described previously, the 15-foot taller buildings would be located in the interior of the site and would be visually buffered by other Project buildings and landscaping. In addition, due to the interior location of the 15-foot taller buildings, they would not encroach into expansive views of the horizon. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1f.		
<b>Policy 2.4.1g:</b> Commercial development proposed in areas that adjoin residential development shall provide adequate buffering by landscaping, screening, or open	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project does not propose commercial development adjacent to residential development. Therefore, the proposed Project would be		

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
space. Height limits shall be established in all commercial zones so as to protect the privacy and solar access on adjacent residential lots.	consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.4.1g.
<b>Policy 2.6.1:</b> Land Form Conservation Policy. In areas not already designated for permanent open space in the Conservation or Open Space Elements, land development should be done in such a manner that the City's primary landforms and scenic vistas are protected.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project is not designated for open space. As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, the proposed buildings would be setback from roadways and would not obstruct public views of the Santa Ana and San Gabriel Mountains, which is the primary landforms and scenic vista in the Project vicinity. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Land Use Element Policy 2.6.1.
<b>Policy 2.7.1:</b> Historical Building Preservation Policy: The City will identify and preserve the unique historical buildings that significantly identify and establish the community's history and character.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, the Norco Egg Ranch is considered to be significant under the City's Landmark criterion A as it is an important part of the City's history. The Project would remove these historic structures on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with Policy 2.7.1 that is provided to reduce impacts to historic resources.
<b>Policy 2.7.1a:</b> Sites of significant historical, archaeological, and cultural value shall be preserved and/or incorporated into proposed new development with mitigation measures established through the environmental review process.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, preservation of the historic structures and incorporation of the Norco Egg Ranch portion of the site into the Project is not feasible for a number of reasons. The Project would remove the significant historic structures on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with Policy 2.7.1 a that is provided to reduce impacts to historic resources.
<b>Policy 2.7.1c:</b> Rehabilitation of historical structures should be done so that the integrity of structures is not jeopardized with inappropriate additions or alterations.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> As described previously and detailed in Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , preservation and rehabilitation of the historic structures on the site is not feasible. The Project would remove the significant historic structures on the Project site. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with Policy 2.7.1 c that is provided to reduce impacts to historic resources.
<b>Policy 2.7.1d:</b> No demolition of any historical structure shall occur until an assessment of the cost of rehabilitation of the existing structure has been submitted to the City.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> As described previously and detailed in Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , the Project would demolish the significant historic structures on the Project site and rehabilitation of the structures would not occur. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with Policy 2.7.1d that is provided to reduce impacts to historic resources.
<b>Policy 2.7.1g:</b> Community design adjacent to historical structures shall not impede the integrity of the historical structure, either through inappropriate design, building mass, landscaping mass, setbacks, etc.	<b>Not Consistent.</b> As described previously and detailed in Section 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , the Project would redevelop the site to be consistent with the requirements of the Gateway Specific Plan Design Guidelines. The Norco Egg Ranch and the related historic buildings occupies a large portion of the center of the Project

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	site. The Project would develop new industrial buildings that would demolish the historic structures and replace them with industrial and business park uses. Therefore, the Project would not be consistent with Policy 2.7.1g that is provided to reduce impacts to historic resources.
<b>Policy 2.7.2a:</b> The City should collect, record, and/or mitigate archaeological resources to the level consistent with the related value of each item in terms of historical significance and importance.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, the Project site has been previously disturbed, which likely eradicated any near-surface record of prehistoric, ethnohistoric, or historic-era behavioral activities that may have otherwise been preserved as archaeological sites, deposits or features. Therefore, the Project area has a low sensitivity for archaeological resources. However, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 has been included to mitigate the potential impacts of inadvertent discoveries of potential resources during construction activities. The mitigation includes collection and recordation of resources, in the unlikely event that they are found onsite. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 2.7.2a.
<b>Policy 2.7.2b:</b> New development requiring discretionary approval from the Planning Commission shall be approved with a condition that requires any construction activity to stop upon discovery of archaeological resources until such time as a qualified archaeologist, retained by the property owner or developer, has investigated the site and made recommendations regarding the disposition of any items. Human remains shall not be moved until the Riverside County Coroner's Office has been notified.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires an archeologist to be retained to provide on-call services and that in the event that potential archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work must be halted within 50 feet of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. In addition, Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, describes that the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 regulate discoveries of human remains at development sites, which requires that excavation or disturbance in the vicinity of human remains to cease until the coroner has reviewed the remains. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.7.2b.
<b>Policy 2.7.2c:</b> New development shall be coordinated with Native American tribes that have an historical presence and interest in the Norco region, or any other groups with historical interest.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.14, <i>Tribal Cultural</i> <i>Resources</i> , pursuant to the requirements of SB 18 and AB 52, the City of Norco has coordinated with Native American tribes that have an historical presence and interest in the Norco region. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.7.2c.
Circulation Element	
<b>Policy 1.1:</b> Develop a circulation system of equestrian trails connecting all residential lots into a city-wide network that connects residential areas with commercial areas, public facilities, and open space/recreational elements.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.1.

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
<b>Policy 1.2:</b> Establish a trail system that is separate and safe from vehicular traffic with appropriate (signalized as necessary) road and intersection crossings to maintain circularity of the trail system.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the Project includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.2.
<b>Policy 1.4:</b> Follow appropriate City standards in designing and constructing future street improvements.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , and Section 5.13, <i>Transportation</i> , the street and vehicular circulation improvements that would be implemented by the Project would be completed in compliance with applicable City of Norco standards. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.4.
<b>Policy 1.7:</b> Establish a signalized arterial street system that provides an acceptable level of service during peak hours under build out conditions.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 5.13, <i>Transportation</i> , Mitigation Measure TR-1 is included to provide for construction of traffic improvements to the arterial street system that would improve LOS levels at intersections to LOS D or better, which is consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.9 (below). Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.7.
<b>Policy 1.9:</b> Encourage a minimum Level of Service D for roadway segments and a minimum Level of Service D for intersections at peak hours under build out conditions.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 5.13, <i>Transportation</i> , Mitigation Measure TR-1 is included to mitigate the impacts related to the traffic trips that would be generated by the proposed Project. The mitigation requires fair-share payments toward construction of traffic improvements that would improve LOS levels at intersections to LOS D or better; thereby encouraging a minimum LOS D. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.9.
<b>Policy 1.11:</b> Encourage the reduction of vehicle trips through implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, such as requiring major employers to prepare Transportation Management Plans with provisions for carpooling, vanpooling, flexible work hours, etc.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , the proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-6, which requires that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Circulation Element Policy 1.11.
<b>Policy 2.5:</b> Continue to maintain and improve the City's system of equestrian trails to also meet the needs of pedestrians within the community.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the Project includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 2.5.
<b>Policy 2.9:</b> Provide a system of bicycle facilities (paths, lanes, and routes) in conjunction with circulation system	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the Project includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
roadway improvements to separate bicycle traffic from equestrian trails.	and development of new equestrian trails. These equestrian trails would be separate from pedestrian and bicycle lane traffic. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 2.9.
<b>Policy 2.12:</b> Provide safe crossings of major arterials for pedestrians and equestrians.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project includes street and vehicular circulation improvements that would be implemented in compliance with applicable City of Norco standards, which provide for safe crossings for pedestrians and equestrians. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 2.12.
<b>Policy 4.1:</b> Require all new developments to provide adequate off-street parking based on expected parking needs.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project includes an amendment to the Gateway Specific Plan to update the parking standards for Project related lands uses. The proposed parking standards are based on the expected parking needs. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Circulation Element Policy 4.1.
Conservation Element	
<b>Policy 2.2.1a:</b> Continue to promote water conservation through the use of xeriscape designs in new development. Additionally, public spaces shall incorporate xerixcape landscaping where feasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the proposed landscaping would use xeriscape designs and irrigation systems would be designed to conserve water. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.2.1 a.
<b>Policy 2.1.1b:</b> New projects (both public and private) should include as part of each project the installation of infrastructure for reclaimed water where the installation for future use is feasible.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 3.0, <i>Project</i> <i>Description</i> , the proposed Project includes use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation within the Project at such time as it can be made reasonably available. The Project includes installation of the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water, as part of street improvements along Jurupa Avenue, Locust Avenue, Alder Avenue, and Armstrong Road. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.1.1b.
<b>Policy 2.1.2a:</b> Protect water resources from pollutants through enforcement of the Clean Water Act with the issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for new development, as applicable, including Storm Water Pollution Protection Plans (SWPPP) during construction, and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) post construction.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.9, <i>Hydrology and</i> Water Quality, the proposed Project would implement a SWPPP as required by the NPDES General Construction Permit and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 during construction activities, and implement a WQMP per the Regional MS4 Permit, which would protect groundwater quality. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.2.1a.
Policy 2.3.2a: Require the installation of flow restriction	Consistent. As detailed in Section 3.0, Project

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
fixtures in all new development.	Description, the proposed Project would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code ([CALGreen]; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), which includes installation of low flow water fixtures. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.3.2a.
<b>Policy 2.5.1a:</b> Encourage new construction and project design that uses, or takes advantage of renewable energy resources, including but not limited to solar energy design.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the proposed Project includes design features that promote energy efficiency and sustainability. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.5.1 a.
<b>Policy 2.7.2.a:</b> Require all new development to be in compliance with its respective National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and corresponding Water Quality Management Plan as applicable, and to not create a situation that would cause a violation of the City of Norco NPDES Permit.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.9, <i>Hydrology and</i> Water Quality, the proposed Project would implement a SWPPP as required by the NPDES General Construction Permit and the City's Municipal Code Chapter 15.70 during construction activities, and implement a WQMP per the Regional MS4 Permit, which would protect groundwater quality. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a situation that would cause a violation of the City of Norco NPDES Permit and would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.7.2a.
<b>Policy 2.8.2:</b> Biological Assessment Policy. As part of the development review process for all development proposals, the City should require habitat and biological assessments in areas expected to contain significant or important plant and wildlife communities identifying species types and locations.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , a Biological Technical Report (BTR 2019) and the Jurisdictional Delineation (JD 2019) were prepared for the Project, which identified mitigation measures that would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.2.
<b>Policy 2.8.3:</b> Wildlife Impact Mitigation Policy. The City should require development that has been found to have a potential adverse impact on sensitive species habitat to mitigate the potential impacts of proposed habitat changes.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, and detailed in Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , mitigation measures have been provided to reduce potential impacts to sensitive species habitat to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.3.
<b>Policy 2.8.4a:</b> Implement the requirements of the MSHCP for public and private development projects including the collection of mitigation fees.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, and detailed in Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the proposed Project would be consistent with the requirements of the MSHCP and mitigation measures have been provided to implement MSHCP preconstruction required activities and approvals. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.4a.
Policy 2.8.4b: Comply with the "Other Plan	Consistent. As described previously, and detailed in
Requirements" of the MSHCP including requirements for:	Section 5.3, Biological Resources, the proposed Project
Riparian/Riverine and Fairy Shrimp Habitat; Narrow	would be consistent with the requirements of the MSHCP
Endemic Fidins; Chiena Area Survey Species; and	increaning requirements for: kipution/ kiverine and fairy
General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
--	--
Urban/Wildlife Interface Guidelines.	Shrimp Habitat; Narrow Endemic Plants; Criteria Area Survey Species; and Urban/Wildlife Interface Guidelines. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.4b.
<b>Policy 2.8.4c:</b> Employ Best Management Practices of the MSHCP in project siting and design for both public and private development projects.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 5.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources</i> , the Project site is located outside of the MSHCP Criteria Area, the Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area, Mammal and Amphibian Survey Areas, as well as outside of Core and Linkage areas. Although, the Project site is within the Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area and Burrowing Owl Survey Area for the MSHCP, neither have been identified on or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, impacts to the MSHCP from the Project location would not occur. As a result, the proposed Project would be consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.4c.
<b>Policy 2.8.6:</b> Natural Vegetation Policy. Review all new development so as to remove only the minimal amount of natural vegetation as possible and require revegetation of graded areas with native plant species consistent with public safety requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Section 5.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources</i> , the Project site is generally devoid of natural vegetation communities, except for a small patch of riparian habitat that is 0.02 acre. Impacts to the riparian habitat would be mitigated at a minimum 2:1 ratio, pursuant to Mitigation Measures BIO-2 and BIO- 4. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.8.6.
<b>Policy 2.9.2:</b> Implement the applicable local strategies as feasible from the RTP/SCS.	<b>Consistent.</b> As detailed in Table 5.10-1 the proposed Project would be implemented consistent with the RTP/SCS Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with General Plan Policy 2.9.2.
<b>Policy 2.9.3:</b> Alternative Transportation Policy. Increase opportunities and accessibility for trail riding, cycling, and walking.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , sidewalks would be installed on the western side of Pacific Avenue, along both sides of Palomino Way, and along Mountain Avenue within the Project area. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails, where none currently exist, along the perimeter of the site. These facilities would facilitate alternative transportation. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.9.3.
<b>Policy 2.9.5:</b> Transportation Demand Management Policy. Encourage, and as appropriate require, car share or ride sharing programs with new developments anticipated to have one or more large employers. Encourage multiple-site transportation demand management programs.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.2, Air Quality, the proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-6, which requires that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Conservation Element

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	Policy 2.9.5.
<b>Policy 2.9.11:</b> Land Use Parking Management Policy. Encourage shared parking and pedestrian access between adjacent similar land uses to encourage walking while at the same time discouraging short vehicle trips between close destinations.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project includes parking facilities adjacent to each building, which could be shared between onsite uses. In addition, the Project includes pedestrian walkways between buildings and sidewalks along streets that provide pedestrian access between adjacent uses. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.9.11.
<b>Policy 2.9.12:</b> Land Use Mixed Development Policy. Encourage a mix of land uses around high-density projects to encourage walking for convenience items as opposed to vehicle trips.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project includes a mix of industrial, office, and commercial uses within one high density area. The design of the Project would encourage walking between onsite uses, by inclusion of pedestrian accesses and sidewalks. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 2.9.12.
<b>Policy 2.9.1:</b> Building Energy Efficiency. In addition to compliance with the California Green Building Code requirements, encourage innovation in residential and non-residential design to further minimize ultimate consumption of energy and water resources including the development of green roofs.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would comply with all CalGreen (Title 24) Building Codes relative to energy efficiency, which would be verified by the City during the building permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Conservation Element Policy 2.9.1.
<b>Policy 2.9.18:</b> Waste Source Reduction Policy. Encourage on-site composting and recycling of food scrap and paper waste materials for diversion from landfills.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.15, Utilities and Service Systems, all uses within the City are subject to the requirements of AB 939, and all projects in the City undergo development review and permitting, including a review to ensure compliance with waste reduction requirements. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Policy 2.9.1.8.
Noise Element	
<b>Policy 2.2.2a:</b> New development projects near developed and occupied residential areas should be evaluated for possible submittal of a noise reduction plan prior to the issuance of grading permits.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.11, Noise, the proposed Project is located near existing residences and a Noise Impact Analyses (included as Appendix O) was prepared to evaluate potential impacts to the nearby residential areas. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 was included to reduce potential noise impacts to a less than significant level. The Noise Impact Analyses includes a plan identifying the noise reduction that would occur from implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Noise Element Policy 2.2.2a.
<b>Policy 2.2.2b:</b> All construction equipment should be equipped with noise attenuation features including mufflers and engine shrouds that are at least as effective as original manufacturer equipment.	<b>Consistent.</b> Construction permitting of the Project would include requirements that construction equipment have effective noise control equipment, as intended by the manufacturer. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Noise Element Policy 2.2.2b.

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
<b>Policy 2.2.7:</b> Commercial Noise Control Policy. The City should incorporate as feasible, measures to minimize noise impacts from commercial and industrial zones that are near residential areas.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously and detailed in Section 5.11, Noise, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 was included to reduce potential noise impacts to a less than significant level. The Noise Impact Analyses includes a plan identifying the noise reduction that would occur from implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Noise Element Policy 2.2.7.
<b>Policy 2.2.7b:</b> The City should encourage measures to minimize noise impacts from loading/unloading activities and stock storage containers in commercial and industrial zones that are near developed and occupied residential districts.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously and detailed in Section 5.11, Noise, the noise levels at the receiver locations would range from 33.8 to 62.8 dBA Lmax and truck unloading/docking activity at sensitive receptor locations. As a result, mitigation has been included to require 10-foot high barriers at the Project site boundary at Second Street, 14-foot high noise barriers at truck loading areas adjacent to Pacific Avenue, and north of First Street, and a restriction of nighttime yard or loading dock activity on the western sides of Buildings 1, 2, 10, 17, and 18 near sensitive receptors. These measures would minimize noise impacts from loading/unloading activities to residential areas. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Noise Element Policy 2.2.7b.
Safety Element	
<b>Policy 2.2.1:</b> Seismic Safety Policy. Preparedness for primary seismic hazards (earthquakes, ground shaking) and secondary seismic hazards (liquefaction, landslides) shall continue to be promoted through the enforcement of the latest building and safety codes in both old and new structures.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.6, Geology and Soils, and included as PPP GEO-1, the Project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code as included in the City's Municipal Code to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. CBC related and geologist and/or civil engineer specifications for the proposed Project shall be incorporated into grading plans and building specifications as a condition of construction permit approval. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.2.1.
<b>Policy 2.2.1a:</b> Continue to require all new development to conform to the currently adopted Uniform Building Code and seismic safety regulations.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in previously and detailed in in Section 5.6, Geology and Soils, the Project is required to comply with the California Building Standards Code as included in the City's Municipal Code, as a condition of construction permit approval, to preclude significant adverse effects associated with seismic and soils hazards. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.2.1 a.
<b>Policy 2.3.1f:</b> Endeavor to meet and maintain adequate fire response time for all residents and businesses.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section, 5.12 Public Services, the Project site is located 0.7 mile from Fire Station 14, 3.5 miles from Fire Station 47, and 4.4 miles from fire station 31. The location of the existing fire stations would allow for adequate fire response time to calls for service from the Project site. Therefore, the

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	proposed Project is consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.3.1f.
<b>Policy 2.3.1i:</b> Consider the needs of fire prevention and suppression during project review of development projects. These include, but are not limited to, providing adequate access to buildings, adequate separation between buildings, and adequate building setbacks from fuel modification areas. Fire suppression measures also include continued implementation of adopted fire and building codes (Title 15) pertaining to the installation of automatic fire extinguishing systems in new buildings.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would redevelop the Project site with non-flammable concrete and cement structures that would include all fire related safety features pursuant to the California Fire Code, as included in Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code and verified through the City's building permitting process. Therefore, the Project has considered fire prevention and suppression needs, and would be consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.3.1i.
<b>Policy 2.3.1</b> <i>j</i> : The City Fire Department should provide input to the Planning Division for all developments that require site plan or subdivision review prior to hearings before official commissions or the City Council. Street and driveway widths shall be adequate to provide access to sites and buildings shall be configured to provide sufficient clearances for fire suppression and other emergency access needs.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the Project would redevelop the Project site with non-flammable concrete and cement related structures that would include all fire related safety features pursuant to the California Fire Code, as included in Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code, and verified through the City's building permitting process, which includes review by the Fire Department. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.3.1j.
<b>Policy 2.3.1m:</b> Continuously and systematically mitigate existing fire hazards related to existing development or patterns of development as they are identified and as resources permit.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project is not within an existing fire hazard area and would redevelop the Project site with non-flammable concrete and cement related structures that would include all fire related safety features pursuant to the California Fire Code, as included in Chapter 15.09 of the City's Municipal Code, and verified through the City's building permitting process. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.3.1m.
<b>Policy 2.4.1:</b> During project review require drainage studies (as needed) by a qualified engineer to certify that new development will be adequately protected, and that project development will not create new downstream flood hazards.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project is required to have City reviewed and approved drainage/hydrology, a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), and a water quality management plan (WQMP) to receive permits to construct and operate the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.4.1j.
<b>Policy 2.4.1k:</b> Require erosion and flood control improvements to be consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Board Best Management Practices (BMP's) and encourage the incorporation of natural landscaping and pervious surfaces in site design review.	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project is required to have a City reviewed and approved SWPPP and WQMP that include BMPs to control erosion and stormwater flows to receive permits to construct and operate the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.4.1k.
<b>Policy 2.5.2a:</b> Endeavor to provide a minimum response time of 5 minutes on all priority 1 calls and 12 minutes on all priority 2 calls. Priority 1 calls include those of a life-threatening nature such as: robbery in progress, accident involving bodily injury, death-threatening situation, a person unable to breathe, and	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.12, <i>Public Services</i> , although an incremental increase in demands on law enforcement services would occur from the Project, it would not be substantial compared to the existing services provided by the Sheriff's Department. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Safety

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
violent crimes in process. Priority 2 calls include those that are not life threatening such as: burglary past, petty theft, shoplifting.	Element Policy 2.5.2a.
<b>Policy 2.5.3:</b> Security Design Program Policy. The City will work to reduce crime potential in the urban environment by making sure that any input regarding crime-reduction strategies from the Planning Division and the Sherriff's Department are considered in all development plans.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.12, <i>Public</i> Services, the proposed Project would include installation of security features, such as the provision of low- intensity security lighting in parking areas and adjacent to building structures. Additionally, all plans would be reviewed and approved by the Sheriff's Department and pursuant to the City's existing permitting process, the Building Department would review and approve the final site plans to ensure that crime prevention measures are incorporated appropriately to provide a safe environment. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.5.3.
<b>Policy 2.5.3b:</b> Encourage and implement appropriate utilization of defensible space design concepts in new developments.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.12, <i>Public</i> Services, the proposed Project would include installation of security features, such as the provision of low- intensity security lighting in parking areas and adjacent to building structures and other crime prevention measures that would be reviewed by the Sheriff's Department and the City during the permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.5.3b.
Policy 2.8.1: For businesses or individuals involved in the use of hazardous materials require proof of compliance with all jurisdictional agencies (federal, state, and local) prior to issuance or renewal of a business license.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the proposed business park uses may include use of hazardous materials. However, any business that uses hazardous material would require a hazardous materials handler permit from the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health and would be required to prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan to minimize the effects and extent of a potential release of a hazardous material. Similarly, the proposed gas station would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 461 (included as PPP HAZ-3) that requires gas stations to have CARB certified enhanced vapor recovery systems, testing and reporting, and routine maintenance and inspection protocols.
<b>Policy 2.9.1:</b> Airport Land Use Compatibility Policy. Through coordination with the Riverside County Airport	<b>Consistent.</b> As described below the Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the

General Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
Land Use Commission (ALUC) ensure that any proposed new development and any change in General Plan Land Use is consistent with the established policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.	Project site and is within the Airport Influence Area. The western portion of the Project site is within Compatibility Zone E, which is identified as an area that has occasional overflights but is beyond the Airport's 55 CNEL noise contour. The safety risk within Compatibility Zone E is low (RIV ALUC 2004a). This zone does not require airspace review or provide limitations on the heights of structures or types of land uses. Therefore, the proposed new development is consistent with the established policies of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.9.1.
<b>Policy 2.9.1a:</b> A determination of consistency should be obtained from the ALUC for any proposed development or General Plan Amendment that is not already deemed exempt by the Airport Land Use Compatibility Map and Policies.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described above, development within the Project site does not require airspace review or provide limitations on the heights of structures or types of land uses. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.9.1a.
<b>Policy 2.9.1b:</b> Proposals for new development consisting of buildings taller than 100 feet and other single solitary structures such as antenna that exceed 35 feet high shall be submitted for recommendation from the ALUC prior to receiving approval from the appropriate City body.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project does not include buildings taller than 100 feet and other single solitary structures such as antenna that exceed 35 feet high. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Safety Element Policy 2.9.1b.

**City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan Policies.** As described in Section 5.10.3, *Environmental Setting*, a majority of the Project site is within the Gateway Specific Plan, which includes policies that are applicable to the proposed Project. Table 5.10-5 lists the Gateway Specific Plan policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The table evaluates the Project's compliance with each policy. As described, the proposed Project would be consistent with these policies and impacts related to conflict with Gateway Specific Plan policies that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

Project Area Design Policies Policy 1: Develop consistent streetscape and architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Policy 1: Develop consistent streetscape and architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the place of a content of the past, but to promote the harmonious placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Barchitecture of the past, but to promote the place of the place of the place of the place of the pla	Specific Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
Policy 1: Develop consistent streetscape and architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Consistent As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, the proposed Project includes landscaping along all of the street corridors within the Project site. The landscaping would include ornamental trees, shrubs, and ground covers within roadway setback areas. The minimum required setbacks are: a 15-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	Project Area Design Policies	
architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. project includes landscaping along all of the street corridors within the Project site. The landscaping would include ornamental trees, shrubs, and ground covers within roadway setback areas. The minimum required setbacks are: a 15-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped area along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	Policy 1: Develop consistent streetscape and	Consistent. As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, the
gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Street, a 28-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue, These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	architectural palettes which are conducive to creating a	proposed Project includes landscaping along all of the
of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme.	gateway statement for Hamner Avenue and other parts	street corridors within the Project site. The landscaping
thematic overview to discourage innovative or contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Covers within roadway setback areas. The minimum required setbacks are: a 15-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped area along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	of the Specific Plan Area. It is not the intent of this	would include ornamental trees, shrubs, and ground
contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme.	thematic overview to discourage innovative or	covers within roadway setback areas. The minimum
architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. First Street, a 25-foot landscaped area along Second Street, a 28-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	contemporary architectural expressions, or to imitate the	required setbacks are: a 15-foot landscaped area along
coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback along Pacific Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	architecture of the past, but to promote the harmonious	First Street, a 25-foot landscaped area along Second
placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian theme. Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	coexistence of architectural styles with an emphasis	Street, a 28-foot landscaped setback along Pacific
theme. Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	placed upon the western/southwestern/early Californian	Avenue, and a 15-foot landscaped area along Mountain
berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.	theme.	Avenue. These setbacks also include a 6-foot landscaped
Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.		berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on
		Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.

Specific Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	Also, the architectural style of the proposed new buildings and signage would comply with the western design theme, as required by the Gateway Specific Plan. Thus, the Project would develop consistent streetscape and architectural landscape palettes; and would be consistent with Policy 1.
<b>Policy 2:</b> Require compliance with the Project Area design guidelines in plans prepared for new development, expansion or redevelopment, and make Project Area design standards a major consideration in the site plan review and approval process.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, the proposed Project would be developed in compliance with the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines, which would be reviewed during the site plan review and approval process. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 2.
<b>Policy 3:</b> Utilize landscape materials within the Corridor which are drought tolerant, clean, safe and relatively low maintenance. Formal forms and configurations should be utilized at activity center nodes, such as major intersections, while less formal, natural planting patterns should be utilized throughout other parts of the Project Area such as in street medians and landscape setbacks.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , and Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , the proposed Project would install drought tolerant landscaping that would be in compliance with the Municipal Code and Gateway Specific Plan landscaping standards. In addition, the Project would comply with CalGreen (Title 24) requirements related to drought tolerant landscaping and low flow irrigation. Larger trees are proposed on the periphery of the Project site along Mountain Avenue, Pacific Avenue, First Street, and Second Street; and enhanced landscaping would occur at Project driveways. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.
<b>Policy 5</b> : Develop land use/site planning concepts that allow for adequate setbacks and land use buffering techniques to mitigate land use conflicts.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> and Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , the proposed Project provides minimum setbacks that are consistent the requirements of the Gateway Specific Plan. Varying setback depths and berms serve as buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses and include a combination of walls, plantings, earthen berms, equestrian trails, and trees. These setbacks would also have a 6-foot landscaped berm on Pacific Avenue and 3-foot landscaped berms on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. These setbacks and use of berms around the Project site, in addition to substantial landscaping along the streets, provide adequate setbacks and land use buffering techniques to mitigate land use conflicts. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 5.
<b>Policy 9:</b> Designate new land uses that are sensitive to existing land use designations. Design appropriate buffers to mitigate potential conflicts caused by possible land use incompatibility.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in the previous response, the Project includes setbacks, berms, and landscaping to provide buffers that mitigate potential land use compatibility conflicts. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 9.
Land Use/Fiscal Policies	
Policy 7: Develop a light industrial land use nucleus	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0. Project

Specific Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
centering around the existing Norco Ranch Facility.	Description, the Project consists of developing a light industrial business park in the Norco Ranch Facility area. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 7.
<b>Policy 8:</b> Promote clustering of multiple, medium sized structures on large parcels rather than single, massive structures.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project consists of 35 industrial business park buildings and 3 commercial buildings of various size and orientation within the Project site. The industrial buildings consist of multiple, medium sized structures that range from 9,240 square feet to 160,275 square feet. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 8.
<b>Policy 9:</b> Allow maximum site development through liberal site development standards in return for well-planned site plans which respond to established design guidelines.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project consists of a well-planned development that provides buffers from adjacent land uses and is consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 9.
<b>Policy 10:</b> Apply design guidelines to mitigate conflicts between uses where a change in land use is not practical.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described previously, the Project includes setbacks, berms, and landscaping to provide buffers that mitigate potential land use compatibility conflicts. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 10.
Circulation Policies	
<b>Policy 2:</b> Allow shared parking and points of access to facilitate efficient parcel usage and to minimize traffic support facilities such as driveways (particularly those that affect traffic flow on major streets such as Hamner Avenue). parting spaces, etc.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project includes parking facilities adjacent to each building, which could be shared between onsite uses. In addition, the Project includes shared driveways that are located along Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.
<b>Policy 3:</b> Discourage new commercial, industrial and office park developments from taking access from local residential streets, by developing internal circulation systems which direct traffic away from surrounding residential neighborhoods.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description,</i> the Project would take access from Mountain Avenue, First Street, and one driveway that provides right-in, right-out access for passenger cars only, is located on Second Street, on the east side of Mountain Avenue. There are no driveways and there is no vehicle access from the Project site to Pacific Avenue. Therefore, the Project would not take access from local residential streets. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.
<b>Policy 9:</b> Promote intersection improvements at the following locations: 1) Hamner Avenue and Yuma Drive (proposed); 2) Parkridge Avenue and Yuma Drive (proposed); 3) Hamner Avenue and First Street; 4) Mountain Avenue and First Street; 5) Parkridge Avenue, First Street, Pacific Avenue and Lincoln Street; 6) Mountain Avenue and proposed connector street; and 7) Cota Street and Parkridge Avenue.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project includes improvement of Mountain Avenue from Second Street to the Project's southern boundary to its ultimate full-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way) and at its ultimate half-section width between the Project's southern boundary to First Street; and improvement of First Street from the Project's western boundary to Mountain Avenue at its ultimate half-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).

Specific Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	In addition, as described in Section 5.13, Transportation, Mitigation Measure TR-1 requires fair-share payments to the City of Norco toward construction of the traffic improvements at Parkridge Avenue and Second Street, and Mountain Avenue and First Street. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy 9.
<b>Policy 10:</b> Promote the construction of pedestrian sidewalk facilities where appropriate within the Project Area to facilitate pedestrian activities. Promote the construction of riding trails along Pacific Avenue, First and Second Streets. Provide incentives to private development to incorporate such amenities into their development proposals.	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project includes a pedestrian circulation system comprised of interconnected sidewalks within roadway rights-of-ways. The Project also includes improvement of the existing equestrian trails and development of new equestrian trails. This includes equestrian trails along Pacific Avenue, First and Second Streets. Thus, proposed Project is consistent with Policy 10.
Environmental Policies	
<b>Policy 1:</b> Limit development within the 100-year flood areas as shown on the latest City FIRM maps (or as may be amended) or provide flood protection measures e.g., improved flood control channel facilities, in accordance with City and Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District requirements.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project includes improvement of the drainage system surrounding the Project site and improve the South Norco Channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan. With these Project improvements, and the proposed grading plan, the Project site would not be located in a 100-year flood hazard area. As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project includes an issuance of Conditional Letter of Map Revision and Letter of Map Revision to the Flood Insurance Rate Map. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 1.
<b>Policy 3:</b> Through the project approval process and the imposition of conditions or mitigation measures, pursuant to CEQA, ensure that all development within the Specific Plan area will not result in a decrease in environmental quality, and will wherever possible create a higher quality environment.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described throughout this EIR, mitigation measures would be implemented pursuant to CEQA to reduce impacts to environmental quality. In addition, as described previously, the Project includes street improvements and landscaping installations that would create a higher quality environment. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy 3.
<b>Policy 4:</b> Encourage that developments within the Project Area impacted by noise provide sufficient noise attenuation levels to maintain exterior and interior CNEL noise levels at acceptable levels.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 5.11, Noise, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 was included to maintain exterior and interior CNEL noise levels at acceptable levels. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 4.
Infrastructure Policies	1
<b>Policy 1:</b> Insure that all necessary public services and utilities are or will be available prior to completion of new development projects and prior to, or concurrently with the issuing of building permits.	<b>Consistent.</b> As described in Section 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , the Project includes infrastructure improvements to provide water, sewer, and drainage utilities. In addition, Section 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , describes that the project would install onsite

Specific Plan Policy	Proposed Project Consistency with Policy
	utility infrastructure that would connect to existing off-site
	infrastructure and that the Project would be adequately
	served by service and utility systems. Therefore, the
	proposed Project is consistent with Policy 1.
Policy 3: Monitor utilization of public infrastructure	Consistent. As described in the previous response, the
systems and program improvements to ensure capacity	Project includes improvements to water, sewer, and
for future planned development.	drainage systems to ensure capacity to serve the
	proposed Project and surrounding land uses. The
	improvements to the South Norco Channel would
	accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the
	Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan.
	Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy
	3.

**Corona Municipal Airport.** As described above, Corona Municipal Airport is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Project site and is within the Airport Influence Area. The western portion of the Project site is within Compatibility Zone E, which is identified as an area that has occasional overflights but is beyond the Airport's 55 CNEL noise contour. The safety risk within Compatibility Zone E is low (RIV ALUC 2004a). This zone does not require airspace review or provide limitations on the heights of structures or types of land uses.

The proposed business park uses allowed by the existing General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations and proposed by the Project would not include any highly noise-sensitive outdoor uses or other uses that could be affected by the occasional overflight related to use of the Corona Municipal Airport. Exterior uses within the Project area would be limited to parking, loading dock, solid waste and recycling, and landscaping uses. The Project would result in a maximum of 50-foot high structures that would not extend into airspace. Additionally, Compatibility Zone E does not include criteria related to types and heights of land uses. Thus, the proposed Project would not conflict with a land use plan or policy related to the Corona Municipal Airport and impacts would not occur.

# 5.10.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The geographic context for this cumulative analysis includes the City of Norco in relation to the City's General Plan. Cumulative development would result in substantial changes to existing land use patterns through conversion of underutilized parcels into urban uses pursuant to the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan land use designations. Cumulative development would also be subject to site-specific environmental and planning reviews that would address consistency with adopted General Plan and Specific Plan policies, as well as with the City's Municipal Code and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Plan policies. As part of environmental review, projects would be required to provide mitigation for any inconsistencies with the General Plan and environmental policies that would result in adverse physical environmental effects. The cumulative projects as a whole would result in a more intensely developed built environment than currently exists and would be required to be consistent with local General Plan policies.

While cumulative projects could include General Plan amendments and/or zone changes, modifications to existing land uses. Such amendments do not necessarily represent an inherent negative effect on the environment, particularly if the proposed changes involve changes in types and intensity of uses, rather than eliminating application of policies that were specifically adopted for the purpose of avoiding or

mitigating environmental effects. Past and present cumulative projects do not involve amendments that would eliminate application of policies that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Determining whether any future project might include such amendments and determining the cumulative effects of any such amendments would be speculative since it cannot be known what applications that are not currently filed might request. Thus, it is expected that the land uses of cumulative projects would be consistent with policies that avoid an environmental effect; therefore, cumulatively considerable impacts from cumulative projects related to policy consistency would be less than significant.

# 5.10.8 EXISTING PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

There are no Plans, Programs, or Policies related to Land Use.

# 5.10.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impact LU-2 would be significant and unavoidable.

### 5.10.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure AQ-6: Transportation Management: As described in Section 5.2, Air Quality.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Jurisdictional Areas: As described in Section 5.3, Biology.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation: As described in Section 5.3, *Biology*.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historic American Buildings Survey Documentation:** As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Resources: As described in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Operational Noise Measures: As described in Section 5.11, Noise.

Mitigation Measure TR-1: Traffic Improvements: As described in Section 5.13, Transportation.

### 5.10.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

As listed above, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources; however, impacts related to historic resources cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Thus, impacts related to conflict with policies related to preservation of historic resources would be significant and unavoidable.

### REFERENCES

City of Norco General Plan. Accessed: www.norco.ca.us/depts/planning/general.asp

City of Norco Gateway Specific Plan. Accessed: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/planning/plans/gateway.asp City of Norco Municipal Code. Accessed: https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Norco/ Corona Airport (Corona 2019). Accessed: https://www.coronaca.gov/government/departmentsdivisions/maintenance-services/corona-airport

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, 2004 (RIV ALUC 2004). Accessed: http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/11-%20Vol%201%20Corona%20Municipal.pdf

Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Compatibility Zone Factors (RIV ALUC 2004a). Accessed: http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/PDFGeneral/plan/newplan/05-%20Vol.%201%20Individual%20Airports.pdf

# 5.11 Noise

# 5.11.1 INTRODUCTION

This section evaluates the noise impacts that would result from development occurring pursuant to the proposed Project. It discusses the existing noise environment within and around the Project area, as well as the regulatory framework for regulation of noise. It also analyzes the effect of the development of the Project on the existing ambient noise environment during construction, demolition, and operational activities, and evaluates the Project's noise effects for consistency with relevant local agency noise policies and regulations. The analysis in this section also addresses impacts in relation to groundborne vibration. The Noise Impact Analyses prepared by Urban Crossroads (Urban Crossroads 2019) is included as Appendix O.

# NOISE AND VIBRATION TERMINOLOGY

Various noise descriptors are utilized in this EIR analysis, and are summarized as follows:

- Leq: The equivalent sound level, which is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, typically1 hour, in terms of a single numerical value. The Leq of a time-varying signal and that of a steady signal are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy over a given time. The Leq may also be referred to as the average sound level.
- Lmax: The instantaneous maximum noise level experienced during a given period of time.
- Lmin: The instantaneous minimum noise level experienced during a given period of time.
- Lx: The sound level that is equaled or exceeded "x" percent of a specified time period. The "x" thus represents the percentage of time a noise level is exceeded. For instance, L50 and L90 represents the noise levels that are exceeded 50 percent and 90 percent of the time, respectively.
- Ldn: Also termed the "day-night" average noise level (DNL), Ldn is a measure of the average of Aweighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, accounting for the greater sensitivity of most people to nighttime noise by weighting noise levels at night (penalizing" nighttime noises). Noise between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. is weighted by adding 10 dBA to take into account the greater annoyance of nighttime noises.
- **CNEL:** The Community Noise Equivalent Level, which, similar to the Ldn, is the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day that is obtained after an addition of 5 dBA to measured noise levels between the hours of 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm and after an addition of 10 dBA to noise levels between the hours of 10:00 pm to 7:00 am to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively.
- Ambient Noise: The "ambient noise level" is the background noise level associated with a given environment at a specified time and is usually a composite of sound from many sources from many directions.

#### Effects of Noise

Noise is generally loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired sound that is typically associated with human activity that is a nuisance or disruptive. The effects of noise on people can be placed into four general categories:

- Subjective effects (e.g., dissatisfaction, annoyance)
- Interference effects (e.g., communication, sleep, and learning interference)
- Physiological effects (e.g., startle response)
- Physical effects (e.g., hearing loss)

Although exposure to high noise levels has been demonstrated to cause physical and physiological effects, the principal human responses to typical environmental noise exposure are related to subjective effects and interference with activities. Interference effects refer to interruption of daily activities and include interference with human communication activities, such as normal conversations, watching television, telephone conversations, and interference with sleep. Sleep interference effects can include both awakening and arousal to a lesser state of sleep. With regard to the subjective effects, the responses of individuals to similar noise events are diverse and are influenced by many factors, including the type of noise, the perceived importance of the noise, the appropriateness of the noise to the setting, the duration of the noise, the time of day and the type of activity during which the noise occurs, and individual noise sensitivity.

In general, the more a new noise level exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise level will be by those hearing it. With regard to increases in A-weighted noise levels, the following relationships generally occur:

- Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1 dBA cannot be perceived.
- Outside of the laboratory, a 3 dBA change in noise levels is considered to be a barely perceivable difference.
- A change in noise levels of 5 dBA is considered to be a readily perceivable difference.
- A change in noise levels of 10 dBA is subjectively heard as doubling of the perceived loudness.

#### **Noise Attenuation**

Stationary point sources of noise, including mobile sources such as idling vehicles, attenuate (lessen) at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source over hard surfaces to 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the source over soft surfaces, depending on the topography of the area and environmental conditions (e.g., atmospheric conditions, noise barriers [either vegetative or manufactured]). Thus, a noise measured at 90 dBA 50 feet from the source would attenuate to about 84 dBA at 100 feet, 78 dBA at 200 feet, 72 dBA at 400 feet, and so forth. Widely distributed noise, such as a large industrial facility spread over many acres or a street with moving vehicles, would typically attenuate at a lower rate, approximately 4 to 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source.

Hard sites are those with a reflective surface between the source and the receiver, such as asphalt or concrete surfaces or smooth bodies of water. No excess ground attenuation is assumed for hard sites and the changes in noise levels with distance (drop-off rate) is simply the geometric spreading of the noise from the source. Soft sites have an absorptive ground surface such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees. In addition to geometric spreading, an excess ground attenuation value of 1.5 dBA (per doubling distance) is normally assumed for soft sites. Line sources (such as traffic noise from vehicles) attenuate at a rate between 3 dBA for hard sites and 4.5 dBA for soft sites for each doubling of distance from the reference measurement.

#### **Fundamentals of Vibration**

Vibration is energy transmitted in waves through the ground or man-made structures. These energy waves generally dissipate with distance from the vibration source. There are several different methods that are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings but is not always suitable for evaluating human response (annoyance) because it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. Instead, the human body responds to average vibration amplitude often described as the root mean square (RMS). The RMS amplitude is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal and is most frequently used to describe the effect of vibration on the human body. Decibel notation (VdB) is commonly used to measure RMS. Decibel notation (VdB) serves to reduce the range of numbers used to describe human response to vibration. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Sensitive receivers for vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly, and sick), and vibration-sensitive equipment.

The background vibration-velocity level in residential areas is generally 50 VdB. Ground-borne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB. For most people, a vibration-velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the ground-borne vibration is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration-velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

# 5.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### United States Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration

The United States Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) sets legal limits on noise exposure in the workplace. The permissible exposure limit for a worker over an eight-hour day is 90 dBA. The OSHA standard uses a 5 dBA exchange rate. This means that when the noise level is increased by 5 dBA, the amount of time a person can be exposed to a certain noise level to receive the same dose is cut in half. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has recommended that all worker exposures to noise should be controlled below a level equivalent to 85 dBA for eight hours to minimize occupational noise induced hearing loss. NIOSH also recommends a 3 dBA exchange rate so that every increase by 3 dBA doubles the amount of the noise and halves the recommended amount of exposure time. OSHA has implemented requirements to protect all workers in general industry (e.g. the manufacturing and the service sectors) for employers to implement a Hearing Conservation Program where workers are exposed to a time weighted average noise level of 85 dBA or higher over an eight-hour work shift. These regulations are part of OSHA Standard 29 CRF, Part 1910.

#### Title 24, California Building Code

State regulations related to noise include requirements for the construction of new hotels, motels, apartment houses, and dwellings other than detached single-family dwellings that are intended to limit the extent of noise transmitted into habitable spaces. These requirements are collectively known as the California Noise Insulation Standards and are found in California Code of Regulations, Title 24 (known as the Building Standards Administrative Code), Part 2 (known as the California Building Code), Appendix Chapters 12 and 12A. To limit noise transmitted between adjacent dwelling units, the noise insulation standards specify

the extent to which walls, doors, and floor ceiling assemblies must block or absorb sound. To limit noise from exterior sources, the noise insulation standards set forth an interior standard of DNL 45 dBA in any habitable room and, where such units are proposed in areas subject to noise levels greater than DNL 60 dBA require an acoustical analysis demonstrating how dwelling units have been designed to meet this interior standard. If the interior noise level depends upon windows being closed, the design for the structure must also specify a ventilation or air conditioning system to provide a habitable interior environment. Title 24 standards are enforced through the building permit application process in the City.

#### City of Norco General Plan Noise Element

The City of Norco General Plan Noise Element describes categories of land uses and compatibility with various noise levels. According to these categories of transportation-related noise compatibility shown on Table 5.11-1, the proposed business park office, business, commercial, and industrial land uses are considered normally acceptable with unmitigated exterior noise levels below 70 dBA CNEL and conditionally acceptable with noise levels approaching 75 dBA CNEL. Nearby sensitive residential land uses are considered normally acceptable with noise levels below 60 dBA CNEL, and conditionally acceptable with noise levels below 70 dBA CNEL. For conditionally acceptable land use, new construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

**Municipal Code Section 9.07.040 General Sound Level Standards.** No person shall create any sound, or allow the creation of any sound, on any property that causes the exterior sound level on any other occupied property to exceed the sound level standards (listed in Table 5.11-2) or that violates the special sound source standards set forth in Section 9.07.060.

**Municipal Code Section 9.07.060 Special Sound Sources Standards, (B) Power Tools and Equipment.** No person shall operate any power tools or equipment between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such that the power tools or equipment are audible to the human ear inside an inhabited dwelling other than a dwelling in which the power tools or equipment may be located. No person shall operate any power tools or equipment at any other time such that the power tools or equipment are audible to the human ear at a distance greater than 100 feet from the power tools or equipment.

LAND US	COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE dB(A) CNEL						
			55	60	65	70 75	80
RESIDENTIAL – LOW DE DUPLEX, MOBILE HOME	ENSITY, SINGLE FAMILY, ES						
RESIDENTIAL – MULTIP							
TRANSIENT LODGING -	- MOTELS, HOTELS						
SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NURSING HOMES	CHURCHES, HOSPITALS	3					
AUDITORIUMS, CONCE	RT HALLS, AMPHITHEATI	ERS					
SPORTS ARENAS, OUT	DOOR SPECTATOR SPO	RTS					
PLAYGROUNDS, NEIGH							
GOLF COURSES, RIDIN RECREATION, CEMETA	G STABLES, WATER RIES						
OFFICE BUILDINGS, BU PROFESSIONAL OFFICI	SINESS, COMMERCIAL, ES						
INDUSTRIAL, MANUFAC AGRICULTURE	TURING, UTILITIES,						
NORMALLY ACCEPTABLE Specified land use is satisfac- tory, based upon assumption that buildings are of normal conventional construction, without special noise insula- tion.	CONDITIONALLY ACCEPTABLE New construction should only proceed after a detailed anal- ysis of noise reduction requi- rements is made and needed insulation included in the de- sign. Conventional construc- tion may suffice with closed windows and a fresh air sup- ply system.	New cons discourag proceeds of noise r ments mu with need ded in the	IORMALLY INACCEPTA struction sho yed. If constru- , a detailed a eduction req ust be comple led insulation e design.	ABLE uld be ruction inalysis uire- eted inclu-	New occu make acce tive a ment	CLEARL UNACCE developmeni r. Constructi e the indoor e ptable would and the outdoor t would not be	Y PTABLE should not on costs to environment be prohibi- or environ- a useable.

#### Table 5.11-1: City of Norco Noise Level Exposure and Land Use Compatibility Guidelines

Source: City of Norco General Plan Noise Element, Table 3.8.

#### Table 5.11-2: Municipal Code Sound Level Standards

Land Use	7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m 7:00 a.m.
Residential	55	45
Commercial	65	55
Light Industrial	75	55
Heavy Industrial	75	75
Business Park	65	45
Public Facility	65	45

Source: Municipal Code Section 9.07.040 General sound level standards

# 5.11.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

To assess the existing noise level environment, ten 24-hour noise level measurements were taken on November 13, 2018 at sensitive receiver locations in the Project area. The receiver locations were selected to describe and document the existing noise environment within the Project area. Figure 5.11-1 shows the noise measurement locations. The existing ambient noise levels in the Project area are dominated by roadway noise. The 24-hour existing noise level measurements are shown on Table 5.11-3.

	Distance to Project Boundary		Energy Average Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )			
Location	(Feet)	Description	Daytime	Nighttime	CNEL	
L1	20'	Located northern Project site boundary on Second Street, near existing residences.	68.2	65.2	72.3	
L2	190'	Located north of the Project site near existing residences on Second Street.	60.9	58.0	65.2	
L3	0'	Located on Mountain Avenue near existing industrial uses within the Project site.	67.6	64.3	71.5	
L4	0'	Located on Mountain Avenue near existing industrial uses southeast of the Project site.	66.4	63.2	70.4	
L5	0'	Located on Mountain Avenue near existing residences north of First Street.	61.8	59.2	66.3	
L6	0'	Located at the southern Project site boundary on First Street near existing residential and industrial uses.	65.7	62.5	69.8	
L7	70'	Located west of the Project site on Pacific Avenue near existing residences.	56.0	53.8	60.8	
L8	75'	Located west of the Project site on Pacific Avenue near existing residences.	54.4	49.8	57.5	

Table 5.11-3: 24-Hour Ambient Noise Level Measurements

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### **Existing Vibration**

Aside from periodic construction work that may occur in the vicinity of the Project area, other sources of groundborne vibration include heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks and delivery trucks) on area roadways. Trucks traveling at a distance of 50 feet typically generate groundborne vibration velocity levels of around 63 VdB (approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV) and could reach 72 VdB (approximately 0.016 in/sec PPV) when trucks pass over bumps in the road (FTA, 2006).

#### **Sensitive Receptors**

Sensitive receivers are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could otherwise adversely affect the use of the land. Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to include: schools, hospitals, residences, churches, libraries, and recreation areas.

Sensitive receivers near the Project site includes single-family residences shown in Figure 5.11-2. The closest sensitive receiver is located approximately 10 feet from the Project site boundary.

R1: Located approximately 20 feet north of the Project site, R1 represents existing residences and outdoor living areas (e.g., backyards) east of Pacific Avenue and south of Second Street. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.



Figure 5.11-1: Noise Measurement Locations



- Distance from receiver to Project site boundary (in feet)

Figure 5.11-2: Sensitive Receiver Locations

- R2: Location R2 represents the existing residence located west of the Project site at roughly 10 feet, on the south side of Second Street. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R3: Location R3 represents existing residences on the north side of Second Street at approximately 92 feet north of the Project site. A 24-hour noise measurement near this location, L2, is used to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R4: Location R4 represents the existing residence located roughly 87 feet southeast of the Project site, on the east side of Mountain Avenue. A 24-hour noise measurement near this location, L5, is used to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R5: Located approximately 61 feet east of the Project site, R5 represents existing residences on the east side of Mountain Avenue. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L5, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R6: Location R6 represents the existing residences located east of the Project site at roughly 10 feet on the south side of First Street. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L6, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R7: Location R7 represents the existing residences located south of the Project site at roughly 112 feet on the south side of First Street. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L6, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R8: Located approximately 91 feet west of the Project site, R8 represents existing residences on the west side of Pacific Avenue. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L6, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R9: Location R9 represents the existing residential homes located west of the Project site at roughly 105 feet on the west of Pacific Avenue. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L7, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.
- R10: Location R10 represents the existing residences located west of the Project site at roughly 86 feet on the west side of Pacific Avenue. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, L8, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

# 5.11.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- NOI-1 Generation of a substantial temporary or 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;
- NOI-2 Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- NOI-3 For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels

The Initial Study established that the project would result in no impact related to Threshold NOI-3; no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

Based on the City's noise requirements and the readily perceptible noise described previously, noise impacts are considered significant if any of the following occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### **Construction Noise and Vibration**

- Because the City of Norco does not have specific noise criteria related to temporary and intermittent construction noise, the Criteria for Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure prepared by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) was utilized. The lowest, most conservative construction noise level threshold of 85 dBA Leq over a period of 8 hours or more is used to evaluate the potential Project-related construction noise impacts at nearby sensitive receptors.
- If short-term Project-generated construction vibration levels exceed the vibration threshold of 0.04 in/sec PPV at sensitive receiver locations (Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual). The City of Norco does not identify specific vibration level standards.

#### Off-Site Traffic Noise

- When the noise levels at existing and future noise-sensitive land uses (e.g. residential, etc.):
  - are less than 60 dBA CNEL and the project creates a readily perceptible 5 dBA CNEL or greater Project-related noise level increase; or
  - range from 60 to 65 dBA CNEL and the project creates a barely perceptible 3 dBA CNEL or greater Project-related noise level increase; or
  - already exceed 65 dBA CNEL, and the project creates a community noise level impact of greater than 1.5 dBA CNEL.
- When the noise levels at existing and future non-noise-sensitive land uses (e.g. office, commercial, industrial, etc.):
  - are less than the City of Norco General Plan Noise Element normally acceptable 70 dBA CNEL and the Project creates a readily perceptible 5 dBA CNEL or greater Project related noise level increase; or
  - are greater than the City of Norco General Plan Noise Element normally acceptable 70 dBA CNEL and the Project creates a barely perceptible 3 dBA CNEL or greater Project noise level increase.

#### **Operational Noise and Vibration**

- If Project-related operational (stationary-source) noise levels exceed the exterior 55 dBA Leq daytime and/or 45 dBA Leq nighttime noise level standards at nearby sensitive receiver locations (City of Norco Municipal Code Section 9.07.040). The City's Municipal Code does not include any adjustments to the noise standards to account for existing ambient noise levels. As such, Projectonly noise levels are evaluated for compliance with the Municipal Code standards.
- If the existing ambient noise levels at the nearby noise-sensitive receivers near the Project site:
  - are less than 60 dBA Leq and the Project creates a readily perceptible 5 dBA Leq or greater Project-related noise level increase; or

- range from 60 to 65 dBA Leq and the Project creates a barely perceptible 3 dBA Leq or greater Project-related noise level increase; or
- already exceed 65 dBA Leq and the Project creates a community noise level impact of greater than 1.5 dBA Leq (FICON, 1992).
- If long-term Project generated operational vibration levels exceed the vibration threshold of 0.04 in/sec PPV at sensitive receiver locations (Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual).

# 5.11.5 METHODOLOGY

**Construction Noise.** To identify the temporary construction noise contribution to the existing ambient noise environment, the construction noise levels anticipated from usage of construction equipment needed to implement the proposed Project were combined with the existing ambient noise levels measurements at the sensitive receiver locations. The difference between the combined Project-construction and ambient noise levels are used to describe the construction noise level contributions necessary to assess the level of significance associated with temporary construction noise level impacts.

Although the City's Municipal Code regulations do not allow construction noise to occur between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. such that the power tools or equipment are audible to the human ear inside an inhabited dwelling, the City does not have established numeric maximum construction noise standard. Therefore, to evaluate whether the Project would generate a potentially significant construction noise impact at sensitive receptors, a construction-related noise level threshold is adopted from the Criteria for Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure prepared by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). NIOSH identifies a noise level threshold based on the duration of exposure to the source. The construction related noise level threshold starts at 85 dBA for more than 8 hours per day, and for every 3 dBA increase, the exposure time is cut in half. This results in noise level thresholds of 88 dBA for more than 4 hours per day, 92 dBA for more than one hour per day, 96 dBA for more than 30 minutes per day, and up to 100 dBA for more than 15 minutes per day. For the purposes of this analysis, the lowest, more conservative construction noise level threshold of 85 dBA Leq over a period of 8 hours or more is used.

**Operational Noise.** The primary source of noise associated with the operation of the proposed Project would be from vehicular and truck trips to and from the Project site. The expected roadway noise level increases from vehicular traffic were calculated using the FHWA traffic noise prediction model and the average daily traffic volumes from the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed Project for the following traffic conditions: existing, opening year 2022, and horizon year 2040 conditions.

As detailed in the Traffic Impact Analysis, which is included as Appendix P, operation of the Project is anticipated to generate 7,922 trip-ends per day (actual vehicles) and includes 1,040 truck trip-ends per day. Of these trips, 852 passenger car equivalent (PCE) a.m. peak hour trips and 916 PCE p.m. peak hour trips would occur. The increase in noise levels generated by the vehicular trips have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable noise standards and thresholds of significance listed previously.

Secondary sources of noise would include new stationary sources (such as loading dock noise and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units) associated with the new business park uses. The increase in noise levels generated by these activities have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable noise standards listed previously.

**Vibration.** Aside from noise levels, groundborne vibration would also be generated during construction of the proposed project by various construction-related activities and equipment; and could be generated by

truck traffic traveling to and from the Project area. The potential ground-borne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring from the proposed Project were estimated by data published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Thus, the groundborne vibration levels generated by these sources have also been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable thresholds of significance listed previously.

### 5.11.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT NOI-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE A SUBSTANTIAL TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT INCREASE IN AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT IN EXCESS OF STANDARDS ESTABLISHED IN THE LOCAL GENERAL PLAN OR NOISE ORDINANCE, OR APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF OTHER AGENCIES.

#### Construction

**Less than Significant Impact.** Noise generated by construction equipment would include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that when combined can reach high levels. Construction is expected to occur in the following stages: demolition, grading, building construction, architectural coating, paving.

To describe the Project construction noise levels, measurements were collected for similar activities at several construction sites. Table 5.11-4 provides a summary of the construction reference noise level measurements. As shown, noise levels generated by individual heavy construction equipment would range from approximately 59 dBA to 79 dBA when measured at 50 feet. However, these noise levels diminish with distance from the construction site at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 79 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receiver would be reduced to 73 dBA at 100 feet from the source to the receiver and would be further reduced to 67 dBA at 200 feet from the source to the receiver.

			Reference Distance	Reference Noise Levels @ Reference	Reference Noise Levels
ID	Noise Source	Duration (h:mm:ss)	From Source (Feet)	(dBA L <sub>ea</sub> )	(dBA L <sub>eg</sub> ) <sup>7</sup>
1	Truck Pass-Bys & Dozer Activity	0:01:15	30'	63.6	59.2
2	Dozer Activity	0:01:00	30'	68.6	64.2
	Construction Vehicle Maintenance				
3	Activities	0:01:00	30'	71.9	67.5
4	Foundation Trenching	0:01:01	30'	72.6	68.2
5	Rough Grading Activities	0:05:00	30'	77.9	73.5
6	Framing	0:02:00	30'	66.7	62.3
7	Dozer Pass-By	0:00:32	30'	84.0	79.6
8	Concrete Mixer Truck Movements	0:01:00	50'	71.2	71.2
9	Concrete Paver Activities	0:01:00	30'	70.0	65.6
10	Concrete Mixer Pour & Paving Activities	0:01:00	30'	70.3	65.9
	Concrete Mixer Backup Alarms & Air				
11	Brakes	0:00:20	50'	71.6	71.6
12	Concrete Mixer Pour Activities	1:00:00	50'	67.7	67.7
	Forklift, Jackhammer, & Metal Truck Bed				
13	Loading	0:02:06	50'	67.9	67.9

Table 5.11-4: Construction Reference Noise	e Levels	
--	----------	--

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Table 5.11-5 provides a summary of the construction noise levels by stage at the nearby noise-sensitive receptor locations (shown in Figure 5.11-3). These noise levels identify the worst-case construction noise by showing the highest noise levels when equipment with the highest noise level is operating at the closest point from the edge of construction activity to each receptor location. The noise analysis for each stage of construction represents multiple pieces of construction equipment operating simultaneously and continuously, and only the highest reference noise sources for each stage are used in the analysis. This is also representative of actual construction activities since all equipment will not operate from a single point. As shown, the construction noise levels would range from 57.8 to 79.6 dBA Leq at the closest receptor locations, which is lower than the threshold of 85 dBA Leq. Therefore, noise from construction activities would be less than significant.

	Construction Noise Level (dBA Leq)						
Receptor Location	Demolition	Site Preparation	Grading	Building Construction	Architectural Coating	Paving	Highest Activity Noise Levels
R1	67.9	79.6	73.5	68.2	67.5	71.6	79.6
R2	67.9	79.6	73.5	68.2	67.5	71.6	79.6
R3	60.9	72.6	66.5	61.2	60.5	64.6	72.6
R4	61.3	73.0	66.9	61.6	60.9	65.0	73.0
R5	60.6	72.3	66.2	60.9	60.2	64.3	72.3
R6	67.9	79.6	73.5	68.2	67.5	71.6	79.6
R7	59.9	71.6	65.5	60.2	59.5	63.6	71.6
R8	58.5	70.1	64.0	58.7	58.0	62.2	70.1
R9	58.2	69.9	63.8	58.5	57.8	61.9	69.9
R10	59.7	71.3	65.2	59.9	59.2	63.4	71.3

Table 5.11-5: Project Construction Noise Levels
---

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### Operation

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. This EIR analysis assumes the Project would be operational 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Operations would primarily be conducted within the enclosed buildings, except for traffic movement, parking, as well as loading and unloading of trucks at loading docks. The Project would generate off-site traffic noise from vehicular trips. The on-site project-related noise sources are expected to include: idling trucks, delivery truck activities, parking, backup alarms, commercial speakerphone, gas station activity, loading dock activity, and roof-top air conditioning units.

**Traffic Noise.** To quantify the Project's operational traffic noise, the changes in traffic noise levels on roadway segments were calculated based on the changes in the average daily traffic volumes. Noise contours were used to assess the Project's noise at land uses adjacent to the roadways that would convey Project traffic. As shown on Table 5.11-6, traffic from operation of the Project would generate noise level increases of up to 1.3 dBA CNEL at a noise sensitive land use on roadway segments in the existing condition, which would be less than the even most stringent threshold (a 1.5 dBA CNEL increase). Therefore, impacts from traffic related noise in the existing plus project condition would be less than significant.



Figure 5.11-3: Construction Noise Receiver Locations

				CNEL at A	Adjacent e (dBA)1	Noise- Sensitive	
			No	With	Project	Land	Threshold
	Road	Segment	Project	Project	Addition	Use?	Exceeded?2
1	River Rd.	s/o Corydon St.	75.0	75.0	0.0	Yes	No
2	River Rd.	s/o Lincoln Av.	74.4	74.4	0.0	Yes	No
3	Parkridge Av.	n/o Second St.	61.4	61.5	0.1	Yes	No
4	Parkridge Av.	s/o Second St.	66.6	66.7	0.1	Yes	No
5	Parkridge Av.	s/o Lincoln Av.	68.0	68.0	0.0	Yes	No
6	Pacific Av.	s/o Second St.	54.8	54.8	0.0	Yes	No
7	Mountain Av.	n/o Hamner Av.	70.1	72.3	2.2	No	No
8	Hamner Av.	s/o Third St.	75.4	75.5	0.0	No	No
9	Hamner Av.	s/o Second St.	74.8	74.9	0.1	No	No
10	Hamner Av.	s/o First St.	73.8	74.2	0.4	No	No
		s/o Hidden Valley					
11	Hamner Av.	Pkwy.	74.8	74.9	0.1	No	No
		s/o Hidden Valley					
12	E. Parkridge Av.	Pkwy.	70.2	70.2	0.0	Yes	No
13	Lincoln Av.	s/o River Rd.	73.4	73.4	0.1	Yes	No
14	Lincoln Av.	s/o Rincon St.	73.4	73.5	0.1	No	No
15	Lincoln Av.	s/o Railroad St.	73.8	73.9	0.0	Yes	No
16	Lincoln Av.	s/o Pomona Rd.	74.6	74.7	0.0	No	No
17	Second St.	w/o Parkridge Av.	72.4	72.4	0.0	Yes	No
18	Second St.	e/o Parkridge Av.	71.5	71.6	0.1	Yes	No
19	Second St.	w/o Pacific Av.	71.9	72.0	0.1	Yes	No
20	Second St.	e/o Pacific Av.	72.1	72.2	0.1	Yes	No
21	Second St.	w/o Mountain Av.	72.4	72.5	0.1	Yes	No
22	Second St.	e/o Mountain Av.	70.5	71.8	1.3	Yes	No
23	Second St.	e/o Dwy. 8	70.5	71.8	1.3	No	No
24	Second St.	w/o Hamner Av.	71.1	72.3	1.2	No	No
25	First St.	w/o Parkridge Av.	73.3	73.4	0.1	Yes	No
26	First St.	e/o Parkridge Av.	71.3	71.4	0.1	Yes	No
27	First St.	e/o Dwy. 1	71.3	71.4	0.1	Yes	No
28	First St.	e/o Mountain Av.	68.2	69.1	0.9	Yes	No
29	First St.	w/o Hamner Av.	68.5	69.3	0.8	Yes	No
	Hidden Valley						
30	Pkwy.	w/o E. Parkridge Av.	74.2	74.2	0.0	Yes	No
	Hidden Valley						
31	Pkwy.	e/o E. Parkridge Av.	74.4	74.4	0.0	Yes	No

Table 5.11-6: Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Traffic Noise Impacts

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Table 5.11-7 provides a comparison of the Year 2040 without and with project conditions CNEL noise levels. As shown, the Project would result in a project-related traffic noise level increase of up to 1.1 dBA CNEL at noise sensitive land uses in 2040, which is less than even the most stringent significance threshold of 1.5 dBA. Thus, traffic related noise impacts would be less than significant impact under the Year 2040 conditions with operation of the proposed Project.

			CNEL at Adjacent Land Use (dBA) No With Project			Noise- Sensitive Land	Threshold
ID	Road	Segment	Project	Project	Addition	Use?	Exceeded?
1	River Rd.	s/o Corydon St.	75.8	75.8	0.0	Yes	No
2	River Rd.	s/o Lincoln Av.	75.6	75.6	0.0	Yes	No
3	Parkridge Av.	n/o Second St.	62.3	62.4	0.1	Yes	No
4	Parkridge Av.	s/o Second St.	69.3	69.3	0.0	Yes	No
5	Parkridge Av.	s/o Lincoln Av.	70.0	70.1	0.0	Yes	No
6	Pacific Av.	s/o Second St.	55.5	55.5	0.0	Yes	No
7	Mountain Av.	n/o Hamner Av.	70.9	72.8	1.9	No	No
8	Hamner Av.	s/o Third St.	76.3	76.3	0.0	No	No
9	Hamner Av.	s/o Second St.	75.7	75.7	0.1	No	No
10	Hamner Av.	s/o First St.	74.6	75.0	0.3	No	No
		s/o Hidden Valley					
11	Hamner Av.	Pkwy.	75.7	75.8	0.1	No	No
		s/o Hidden Valley					
12	E. Parkridge Av.	Pkwy.	72.0	72.0	0.0	Yes	No
13	Lincoln Av.	s/o River Rd.	74.2	74.3	0.1	Yes	No
14	Lincoln Av.	s/o Rincon St.	74.2	74.3	0.1	No	No
15	Lincoln Av.	s/o Railroad St.	74.7	74.7	0.0	Yes	No
16	Lincoln Av.	s/o Pomona Rd.	75.5	75.5	0.0	No	No
17	Second St.	w/o Parkridge Av.	73.0	73.1	0.0	Yes	No
18	Second St.	e/o Parkridge Av.	72.2	72.3	0.1	Yes	No
19	Second St.	w/o Pacific Av.	72.6	72.7	0.1	Yes	No
20	Second St.	e/o Pacific Av.	72.8	72.9	0.1	Yes	No
21	Second St.	w/o Mountain Av.	73.1	73.2	0.1	Yes	No
22	Second St.	e/o Mountain Av.	71.3	72.4	1.1	Yes	No
23	Second St.	e/o Dwy. 8	71.3	72.4	1.1	No	No
24	Second St.	w/o Hamner Av.	72.0	73.0	1.0	No	No
25	First St.	w/o Parkridge Av.	74.2	74.3	0.1	Yes	No
26	First St.	e/o Parkridge Av.	72.1	72.2	0.1	Yes	No
27	First St.	e/o Dwy. 1	72.1	72.2	0.0	Yes	No
28	First St.	e/o Mountain Av.	69.1	69.9	0.7	Yes	No
29	First St.	w/o Hamner Av.	69.4	70.1	0.7	Yes	No
	Hidden Valley						
30	Pkwy.	w/o E. Parkridge Av.	75.1	75.1	0.0	Yes	No
31	Hidden Valley Pkwy.	e/o E. Parkridge Av.	75.3	75.3	0.0	Yes	No

Table 5.11-7: Year 2040 Plus Project Traffic Noise Impacts

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

**Other Operational Noise Sources:** To estimate the Project operational noise impacts, the Noise Impact Analysis describes that reference noise level measurements were collected from similar types of activities to represent the noise levels expected with the development of the proposed Project. The reference noise level measurements (detailed in the Noise Impact Analysis Section 9.2) were used to estimate the Project operational noise impacts and assume the worst-case noise environment with the idling trucks, delivery truck activities, backup alarms, refrigerated containers or reefers, as well as loading and unloading of dry goods, roof-top air conditioning units, and parking lot vehicle movements all operating simultaneously.

**Loading Docks and Truck Movements.** The noise from the loading dock activity includes: employees loading and unloading a docked truck container included the squeaking of the truck's shocks when weight was removed from the truck, employees playing music over a radio, forklift horn, trucks backup alarm, truck engines and air brakes noise. In addition, this noise includes truck idling/refrigeration activity, truck movement, parking, reversing and docking at a loading bay, adding truck engine and air brakes noise.

**HVAC Units.** Noise generated by HVAC units were estimated based on the use of a typical system for the proposed buildings; such as a Lennox SCA120 series 10-ton model HVAC unit. This unit generates a noise level of 57.2 dBA Leq at a distance of 50 feet.

**Parking and Commercial Activity.** The parking lot noise levels are mainly due to cars pulling in and out of spaces, doors slamming, and people talking. Similarly, the commercial retail and gas station noise would consist of vehicular related noises, voices, and a drive through speakerphone.



Figure 5.11-4: Operational Noise Source and Receiver Locations
Table 5.11-8 provides the operational noise levels that are estimated to occur from operation of the Project at the closest sensitive receiver locations, which are shown on Figure 5.11-4. These noise levels include barrier attenuation provided by the Project buildings themselves, where applicable. As shown, the noise levels at the receiver locations would range from 29.1 to 49.7 dBA Lmax, which would be within the 55 dBA Leq daytime noise standard. However, it would exceed the nighttime standard of 45 dBA Leq at receptor location R4, as shown in Table 5.11-8.

As a result, mitigation has been included to require 10-foot high barriers at the Project site boundary along the south side of proposed Buildings 19 and 21 and at the western boundary of the truck loading and parking areas of Buildings 6 and 7 near sensitive receptors, as shown on Figure 5.11-5.

	Unmit	igated N	loise Lev	els by N	loise So	urce (dE	BA L <sub>eq</sub> )		Threshold	Exceeded?
Receiver Location <sup>1</sup>	Air Conditioning Unit (Roof-Top)	Truck Unloading/Docking Activity	Truck Idle/Reefer Activity	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Industrial)	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Commercial)	Drive-Through Speakerphone	Gas Station Activity	Combined Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Daytime (55 dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Nighttime (45 dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )
R1	34.9	_1	29.9	28.2	_1	_1	_1	36.7	No	No
R2	39.0	-1	27.7	41.3	_1	_1	-1	43.4	No	No
R3	27.8	-1	_1	23.1	_1	_1	-1	29.1	No	No
R4	36.3	49.4	_1	23.8	21.3	17.5	28.4	49.7	no	Yes
R5	34.0	_1	_1	22.8	31.9	23.9	41.3	42.5	No	No
R6	34.8	41.5	_1	18.4	29.9	27.8	40.5	44.8	No	No
R7	30.1	_1	_1	26.1	17.4	25.3	21.9	33.0	No	No
R8	32.7	_1	30.0	28.9	_1	_1	_1	35.6	No	No
R9	28.7	_1	_1	28.3	_1	_1	_1	31.5	No	No
R10	35.0	_1	_1	30.8	_1	_1	_1	36.4	No	No

 Table 5.11-8: Operational Noise Levels

<sup>1</sup> Receiver would not have a direct line-of-sight to the noise source because planned and/or existing structures would be in between the noise source and receiver location; and/or is located at too great a distance for the noise source to substantively increase the combined Project operational noise level. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

As shown on Table 5.11-9 the mitigated daytime operational noise levels would range from 29.1 to 44.8 dBA Leq at the sensitive receiver locations, and Table 5.11-10 shows that the mitigated nighttime operational noise levels would range from 29.1 to 44.8 dBA Leq at the sensitive receiver locations, which would not exceed the City's noise standards. Thus, with implementation of mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank





N

LEGEND:

🕦 Required noise barrier height (in feet) 💻 Operational noise barrier mitigation

This page intentionally left blank

	Daytin	ne Mitigo	ated Noise Lo	evels by	Noise S	ource (d	BA L <sub>eq</sub> )		Threshold Exceeded?
Receiver Location	Air Conditioning Unit (Roof-Top)	Truck Unloading/Docking Activity	Truck Idle/Reefer Activity	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Industrial)	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Commercial)	Drive-Through Speakerphone	Gas Station Activity	Combined Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Daytime (55 dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )
R 1	34.9	_1	29.9	28.2	_1	_1	_1	36.7	No
R2	39.0	_1	27.7	41.3	_1	_1	_1	43.4	No
R3	27.8	_1	-1	23.1	_1	_1	_1	29.1	No
R4	36.3	43.3	-1	23.8	21.2	17.5	28.4	44.3	No
R5	34.0	_1	-1	22.8	31.9	23.9	41.3	42.5	No
R6	34.8	41.5	-1	18.4	29.9	27.8	40.5	44.8	No
R7	30.1	_1	_1	26.1	17.4	25.3	21.9	33.0	No
R8	32.7	_1	30.0	28.9	_1	_1	_1	35.6	No
R9	28.7	_1	_1	28.3	_1	_1	_1	31.5	No
R10	35.0	_1	_1	30.8	_1	_1	_1	36.4	No

Table 5.11-9: Mitigated Daytime Operational Noise Levels

<sup>1</sup> Receiver does not have a direct line-of-sight to the noise source and/or is located at too great a distance for the noise source to substantively increase the combined Project operational noise level.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

	Nig	httime N	Aitigated No (d	oise Lev BA L <sub>eq</sub> )	els by N	loise So	urce		Threshold Exceeded?
Receiver Location	Air Conditioning Unit (Roof-Top)	Truck Unloading/Docking Activity	Truck Idle/Reefer Activity	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Industrial)	Parking Lot Vehicle Movements (Commercial)	Drive-Through Speakerphone	Gas Station Activity	Combined Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)	Nighttime (45 dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )
R1	34.9	-1	29.9	28.2	_1	_1	_1	36.7	No
R2	39.0	_1	27.7	41.3	_1	_1	_1	43.4	No
R3	27.8	_1	-1	23.1	_1	_1	_1	29.1	No
R4	36.3	43.3	_1	23.8	21.2	17.5	28.4	44.3	No
R5	34.0	_1	-1	22.8	31.9	23.9	41.3	42.5	No
R6	34.8	41.5	_1	18.4	29.9	27.8	40.5	44.8	No
R7	30.1	_1	-1	26.1	17.4	25.3	21.9	33.0	No
R8	32.7	_1	30.0	28.9	_1	_1	_1	35.6	No
R9	28.7	_1	_1	28.3	-1	_1	_1	31.5	No
R10	35.0	_1	_1	30.8	_1	_1	_1	36.4	No

Table 5.11-10: Mitigated Nighttime Operational Noise Levels

<sup>1</sup> Receiver does not have a direct line-of-sight to the noise source and/or is located at too great a distance for the noise source to substantively increase the combined Project operational noise level. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

**Operational Ambient Noise Level Increases.** To describe the Project operational noise level contributions, the Project operational noise levels were combined with the existing ambient noise levels at the sensitive receptors. As shown on Tables 5.11-11 and 5.11-12, operation of the Project would generate a daytime ambient noise level increase of up to 0.3 dBA Leq and a nighttime ambient noise level increase of up to 0.5 dBA Leq at sensitive receptors, which would not exceed thresholds. Therefore, impacts related to operational ambient noise level increases would be less than significant.

Receptor Location	Total Unmitigated Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Threshold	Threshold Exceeded?
R1	36.7	L1	68.2	68.2	0.0	1.5	No
R2	43.4	L1	68.2	68.2	0.0	1.5	No
R3	29.1	L2	60.9	60.9	0.0	3.0	No
R4	49.7	L5	61.8	62.1	0.3	3.0	No
R5	42.5	L5	61.8	61.9	0.1	3.0	No
R6	44.8	L6	65.7	65.7	0.0	1.5	No
R7	33.0	L6	65.7	65.7	0.0	1.5	No
R8	35.6	L6	65.7	65.7	0.0	1.5	No
R9	31.5	L7	56.0	56.0	0.0	5.0	No
R10	36.4	L8	54.4	54.5	0.1	5.0	No

Table 5.11-11: Daytime Operational Noise Level Increases

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Palomino Business Park Project

 Table 5.11-12:
 Nighttime Operational Noise Level Increases

Receptor Location	Total Unmitigated Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Threshold	Threshold Exceeded?
R1	36.7	L1	65.2	65.2	0.0	1.5	No
R2	43.4	L1	65.2	65.2	0.0	1.5	No
R3	29.1	L2	58.0	58.0	0.0	5.0	No
R4	49.7	L5	59.2	59.7	0.5	5.0	No
R5	42.5	L5	59.2	59.3	0.1	5.0	No
R6	44.8	Ló	62.5	62.6	0.1	3.0	No
R7	33.0	L6	62.5	62.5	0.0	3.0	No
R8	35.6	L6	62.5	62.5	0.0	3.0	No
R9	31.5	L7	53.8	53.8	0.0	5.0	No
R10	36.4	L8	49.8	50.0	0.2	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

# IMPACT NOI-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT GENERATE EXCESSIVE GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION OR GROUNDBORNE NOISE LEVELS.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. The proposed construction activities most likely to cause vibration are:

Heavy Construction Equipment: Although all heavy mobile construction equipment has the potential
of causing at least some perceptible vibration while operating close to building, the vibration is
usually short-term and is not of sufficient magnitude to cause building damage but can result in an
impact related to human annoyance. As shown on Table 5.11-13, information from the Federal
Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (September 2018) identifies
that large bulldozers used during grading operations result in the greatest typical construction
vibration from the Project, which does not involve pile driving activities.

Equipment	PPV (in/sec) at 25 feet				
Small bulldozer	0.003				
Jackhammer	0.035				
Loaded Trucks	0.076				
Large bulldozer	0.089				
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.					

T I. I	E 1	1 1 2	\/ <b>!</b>	<b>C</b>	1	t	•	F	
lable	<b>J</b> .I	1-13:	Vibration	Source	Levels 1	ror C	onstruction	Equip	ment

• Trucks: Trucks hauling building materials to construction sites can be sources of vibration intrusion if the haul routes pass through residential neighborhoods on streets with bumps or potholes. Repairing the bumps and potholes generally eliminates the problem.

Based on the reference vibration levels provided by the FTA, at distances ranging from 50 to 152 feet from Project construction activities, construction vibration velocity levels are expected to approach 0.03 in/sec PPV, which is below the threshold of 0.04 in/sec PPV as shown on Table 5.11-14. In addition, this level of vibration would not result in building damage to nearby residences. The FTA identifies construction vibration levels capable of building damage ranging from 0.12 to 0.5 in/sec PPV (Urban Crossroads 2019). Furthermore, these levels of vibration would only occur for short-term intermittent times when heavy construction equipment is operating adjacent to the Project site perimeter near the sensitive receptor. Therefore, impacts related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

	Dist. To		Receiver					
Receiver	Const. Activity (Feet)	Small Bulldozer	Jack- hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration	Threshold (in/sec PPV)	Threshold Exceeded?
R1	50'	0.001	0.001	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.04	No
R2	50'	0.001	0.001	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.04	No
R3	112'	0.000	0.004	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.04	No
R4	107'	0.000	0.004	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.04	No
R5	116'	0.000	0.004	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.04	No
R6	50'	0.001	0.012	0.027	0.031	0.031	0.04	No
R7	125'	0.000	0.003	0.007	0.008	0.008	0.04	No
R8	148'	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.04	No
R9	152'	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.04	No
R10	129'	0.000	0.003	0.006	0.008	0.008	0.04	No

Table 5.11-14: Construction Equipment Vibration Levels

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Operation

The operation of the Project would include heavy trucks driving at normal speeds along the roadways and transiting on the site to and from the loading dock areas. Truck vibration levels are dependent on vehicle characteristics, load, speed, and pavement conditions. Typical vibration levels for the heavy truck activity at normal traffic speeds would be 0.004 in/sec PPV at 25 feet, based on the FTA *Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment*. Trucks transiting on site would be travelling at very low speeds and would be less than the 0.04 in/sec PPV threshold (Urban Crossroads 2019). Therefore, vibration impacts during Project operations would be less than significant.

## 5.11.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative noise assessment considers development of the proposed Project in combination with ambient growth and other development projects within the vicinity of the Project area. As noise is a localized phenomenon, and drastically reduces in magnitude as distance from the source increases, only projects and ambient growth in the nearby area could combine with the proposed Project to result in cumulative noise impacts. In regard to cumulative traffic noise, the geographic area considered includes the roadways examined in the transportation impact analysis and evaluated in Section 5.13, *Transportation and Circulation*, of this EIR. The cumulative development program assumed in the traffic forecasts used in the noise modeling effort includes cumulative growth through 2040, as well as large projects that would utilize the same roadways as the proposed Project.

Development of the Project in combination with the related projects would result in an increase in local construction-related and traffic-related noise and vibration. However, each of the related projects would be subject to the operational noise standards established in the City's Municipal Code, and the municipal code standards of the nearby projects in adjacent jurisdictions. In addition, construction noise and vibration is localized in nature and decreases substantially with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a substantial cumulative increase in construction noise levels or vibration, more than one source emitting high levels of construction noise and/or vibration would need to be in close proximity to the construction noise on the Project site. However, due to the size of the Project site (110 acres) and the intermittent location of development activities, the construction noise and/or vibration would have a minimal potential to combine and become cumulatively significant. In addition, as shown on Figure 5-1, there are no cumulative projects that are adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, cumulative noise and/or vibration impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant.

As described previously, the operational noise from onsite activities would be mitigated by inclusion of noise barriers and nighttime activity restrictions, which would ensure that operational noise does not exceed municipal code requirements and would only result in a 0.5 dBA ambient noise increase, which would occur adjacent to the project site, and is below human perception. Due to the limited ambient noise increase and the location of cumulative development projects shown in Figure 5-1, operational noise from the proposed Project would not combine with operational noise from nearby development projects to result in a cumulatively significant increase. Thus, the proposed Project would result in a less than cumulatively significant impact on ambient noise levels from operational activities.

Cumulative mobile source noise increases that would occur as a result of the combination of increased traffic on local roadways due to the proposed Project, 2040 growth, and related projects are shown in Table 5.11-8. As indicated, the Project would contribute a noise level increase of up to 1.1 dBA CNEL, which is less than the significance threshold of 1.5 dBA, and therefore less than cumulatively considerable. As a result, cumulative traffic related noise impacts would be less than significant.

# 5.11.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

- OSHA Standard 29 CRF, Part 1910
- California Building Code, Title 24
- Norco Municipal Code Sections 9.07.040 and 9.07.060

## 5.11.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impact NOI-2 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, Impact NOI-1 would be **potentially significant**.

## 5.11.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Operational Noise Measures.** If receiver location R4 represents owned and/or occupied noise-sensitive uses at the time of Project operation, then minimum 10-foot high noise barriers are required at the truck loading dock areas. Each barrier shall provide a weight of at least 4 pounds per square foot of face area with no decorative cutouts or line-of-sight openings between shielded areas and the roadways, or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dBA. The barriers shall consist of a solid face from top to bottom. Unnecessary openings or decorative cutouts shall not be made. All gaps (except for weep holes) should be filled with grout or caulking. The noise barriers shall be constructed using the following materials:

- Masonry block;
- Earthen berm;
- Or any combination of construction materials capable of the minimum weight of 4 pounds per square foot or a minimum transmission loss of 20 dBA.

## 5.11.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, impacts related to operational noise would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

## REFERENCES

Palomino Business Park Noise Impact Analysis, Prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019.

This page intentionally left blank

## 5.12 Public Services

## 5.12.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing law enforcement and fire department services in the Project area and evaluates the potential for implementation of the Project to impact the provision of these services. This section of the EIR addresses whether there are physical environmental effects of new or expanded facilities that are necessary to maintain acceptable service levels in relation to law enforcement and fire protection services. Because CEQA focuses on physical environmental effects, this section analyzes whether any physical changes resulting from an increase in service demands from development pursuant to the proposed Project could result in significant adverse environmental effects. Thus, an increase in staffing associated with public services or an increase in calls for services would not, by itself, be considered a physical change in the environment, although physical changes in the environment resulting from the construction of new facilities or an expansion of existing facilities to accommodate the increased staff or equipment needs could constitute a significant impact.

## 5.12.2 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

## 5.12.2.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### California Fire Code

State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, which include regulations concerning building standards (as also set forth in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (such as extinguishers and smoke alarms), building evacuation and access standards, and fire suppression training.

#### California Health and Safety Code

Additional State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, which includes regulations for building standards, fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices such as extinguishers, smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards, and fire suppression training.

#### California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

In accordance with the California Code of Regulations, Title 8 Sections 1270 "Fire Prevention" and 6773 "Fire Protection and Fire Fighting Equipment," California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) has established minimum standards for fire suppression and emergency medical services. The standards include, but are not limited to, guidelines on the handling of highly combustible materials, fire house sizing requirements, restrictions on the use of compressed air, access roads, and the testing, maintenance, and use of all firefighting and emergency medical equipment.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policies contained in the Safety Element are relevant to fire protection services and the proposed Project:

**Fire Safety Policy:** The City shall maintain adequate fire protection in both urban and hillside areas through the enforcement of the latest fire codes, encouraging cooperation between the Fire Department, Planning, and building divisions, and coordinating with neighboring fire departments.

**Policy 2.3.1 c.** The minimum fireflow standard for low density residential construction should be 1,000 gallons of water per minute.

**Policy 2.3.1 d.** The minimum fireflow standard for multiple-family residential construction should be 1,500 gallons of water per minute.

**Policy 2.3.1 e.** The minimum fireflow standard for commercial and industrial developments should be 2,500 gallons per minute.

Policy 2.3.1f. Endeavor to meet and maintain adequate fire response time for all residents and businesses.

**Policy 2.3.1i.** Consider the needs of fire prevention and suppression during project review of development projects. These include, but are not limited to, providing adequate access to buildings, adequate separation between buildings, and adequate building setbacks from fuel modification areas. Fire suppression measures also include continued implementation of adopted fire and building codes (Title 15) pertaining to the installation of automatic fire extinguishing systems in new buildings.

**Policy 2.3.1j.** The City Fire Department should provide input to the Planning Division for all developments that require site plan or subdivision review prior to hearings before official commissions or the City Council. Street and driveway widths shall be adequate to provide access to sites and buildings shall be configured to provide sufficient clearances for fire suppression and other emergency access needs.

**Policy 2.3.1m.** Continuously and systematically mitigate existing fire hazards related to existing development or patterns of development as they are identified and as resources permit.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

The City of Norco Municipal Code includes the following regulation related to fire protection.

Section 15.09.010: Adopts the California Fire Code, Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

## 5.12.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Norco contracts with the Riverside County Fire Dept/Cal Fire for all City fire services, which includes fire station operation, fire suppression and prevention, emergency medical response, hazardous materials response, fire investigations, and other related services.

The Riverside County Fire Department is a regional fire protection department that provides fire, EMS, technical rescue, and hazardous materials response to approximately 1.6 million residents in the unincorporated Riverside County area, in 20 partner fire cities (including Norco) and one community services district. The Fire Department has 95 fire stations, approximately 1,050 firefighters, 276 administrative and support personnel, and about 150 reserve volunteer firefighters.

The closest existing fire stations to the Project site include the following:

- Station 14 is located at 1511 Hamner Avenue, which is 0.7 mile from the Project site;
- Station 47 is located at 3902 Hillside Avenue, which is 3.5 miles from the Project site; and
- Station 31 is located at 14491 Chandler Street in Corona, which is 4.4 miles from the Project site.

These stations are staffed 24 hours per day/7 days per week with a minimum 3 person crew, including a paramedic, operating "Type-1" structural fire-fighting apparatus.

In 2017, there were 2,553 calls for fire services, which is a 3.95 percent increase in calls over the 2,456 calls for fire services in 2016. Of these calls for service from the City, 71 percent were medically related (2017 Annual Report).

The Riverside County Fire Department has set a response time goal that is measured from the time a resource is placed in the Computer Aided Dispatch system as in route to when it is placed in Computer Aided Dispatch system as on scene. These targets are established by the department and vary by location type, and include: five minutes in urban areas, 10 minutes in rural areas, and 15 minutes in outlying areas.

## 5.12.2.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - PS-1 Fire Protection
  - PS-2 Police Protection
  - PS-3 Schools
  - PS-4 Parks
  - PS-5 Other public facilities

The Initial Study established that the Project would result in no impact related to Thresholds PS-3 through PS-5; no further assessment of these impacts is required in this EIR.

## 5.12.2.4 METHODOLOGY

The potential impacts related to fire protection were evaluated based on the ability of existing and planned fire department staffing, equipment, and facilities to meet the additional demand for fire protection and emergency medical services resulting from development of the Project. Impacts are considered significant if implementation of the proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, response times, and/or increased demand for services that would require the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. For fire services, a significant impact could occur if the Project generated the need for additional personnel or equipment that could not be accommodated within the existing stations and would require the construction of a new station or an expansion of an existing station.

## 5.12.2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Impact PS -1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED GOVERNMENTAL FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, IN ORGER TO MAINTAIN ACCEPTABLE SERVICE RATIOS, RESPONSE TIMES, OR OTHER PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES.

Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would remove the existing buildings and infrastructure on the Project site and develop a business park with 35 industrial warehousing buildings and three commercial buildings. This increase in development and persons within the Project area would result in additional calls for fire department services, which would increase needs for fire department staffing and equipment.

However, the proposed structures would be constructed from non-flammable concrete and cement, the buildings would have automatic ceiling-mounted fire sprinkler system and would include all fire related safety features pursuant to the California Fire Code (CFC), which is included in the City's Municipal Code as Section 15.09.010. Additionally, the City's Building Department and the Fire Department would review the building plans prior to approval to ensure that all applicable fire safety features are included in the project. Furthermore, the Fire Department would complete an inspection of all new structures before approval of occupancy permits to ensure that all fire safety features are installed appropriately, which would reduce the potential for fire hazards during operation of the project.

As described above, the Fire Department has three existing fire stations within 4.4 miles from the site; the closest of which is 0.7 mile from the site. These existing fire facilities would respond to any emergency or medical services within the Project vicinity, with Station 14 being the primary responding station, as it is the closest to the site.

The proposed Project would develop the project area in consistency with the City's General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan land use designations, and the additional urbanization of the Project area has been previously anticipated by the City. Calls for emergency services from the proposed Project would be accommodated by the existing fire service facilities, and buildout of the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact on the ability to maintain adequate level of fire protection service to the area. Furthermore, the proposed Project would not require provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Thus, impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

## 5.12.3 **POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES**

## 5.12.3.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policies contained in the Safety Element are relevant to police protection services and the proposed Project.

**Police Service Policy:** The City shall endeavor to provide a safe, low-crime environment through neighborhood watch programs, citizen patrols, and ensuring adequate police response times.

**Policy 2.5.2a.** Endeavor to provide a minimum response time of 5 minutes on all priority 1 calls and 12 minutes on all priority 2 calls. Priority 1 calls include those of a life-threatening nature such as: robbery in progress, accident involving bodily injury, death-threatening situation, a person unable to breathe, and violent crimes in process. Priority 2 calls include those that are not life threatening such as: burglary past, petty theft, shoplifting.

**Security Design Program Policy:** The City will work to reduce crime potential in the urban environment by making sure that any input regarding crime-reduction strategies from the Planning Division and the Sherriff's Department are considered in all development plans.

**Policy 2.5.3a.** Through zoning, subdivision and building regulations, and environmental assessment practices, the City should encourage development that will increase or better ensure the public's safety.

**Policy 2.5.3b.** Encourage and implement appropriate utilization of defensible space design concepts in new developments.

**Policy 2.5.3c.** Encourage community crime prevention measures, such as building security hardware that could result in a reduction in insurance premiums and other economic incentives.

**Policy 2.5.3e.** Promote land use and design policies and regulations which encourage a mixture of compatible uses to promote and increase the safety of public use areas and pedestrian/equestrian travel.

**Policy 2.5.3f.** Systematically mitigate crime hazards related to urban development or patterns of urban development as they are identified and as resources permit.

## 5.12.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Norco contracts with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department for all City law enforcement services. Services to Norco are generally provided from the Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station, which is located at 7477 Mission Boulevard in Jurupa Valley, approximately 13.5 miles from the Project site. The Jurupa Valley Sheriff's Station serves an area of approximately 94 square miles, which includes the Cities of Norco and Eastvale. Additionally, a Sheriff's Department substation is located in the City Hall building (at 2870 Clark Avenue), which is 1.4 miles from the project site. However, the substation has limited hours of operation of 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

As shown in Table 5.12-1, in 2018 the City had a total of 9,556 calls for service, which was less than the calls in 2017. Of the 2018 calls for service, 1.9 percent were emergency (Priority 1) calls, which is approximately the same percentage as 2017.

Riverside County Sherriff's Department calculates response time as the time between dispatch receiving the call for service and deputy arrival at the scene. As shown in Table 5.12-1, the 2018 average response times to emergency calls for service was 6.47 minutes.

	2017	2018
Priority 1		
Average Response Time	6.71	6.47
Number of Calls for Service	197	177
Priority 2		
Average Response Time	20.01	18.09
Number of Calls for Service	3,936	3,735
Priority 3		

Table 5.12-1: Summary of Norco Sherriff Services

Average Response Time	37.00	35.51
Number of Calls for Service	3,/48	3,5/5
Priority 4		
Average Response Time	56.08	53.06
Number of Calls for Service	2,181	2,069
Total Average Response Time	33.90	31.96
Total Calls for Service	10,062	9,556

## 5.12.3.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

PS-2 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for law enforcement services.

## 5.12.3.4 METHODOLOGY

The potential impacts related to law enforcement services were evaluated based on the ability of existing and planned Sheriff's department staffing, equipment, and facilities to meet the additional demand for law enforcement services resulting from development of the Project. Impacts are considered significant if implementation of the proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, response times, and/or increased demand for services that would require the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. For law enforcement services, a significant impact could occur if the Project generated the need for additional personnel or equipment that could not be accommodated within the existing station and would require the construction of a new station/substation or an expansion of the existing station/substation.

## 5.12.3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Impact PS-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN SBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED GOVERNMENTAL FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, IN ORGER TO MAINTAIN ACCEPTABLE SERVICE RATIOS, RESPONSE TIMES, OR OTHER PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES.

Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the addition of employees and potentially valuable goods within the Project area, which could result in an increase in calls for law enforcement services. However, the proposed Project would include installation of security features to reduce the potential for crime, such as the provision of low-intensity security lighting in parking areas and adjacent to buildings structure security. As described in the proposed Project illumination of on-site areas include: lighting for parking areas, pedestrian walkways, shipping and loading areas, and additional exterior areas. Also, pursuant to the City's existing permitting process, the Building Department would review and approve the final site plans to ensure that crime prevention through design measures are incorporated appropriately to provide a safe environment. Additionally, the Project would operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. This would ensure there is no time during which no person(s) are onsite,

which lowers the potential for crime during non-occupied times. Therefore, development of the Project would include features to reduce the need for law enforcement services.

Although the proposed Project would generate additional long-term employees within the Project area, this increase in employment is not anticipated to result in an increase in population that would generate an additional need for law enforcement services. Because Riverside County (including the City of Norco) is housing rich, the increase in jobs from the proposed Project is not expected to create a corresponding increase in population (because the new jobs created by the Project would be filled by existing residents from the region).

Overall, implementation of the proposed Project would result in an incremental increase in demands on law enforcement services; but would not be substantial compared to the existing services provided by the Sherriff's Department. The Sherriff's Department via City contract for law enforcement services would continue to add staff and equipment on an as-needed basis in order to accommodate the incrementally increasing demands from buildout of land uses, as was identified in the City's General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan. Furthermore, buildout of the proposed Project would not result or require development of new, or expansion of existing, Sherriff Department facilities. Thus, impacts related to law enforcement services would be less than significant.

## 5.12.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative study area for public services includes the City of Norco because it is the geographical area that is served by the City's contract for services and facilities with the Riverside County Fire and Sheriff Departments.

**Fire Services:** Cumulative development projects are anticipated to occur within the City in the future. As anticipated by the City's planning process, development of the Project site as identified in the City's General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan would generate a proportional increase in demand for additional fire protection and emergency medical services. As development occurs within the City, the Fire Department would continue to monitor service provision to ensure the stations are operating within the established level of service standards and would add staffing and equipment as necessary. However, because of the geographical coverage of existing fire stations in the area and the closest station at 0.7 mile from the site, cumulative projects are not anticipated to result in the need for another new or expanded fire station, the construction of which could result in significant impacts. In addition, because the proposed Project would be consistent with buildout assumptions of the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan and would implement fire safety design features (as described above), it would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase to the need for fire and emergency response. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to fire services from implementation of the proposed Project would be less than cumulatively significant.

Law enforcement Services: As described above, cumulative development projects are anticipated to occur throughout the City. This overall development would generate a proportional increase in calls for law enforcement services. The development projects would be reviewed by the Sherriff's Department staff prior to development permit approval to ensure adequate security measures are provided for each sitespecific development in the City. Overall, it is anticipated that future development would result in the need for additional sworn officers and equipment, but implementation of the proposed Project would not create a cumulatively considerable need for a new or expanded Sherriff's Station, the construction of which could result in an environmental impact. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with law enforcement services from implementation of the proposed Project would be less than cumulatively significant.

# 5.12.5 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

There are no Plans, Programs, or Policies related to fire and law enforcement services.

## 5.12.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impact PS-1 and PS-2 would be less than significant.

## 5.12.7 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

## 5.12.8 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to fire and law enforcement services have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

## REFERENCES

Riverside County Fire Department. Accessed: http://www.rvcfire.org/Pages/default.aspx.

Riverside County Sheriff's Department. Accessed: http://www.riversidesheriff.org/.

City of Norco General Plan Safety Element, 2013. Accessed: http://www.norco.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=25455

County of Riverside Fiscal Year 2018/19 Recommended Budget. Accessed: https://countyofriverside.us/Portals/0/Government/Budget%20Information/18-19/FY18-19\_Recommended\_Budget\_@2018-05-25\_ELECTRONIC\_VERSION.pdf

# 5.13 Transportation

## 5.13.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing transportation and circulation conditions, criteria for the level of service, and impacts from implementation of the proposed Project. As necessary, mitigation measures for significant transportation and circulation impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed Project are also included. The proposed Project's impacts are analyzed in the context of existing (2018), Project opening (2022), and future (2040) conditions. This analysis is based on information contained in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report by Urban Crossroads in 2019, which is included as Appendix P.

## 5.13.2 REGULATORY SETTING

#### **Congestion Management Program**

In 1990, the California Legislature enacted the Congestion Management Program (CMP) to implement Proposition 111, a state-wide transportation funding proposal that required local governments to implement mitigation measures to offset the impacts from new development on the regional transportation system. The CMP addresses the impact of local growth on the regional transportation system; the goal is to examine the interactions among land use, transportation, and air quality and to make decisions at the regional and local level in consideration of these interactions.

When LOS requirements are not maintained on portions of the CMP highway and roadway system, a deficiency plan is required that analyzes the cause of the deficiency and the implementation costs of various alternatives such as roadway modifications, programs, or actions to measurably improve performance. Highways must maintain at least LOS E, which is defined by a level of service where traffic flow fluctuates in terms of speed and flow rates, operating speeds average 35 miles per hour. For arterial streets, LOS E occurs where queues of vehicles are waiting upstream of an intersection and it may take several signal cycles for a vehicle to clear the intersection. A jurisdiction failing to comply with the CMP may have its allocation of the state gas tax withheld.

#### SCAG 2016 - 2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

On April 7, 2016 SCAG's Regional Council adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) and the goals and policies relevant to the proposed Project are listed below:

#### Goals

- 1. Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.
- 2. Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.
- 3. Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.
- 4. Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.
- 5. Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.
- 6. Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).

- 7. Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.
- 8. Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and active transportation.

#### **Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Program**

The Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program is administered by the Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG) based upon a regional Nexus Study most recently updated in 2016 to address major changes in right of way acquisition and improvement cost factors. This regional program was put into place to ensure that development pays its fair share and that funding is in place for construction of facilities needed to maintain the requisite level of service critical to mobility in the region. TUMF is a regional mitigation fee program focused on improvements necessitated by regional growth and is imposed and implemented in every jurisdiction in Western Riverside County.

TUMF guidelines allow a local zone committee to prioritize certain projects. The Project is in the Northwest Zone, which has a 5-year capital improvement program to prioritize public construction of certain roads that are necessitated by regional growth.

#### City of Norco Development Impact Fee Program

The City of Norco has implemented a local Development Impact Fee (DIF) Program to impose and collect fees from new development that may be used to mitigate the additional traffic burdens created by new development to the City's arterial and collector street system. The proposed Project would be subject to the DIF Program and would be required to pay fees as part of permit approval.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following goal and policies contained in the Circulation Element are relevant to the proposed Project.

**Goal 1:** A circulation network of equestrian trails and streets, integrated with the planned land uses, that provide for a safe, efficient, and economic movement of people and goods.

**Policy 1.2:** Establish a trail system that is separate and safe from vehicular traffic with appropriate (signalized as necessary) road and intersection crossings to maintain circularity of the trail system.

Policy 1.4: Follow appropriate City standards in designing and constructing future street improvements.

**Policy 1.9:** Encourage a minimum Level of Service D for roadway segments and a minimum Level of Service D for intersections at peak hours under build out conditions.

**Policy 1.11:** Encourage the reduction of vehicle trips through implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, such as requiring major employers to prepare Transportation Management Plans with provisions for carpooling, vanpooling, flexible work hours, etc.

**Policy 2.5:** Continue to maintain and improve the City's system of equestrian trails to also meet the needs of pedestrians within the community.

**Policy 2.9:** Provide a system of bicycle facilities (paths, lanes, and routes) in conjunction with circulation system roadway improvements to separate bicycle traffic from equestrian trails.

**Policy 4.1:** Require all new developments to provide adequate off-street parking based on expected parking needs.

**Policy 4.2:** Provide adequate loading areas within off-street parking areas for all commercial and manufacturing land uses.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

Section 12.05.040. Street Opening and Pavement Restoration Regulation, Permits states that any and all construction work within the public right-of-way shall require an encroachment permit. Anyone doing excavation work within the City of Norco public right-of-way shall obtain a street cut permit for the purpose of excavation in addition to any other required permits. All applications shall include a traffic control plan that shall be approved prior to the preconstruction meeting for the project. No disruption of traffic is allowed after 4:00 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. unless specifically approved for these hours.

## 5.13.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Existing Roadway Network

- Hamner Avenue is identified as an Urban Arterial in the City's General Plan (with a 110-foot rightof-way and 86-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is the major north-south roadway through the City connecting to the City of Corona to the south and Eastvale and Jurupa Valley to the north.
- **River Road** is identified as a Major Arterial in the City's General Plan (with a 100-foot right-ofway and 80-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is a north-south arterial that links the City of Corona to the south and Jurupa Valley to the north.
- Hidden Valley Parkway is identified as a Major Arterial in the City's General Plan (with a 100foot right-of-way and 80-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing east-west arterial along the southern boundary of the City, which extends east from Hamner Avenue to McKinley Avenue. West of Hamner Avenue Hidden Valley Parkway becomes Mountain Avenue through the Gateway Specific Plan Area.
- **Corydon Avenue** is identified as a Collector Street in the City's General Plan (with an 88-foot rightof-way and 64-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing north-south roadway connecting Norco Drive to the north with River Road on the south.
- **First Street** is identified as a Collector Street in the City's General Plan (with an 88-foot right-ofway and 64-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing east-west roadway serving the Gateway Specific Plan area from Hamner Avenue to River Road.
- **Parkridge Avenue** is identified as a Collector Street in the City's General Plan (with an 88-foot right-of-way and 64-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing north-south roadway that is located east of the Project site.
- Second Street is identified as a Collector Street in the City's General Plan (with an 88-foot right-ofway and 64-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing east-west roadway that is located on the northern border of the Project site and connects to I-15.
- **Third Street** is identified as a Collector Street in the City's General Plan (with an 88-foot right-ofway and 64-foot curb-to-curb measurement) and is an existing east-west roadway that is to the north of the Project site.
- Local Streets are two-lane undivided roadways with a 60-foot right-of-way and 36-foot curb-tocurb measurement. The following local streets are included in the Project's traffic study area:
  - Country Club Lane, west of River Road
  - First Street, west of Parkridge Street
  - Pacific Avenue
  - o El Paso Drive

• East Parkridge Avenue

#### **Existing Vehicular Trips**

The 110-acre Project site is currently developed with 36 single-family residential structures and a chicken egg warehouse and distribution facility for Hidden Villa Ranch. The residences are located along First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue, some of which are vacant. The Hidden Villa Ranch facility is located on the northern central portion of the site on the west side of Mountain Avenue and south of Second Street. Operations at the Hidden Villa Ranch facility included receiving, cleaning, inspecting, repackaging, and distribution of fresh eggs, and distribution of dairy products.

To identify the existing vehicular trips generated by the Hidden Villa Ranch facility, counts were conducted during its operation on November 7, 2017. Vehicles were identified by the following: passenger cars, 2-Axle Trucks, and 4 or More Axle Trucks. Large trucks, buses and recreational vehicles were converted into Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE) because these vehicles occupy the same space as two or more passenger cars, and it takes them longer to accelerate and slow-down. As shown on Table 5.13-1, the Hidden Villa Ranch facility generated 750 PCE trips per day, with 63 a.m. PCE peak hour trips and 57 p.m. PCE peak hour trips.

	AM Peak Hour			PN	\ Peak	Hour	
Land Use	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	Daily
Act	ual Ve	ehicles					
Mountain Avenue Driveway							
Passenger Cars:	39	3	42	10	41	51	374
Truck Trips:							
2-axle:	2	2	4	0	0	0	47
3-axle:	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
4+-axle:	3	2	5	1	1	2	96
Net Truck Trips (Actual)	5	4	9	1	1	2	152
Total:	44	7	51	11	42	53	526
Passenger (	Car Eq	uivale	nt (PCE)				
Mountain Avenue Driveway							
Passenger Cars:	39	3	42	10	41	51	374
Truck Trips:							
2-axle:	3	3	6	0	0	0	72
3-axle:	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
4+-axle:	9	6	15	3	3	6	288
Net Truck Trips (PCE)	12	9	21	3	3	6	376
Total:	51	12	63	13	44	57	750

Table	5.13-1:	Existina	Hidden	Villa	Ranch	Vehicular	Trips
	0.10 1.	=	maacm			V CITICOTAT	

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### **Study Intersections**

The traffic study area for the proposed Project includes a total of 35 existing and future intersections that were selected for analysis by the City of Norco Traffic Engineering Division based on their location to the Project site and the City's "50 peak hour trip" traffic study criteria that represents the minimum number of trips that a typical intersection could be substantively impacted by a development. This methodology is also utilized by the City of Corona.

To identify existing conditions at these intersections, traffic counts were collected that identified vehicles by the following: passenger cars, 2-Axle Trucks, 2-Axle Trucks, and 4 or More Axle Trucks. PCE. The TIA applied a PCE factor of 1.5 to 2-axle trucks, 2.0 for 3-axle trucks, and 3.0 for 4+-axle trucks, which are consistent with the values recommended for use in the CMP. The existing weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection volumes (in PCE) are shown on Table 5.13-2. Per the General Plan, the City defined LOS D as the minimum

"acceptable" level of service. Anything above LOS D is considered to be "unacceptable." As shown, the following existing study area intersections are currently operating at an unacceptable LOS during the peak hours:

- Parkridge Ave. (East) & Second St. (#11) LOS F a.m. peak hour
- Mountain Ave. & Second St. (#16) LOS E a.m. peak hour
- Mountain Ave. & First St. (#22) LOS E a.m. peak hour
- Hamner Ave. & Second St. (#25) LOS E a.m. peak hour; LOS F p.m. peak hour
- I-15 NB Ramps & Second St. (#32) LOS E a.m. peak hour

Table 5.13-2: Existing	(2018)	Intersection	Conditions
------------------------	--------	--------------	------------

			Delay		Level of		
			(se	(secs.)		vice	Acceptable
#	Intersection	Agency	a.m.	p.m.	a.m.	p.m.	LOS
1	River Rd. & Corydon St.	Norco/Corona	29.5	33.5	С	С	D
2	River Rd. & Country Club Ln./Second St.	Norco/Corona	29.2	24.7	С	С	D
3	River Rd. & Lincoln Ave.	Corona	42.9	29.2	D	С	D
4	Lincoln Ave. & Rincon St.	Corona	16.1	23.8	В	С	D
5	Lincoln Ave. & Railroad St.	Corona	33.3	29.5	С	С	D
6	Lincoln Ave. & Pomona Rd.	Corona	26.7	20.0	С	В	D
7	Lincoln Ave. & SR-91 WB Ramps	Caltrans/Corona	21.1	23.2	С	С	D
8	Lincoln Ave. & D St./Second St.	Corona	26.5	34.6	С	С	D
9	SR-91 EB Ramps & Second St.	Caltrans/Corona	27.0	24.7	С	С	D
10	Parkridge Ave. (West) & Second St.	Norco	28.0	17.1	D	С	D
11	Parkridge Ave. (East) & Second St.	Norco	79.9	13.3	F	В	D
12	Pacific Ave. & Second St.	Norco	21.3	13.3	С	В	D
13	Parkridge Ave. & Lincoln Ave./First St.	Norco/Corona	31.5	27.5	С	С	D
14	Driveway 1 & First St.	Norco	Future Driveway				D
15	Driveway 2 & First St.	Norco		Future Dr	iveway		D
16	Mountain Ave. & Second St.	Norco	41.1	19.1	E	С	D
17	Mountain Ave. & Driveway 3	Norco	Future Drivewo		iveway		D
18	Mountain Ave. & Driveway 4	Norco	Future Driveway				D
19	Mountain Ave. & Driveway 5	Norco		Future Dr	iveway		D
20	Mountain Ave. & Driveway 6	Norco		Future Dr	iveway		D
21	Mountain Ave. & Driveway 7	Norco		Future Dr	'iveway		D
22	Mountain Ave. & First St.	Norco	48.4	23.5	E	С	D
23	Driveway 8 & Second St.	Norco		Future Dr	iveway		D
24	Hamner Ave. & 3rd St.	Norco	42.4	32.8	D	С	D
25	Hamner Ave. & Second St.	Norco	78.3	173.0	E	F	D
26	Hamner Ave. & First St.	Norco	16.1	22.7	В	С	D
27	Hamner Ave. & Mountain Ave./Hidden Valley	Norco	34.3	37.9	С	D	D
28	Main St. & Parkridge Ave.	Corona	40.5	38.0	D	D	D
29	I-15 SB Ramp & Second St.	Caltrans/Norco	22.6	14.8	с	В	D
30	I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	Caltrans/Norco	16.3	20.4	В	с	D
31	I-15 SB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy	Caltrans/Norco	4.6	3.4	Ā	A	D
32	L15 NB Ramps & Second St	Caltrans/Norco	56 3	47 7	F		D
32	1 15 NR On Pamp & Hiddon Vallov Plance	, Caltrans/Norco/	0.5	10.3		B	
33			9.0	10.5	A	D	

			De (se	Delay (secs.)		el of vice	Acceptable
#	Intersection	Agency	a.m.	p.m.	a.m.	p.m.	LOS
		Corona					
		Caltrans/Norco/					
34	I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	Corona	25.2	15.3	С	В	D
35	Parkridge Av./El Paso Dr. & Hidden Valley	Norco/Corona	36.5	48.2	D	D	D

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

#### **Traffic Signal Warrants**

In addition, a traffic signal warrant analysis was prepared for unsignalized intersections in the existing condition, which indicated that the Mountain Avenue and First Street intersection (#22) currently warrants a traffic signal (Urban Crossroads 2019).

#### Off-Ramp Queuing

A queuing analysis Caltrans traffic study guidelines was performed for the off-ramps at the SR-91 at the Lincoln Avenue and Second Street interchanges and the I-15 Freeway at the Second Street and Hidden Valley Parkway interchanges to assess vehicle queues for the off-ramps that may potentially result in deficient peak hour operations at the ramp-to-arterial intersections and may potentially "spill back" onto the SR-91 or I-15 mainlines. As shown on Table 5.13-3, there are no movements that are currently experiencing queuing issues during the weekday a.m. or p.m. peak 95th percentile traffic flows.

			95th Pe	rcentile		
		Available	Queue	(Feet) <sup>3</sup>	Acce	otable? 1
		Stacking Distance	a.m. Peak	p.m. Peak		
Intersection	Movement	(Feet)	Hour	Hour	a.m.	p.m.
7. Lincoln Ave. & SR-91 WB Ramps	WBL	315	154	212	Yes	Yes
	WBL/T	1,050	160	214	Yes	Yes
	WBR	300	465 <sup>2,3</sup>	115	Yes	Yes
9. SR-91 EB Ramps & Second Street	SBL	930	52	114	Yes	Yes
	SBR	430	54	64	Yes	Yes
29. I-15 SB Ramps & Second Street	SBT/L	1,500	70	108	Yes	Yes
	SBR	340	278	96	Yes	Yes
30. I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden	SBL	1,650	158	330 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
Valley Pkwy	SBL/T/R	1,650	227	348 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	SBR	320	178	68	Yes	Yes
32. I-15 NB Ramp & Second	NBL/T	1,265	919	656 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
Street	NBR	1,265	267	97	Yes	Yes
34. I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden	NBL	1,375	223	166	Yes	Yes
Valley Pkwy	NBT	1,300	97	70	Yes	Yes
	NBR	470	57	90	Yes	Yes

Table 5.13-3: Peak Hour Freeway Off-Ramp Queuing of Existing (2018) Conditions

<sup>1</sup> Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided.

<sup>2</sup> 95<sup>th</sup> percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.

<sup>3</sup> Although 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue is anticipated to exceed the available storage for the turn lane, the adjacent through lane has sufficient storage to accommodate any spillover without spilling back and affecting the SR-91 mainline. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Freeway Segments

The freeway mainline locations for analysis were selected based on Caltrans traffic study guidelines, which states that the analysis should evaluate the freeway segments near the Project's point of entry where the Project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips. As shown on Table 5.13-4, the

southbound I-15 freeway segment north of Second St. (#3) currently operates at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E) in the a.m. peak hour.

Table 5.13-4 also shows that the SR-91 and the other segments of the I-15 are found to operate at an acceptable LOS based on Caltrans PeMS data. However, field observations indicate constrained flow and slow-moving conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Because of the slow moving vehicles, fewer vehicles over a specific timeframe are passing by and being reported in the Caltrans PeMS data. Thus, the PeMS data indicates that fewer vehicles are on the roadways than actually exist. The LOS for the SR-91 and the I-15 mainline analyses is based on the reported data and the Caltrans traffic study guidelines. As a result, the LOS is reported as acceptable; however the freeways are likely at capacity during the peak hours.

αy	uo			Den	sity <sup>1</sup>	LC	DS 🛛
Freew	Directi	Mainline Segment	Lanes	a.m.	p.m.	a.m.	p.m.
-91	WB	West of Lincoln Ave.	5	18.2	22.6	С	D
SR	EB	West of Lincoln Ave.	5	26.6	28.2	D	D
		North of Second St.	3	35.2	31.7	E	D
	SB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy	5	19.1	16.8	С	В
15		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy	4	22.6	20.3	С	С
<u> </u>		North of Second St.	3	30.0	27.3	D	D
	R R R	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy	5	19.9	17.2	С	В
		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy	4	26.0	21.5	С	С
*	BOLI	<b>D</b> = Unacceptable Level of Service					

Table 5.13-4: Basic Freeway Segment Existing (2018) Conditions

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service <sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Freeway Merge/Diverge

The freeway merge/diverge locations identified for analysis were selected based on Caltrans traffic study guidelines, which states that the analysis should evaluate the locations nearest to the Project site where the Project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips. As shown in Table 5.13-5, the following merge and diverge areas currently operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or worse) during the peak hours in the existing (2018) traffic conditions:

- I-15 southbound off-ramp at Second St. (#3) LOS E a.m. peak hour
- I-15 southbound on-ramp at Second St. (#3) LOS E a.m. peak hour

Table 5.13-5: Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge Existing (2018) Conditions

way	tion	Parma ex Commont	Lanes on	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour
Free	Direc	Kamp or segment	Freeway	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS
-91	WB	Lincoln Ave. On-Ramp	5	21.9	С	24.3	С
SR	EB	Lincoln Ave. Off-Ramp	5	33.4	D	34.7	D
		Second St. Off-Ramp	3	36.1	E	34.5	D
5	~	Second St. On-Ramp	3	37.9	ш	32.7	D
Ξ	SE	Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	5	22.4	С	20.1	С
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	24.5	С	23.0	С

way	tion	Dama ay Commont	Lanes on Freeway	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour
Free	Direc	kamp or segment		Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS
		Second St. On-Ramp	4	20.9	С	20.9	С
	B	Second St. Off-Ramp	5	25.4	С	21.4	С
	Z	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	30.3	D	28.1	D
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	4	33.1	D	29.5	D

**BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Transit Services

The study area is currently served by both the Corona Cruiser and the Riverside Transit Authority (RTA). The Corona Cruiser is a fixed-route bus system that travels along two routes and connects with RTA routes. Within the study area, the Corona Cruiser route includes Parkridge Avenue, which is south of the Project site. The RTA provides both local and regional services throughout the region with 38 fixed routes, 9 commuter link routes, and Dial-A-Ride services. Existing RTA bus Route 3 is located on Hamner Avenue, approximately 0.25 mile from the Project site is the closest existing route to the Project.

#### Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Equestrian Facilities

Hamner Avenue is planned to have a Class II bike lane south of Hidden Valley Parkway, and there are existing Class II bike lanes along River Road, Corydon Street, and Country Club Road. There are no existing sidewalks adjacent to the Project site; however, existing equestrian trails exist along Second Street and Pacific Avenue.

## 5.13.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- TR-1 Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;
- TR-2 Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b);
- TR-3 Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or
- TR-4 Result in inadequate emergency access.

The Initial Study established that the Project would not result in significant impacts related to Threshold TR-2; no further assessment of this impact is required in this EIR.

#### Intersection Thresholds

As described previously, the City of Norco and City of Corona utilize a "50 peak hour trip" criteria to identify intersections that need to be evaluated. This generally represents the minimum number of trips by which a typical intersection could be substantively impacted by a development.

<u>City of Norco and City of Corona Intersections</u>: For intersections located within the Cities of Norco or Corona, a direct project impact would result if project-generated traffic would cause a deterioration from an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) to an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or F). For intersections within the Cities of Norco and Corona that already operate at an unacceptable LOS, a cumulative project impact would result if the project contributes 50 or more trips to the intersection during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour.

#### **Caltrans Facility Thresholds**

The following thresholds determine whether the addition of project traffic to freeway segments would result in an impact:

- The project results in the LOS of a segment degrading from D or better to E or F.
- The project results in the exacerbation an already deficient condition by contributing 50 or more one-way peak hour trips. A segment that is operating at or near capacity based on Caltrans PeMS data is deemed to be deficient. Because the Caltrans facilities selected for evaluation are all anticipated to receive 50 or more one-way peak hour trips from the project, any of the segments that are identified as deficient, would be considered cumulatively significant.

## 5.13.5 METHODOLOGY

This analysis focuses on the nature and magnitude of the change in the transportation and circulation environment due to implementation of the proposed Project, based on the maximum development assumptions outlined in Section 3.0, *Project Description*. This evaluation of the significance of potential impacts related to transportation and circulation has been prepared in accordance with the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Congestion Management Program (CMP) Guidelines and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (December 2002). Trips generated by the Project's proposed land uses have been estimated based on trip generation rates collected by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017.

#### **Signalized Intersections**

The Cities of Norco and Corona require signalized intersection operations analysis based on the methodology described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), which identifies intersection LOS operations are based on an intersection's average control delay. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. For signalized intersections LOS is directly related to the average control delay per vehicle and is correlated to a LOS designation as described in Table 5.13-6.

Description	Average Control Delay (Seconds), V/C ≤ 1.0	Level of Service, V/C ≤ 1.0	Level of Service, V/C > 1.0
Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable progression and/or short cycle length.	0 to 10.00	А	F
Operations with low delay occurring with good progression and/or short cycle lengths.	10.01 to 20.00	В	F
Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear.	20.01 to 35.00	С	F
Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C	35.01 to 55.00	D	F

#### Table 5.13-6: Signalized Intersection LOS Thresholds

Description	Average Control Delay (Seconds), V/C ≤ 1.0	Level of Service, V/C ≤ 1.0	Level of Service, V/C > 1.0
ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures			
are noticeable.			
Operations with high delay values indicating poor			
progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios.	55.01 to 80.00	F	F
Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. This is		-	·
considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.			
Operation with delays unacceptable to most drivers			
occurring due to over saturation, poor progression, or	80.01 and up	F	F
very long cycle lengths.			
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### California Department of Transportation

Per the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, the traffic modeling and signal timing optimization software package Synchro (Version 10) has been utilized to analyze signalized intersections under Caltrans' jurisdiction, which include the I-15 ramps at Hidden Valley Parkway and Second Street and the SR-91 ramps at Lincoln Avenue and Second Street. Signal timing for the freeway arterial-to-ramp intersections have been obtained from Caltrans District 8 and were utilized for the purposes of this EIR analysis.

#### **Unsignalized Intersections**

The Cities of Norco and Corona require that unsignalized intersections be evaluated using the methodology described in the HCM. The LOS rating is based on the weighted average control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle, as shown in Table 5.13-7.

Description	Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)	Level of Service, V/C ≤ 1.0	Level of Service, V/C > 1.0
Little or no delays.	0 to 10.00	А	F
Short traffic delays.	10.01 to 15.00	В	F
Average traffic delays.	15.01 to 25.00	С	F
Long traffic delays.	25.01 to 35.00	D	F
Very long traffic delays.	35.01 to 50.00	E	F
Extreme traffic delays with intersection capacity exceeded.	> 50.00	F	F

Table 5.13-7: Unsignalized Intersection LOS Thresholds

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

At two-way or side-street stop-controlled intersections, LOS is calculated for each controlled movement and for the left turn movement from the major street, as well as for the intersection as a whole. For approaches composed of a single lane, the delay is computed as the average of all movements in that lane. For all-way stop controlled intersections, LOS is computed for the intersection as a whole.

#### Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis Methodology

The term "signal warrants" refers to established criteria used by Caltrans and other public agencies to quantitatively identify the need for installation of a traffic signal at an unsignalized intersection. The traffic analysis uses the signal warrant criteria presented in the latest edition of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for all study area intersections.

Future unsignalized intersections, that currently do not exist, have been assessed regarding the potential need for new traffic signals based on future average daily traffic (ADT) volumes, using the Caltrans planning level ADT-based signal warrant analysis worksheets. Traffic signal warrant analyses were performed during the peak weekday conditions wherein the Project is anticipated to contribute the highest trips.

#### Freeway Mainline Segment Analysis Methodology

This analysis includes freeway segments along the SR-91 and I-15 where the proposed Project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips. The freeway segment analysis is based on the HCM methodology and conducted using HCS7 software. Table 5.13-8 lists the freeway segment LOS descriptions for each density range utilized for this analysis.

Level of Service	Description	Density Range (pc/mi/ln) <sup>1</sup>
А	Free-flow operations in which vehicles are relatively unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Effects of incidents are easily absorbed.	0.0 – 11.0
В	Relative free-flow operations in which vehicle maneuvers within the traffic stream are slightly restricted. Effects of minor incidents are easily absorbed.	11.1 – 18.0
С	Travel is still at relative free-flow speeds, but freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is noticeably restricted. Minor incidents may be absorbed, but local deterioration in service will be substantial. Queues begin to form behind significant blockages.	18.1 – 26.0
D	Speeds begin to decline slightly and flows and densities begin to increase more quickly. Freedom to maneuver is noticeably limited. Minor incidents can be expected to create queuing as the traffic stream has little space to absorb disruptions.	26.1 – 35.0
E	Operation at capacity. Vehicles are closely spaced with little room to maneuver. Any disruption in the traffic stream can establish a disruption wave that propagates throughout the upstream traffic flow. Any incident can be expected to produce a serious disruption in traffic flow and extensive queuing.	35.1 – 45.0
F	Breakdown in vehicle flow.	>45.0

#### 5.13-8: Description of Freeway Mainline LOS

<sup>1</sup> pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Freeway Merge/Diverge Ramp Junction Analysis

The freeway merge/diverge analysis is based on the HCM Ramps and Ramp Junctions analysis method and performed using HCS7 software. The measure of effectiveness (reported in passenger car/mile/lane) is defined in level of service descriptions for each density range, as listed in Table 5.13-9.

Table 5.13-9: Description of Freeway Merge	and Diverge LOS
--	-----------------

Level of Service	Density Range (pc/mi/ln)
А	≤10.0
В	10.0 – 20.0
С	20.0 – 28.0
D	28.0 - 35.0
E	>35.0
F	Demand Exceeds Capacity

<sup>1</sup> pc/mi/ln = passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### **Minimum Acceptable Levels of Service**

**City of Norco:** For the study intersections located in the City of Norco, LOS D is the minimum acceptable condition that should be maintained during the peak commute hours.

**City of Corona:** In accordance with the City of Corona's General Plan, the following intersection LOS thresholds from the General Plan shall be implemented using the current HCM:

- LOS C or better shall be maintained for local intersections in residential/industrial areas.
- LOS D or better shall be maintained on collector and arterial intersections.
- LOS E will be permitted at specific ramp-to-arterial intersections, and other locations as approved by the City Engineer.

All of the intersections within the traffic study area that are in the City of Corona are collector or arterial intersections. As such, the minimum level of service applicable to the study area intersections is LOS D.

**Caltrans**: Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS between LOS C and LOS D; however, Caltrans acknowledges that this may not always be feasible. The Caltrans Traffic Impact Study Guidelines (December 2002) states that if an existing state highway facility is operating at less than this target LOS, the existing LOS should be maintained. In general, the region-wide goal for an acceptable LOS on all freeways, roadway segments, and intersections is LOS D. Thus, LOS D is used as the target LOS for freeway ramps, freeway segments, and freeway merge/diverge ramp junctions.

## 5.13.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### Impact TR-1: THE PROJECT WOULD CONFLICT WITH A PROGRAM, PLAN, ORDINANCE, OR POLICY ADDRESSING THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING TRANSIT, ROADWAY, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES.

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact.** The proposed Project would redevelop approximately 110 acres of land for a new business park that would provide vehicular and truck traffic access to the Project site from 11 driveways. Five driveways would provide access to the eastern portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, 4 driveways would provide access to the western portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, and 2 driveways would provide access to the site from First Street. As detailed further in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project includes the following traffic and circulation improvements that would be completed in compliance with the City of Norco standards:

- Improve Pacific Avenue from the Project's northern boundary to its southern boundary at its ultimate half-section width along the Project's frontage as a local street (60-foot right-of-way). The Project will also accommodate the right-of-way for a future planned equestrian trail along the western side of Pacific Avenue.
- Improve Mountain Avenue from Second Street to the Project's southern boundary to its ultimate fullsection width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way) and at its ultimate half-section width between the Project's southern boundary to First Street.
- Improve Second Street from the Project's western boundary to the Project's eastern boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).
- Improve First Street from the Project's western boundary to Mountain Avenue at its ultimate halfsection width as a collector street (88-foot right-of-way).

- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes.
- Install a traffic signal at the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Project Driveway 5.
- Improve the intersection of Mountain Avenue and First Street with installation of a traffic signal that accommodates northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lanes in conjunction with a southbound right turn lane.
- The Project would enhance the existing equestrian trails or construct new trails adjacent to the roadways that surround the Project site.

#### **Project Trip Generation**

As shown on Table 5.13-10 operation of the Project is anticipated to result in an increase of 8,696 PCE tripends per day, 852 PCE a.m. peak hour trips and 916 PCE p.m. peak hour trips.

			AN	NPeak	Hour	PM	Peak I		
Land Use	Quantity	Units <sup>1</sup>	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	Daily
High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	602.130	TSF							
Passenger Cars:			35	11	46	15	41	56	866
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-6	-8	-14	- 1	-3	-4	-62
Truck Trips:									
2-axle:			8	2	10	2	6	8	214
3-axle:			3	1	4	1	3	4	90
4+-axle:			26	8	34	7	19	26	670
- Net Truck Trips (PCE) <sup>2</sup>			37	11	48	10	28	38	974
High-Cube C	old Storage S	Subtotal:	66	14	80	24	66	90	1,778
Industrial Park	1,426.460	TSF							
Passenger Cars:			402	94	496	104	392	496	4,182
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-31	-37	-68	-7	-12	-19	-162
Truck Trips:									
2-axle:			15	4	19	4	15	19	156
3-axle:			26	6	32	6	26	32	260
4+-axle:			111	26	137	30	111	141	1,174
- Net Truck Trips (PCE) <sup>2</sup>			152	36	188	40	152	192	1,590
In	dustrial Park S	Subtotal:	523	93	616	137	532	669	5,610
Building A: Commercial Retail (50%)	6.520	TSF							
Passenger Cars:			4	2	6	12	13	25	246
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-2	-2	-4	-6	-4	-10	-98
Pass-by Reduction:4			0	0	0	-2	-2	-4	-52
Comr	nercial Retail S	Subtotal:	2	0	2	4	7	11	96
Building A: Fast-food Without Drive-Thru (50%)	6.520	TSF							
Passenger Cars:			98	65	163	92	92	184	2,258
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-24	-20	-43	-23	-35	-58	-712
Pass-by Reduction:4			-22	-22	-44	-29	-29	-58	-774
Fast-food w/	o Drive-Thru S	Subtotal:	53	24	76	40	28	68	772
Building B: Gas Station w/ Market	12	VFP							
Passenger Cars:			122	122	244	134	134	268	2,378
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-22	-22	-44	-71	-42	-113	-1,006
Pass-by Reduction:4			-62	-62	-124	-35	-35	-70	-770
i	Gas Station S	Subtotal:	38	38	76	28	57	85	602
Building C: Fast-food With Drive-Thru	4.275	TSF							
Passenger Cars:			88	84	172	73	67	140	2,014
Internal Capture: <sup>3</sup>			-24	-20	-43	-23	-35	-58	-836
Pass-by Reduction:4			-32	-32	-64	-16	-16	-32	-590
Fast-food w/ Drive-Thru Subtotal:				33	65	34	16	50	588
Project Total (PCE) <sup>5</sup>	•		714	201	915	267	706	973	9,446
Existing Project (PCE)			-51	-12	-63	-13	-44	-57	-750
Project Increase in Trips (PCE)			663	189	852	254	662	916	8,696
					-	-	<b>5 10 10</b>		

Table 5.13-10: Project Trip Generation (PCE)

<sup>1</sup> TSF = Thousand Square Feet; VFP = Vehicle Fueling Position

<sup>2</sup> Based on the following Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Factors: 2-axle = 1.5 PCE, 3-axle = 2.0 PCE, 4+-axle = 3.0 PCE.

<sup>3</sup> Internal capture based on the ITE Trip Generation Handbook methodology.

<sup>4</sup> Pass-by trip reductions obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Handbook: Tables E.9, E.31, E.32, E.37, and E.38.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### **Existing Plus Project**

**Intersection Operations.** Table 5.13-11 identifies existing traffic volumes at the study area intersections, as well the Project generated traffic. Table 5.13-11 shows that the intersection of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street (#10) is currently operating at an acceptable LOS (D) in the a.m. peak hour and would operate at an unacceptable LOS (E) with Project traffic included. In addition, the proposed Project would contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips at the following three intersections that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS:

- Parkridge Avenue (East) and Second Street (#11 Norco) in the a.m. peak hour
- Hamner Avenue and Second Street (#25 Norco) in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour
- I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street (#33 Caltrans/Norco) in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour

Table 5.13-11: Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations

		E	ixisting (2	2018)		Existing Plus Project					
		De	Delay <sup>1</sup>			Delc	ıy <sup>1</sup>	Leve	el of		
		(se	ecs.)	Serv	vice	(sec	s.)	Servi			
#	Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM		
1	River Rd. & Corydon St.	29.5	33.5	С	С	29.9	34.3	С	С		
2	River Rd. & Country Club Ln./Second St.	29.2	24.7	С	С	30.9	27.0	С	С		
3	River Rd. & Lincoln Av.	42.9	29.2	D	С	43.0	29.5	D	С		
4	Lincoln Av. & Rincon St.	16.1	23.8	В	С	16.2	24.1	В	С		
5	Lincoln Av. & Railroad St.	33.3	29.5	С	С	34.3	29.7	С	С		
6	Lincoln Av. & Pomona Rd.	26.7	20.0	С	В	26.8	20.0	С	В		
7	Lincoln Av. & SR-91 WB Ramps	21.1	23.2	С	С	21.3	23.4	С	С		
8	Lincoln Av. & D St./Second St.	26.5	34.6	С	С	27.1	35.2	С	D		
9	SR-91 EB Ramps & Second St.	27.0	24.7	С	С	27.6	25.0	С	С		
10	Parkridge Av. (West) & Second St.	28.0	17.1	D	С	39.8	19.0	E	С		
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Second St.	79.9	13.3	F	В	>100.0	15.5	F	С		
12	Pacific Av. & Second St.	21.3	13.3	С	В	31.9	16.0	D	С		
13	Parkridge Av. & Lincoln Av./First St.	31.5	27.5	С	С	33.6	29.2	С	С		
14	Dwy. 1 & First St.	Fu	ture Inter	section		11.8	10.9	В	В		
15	Dwy. 2 & First St.	Fu	ture Inter	section		12.8	11.2	В	В		
16	Mountain Av. & Second St.	41.1	19.1	E	С	22.8	17.3	С	В		
17	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 3	Fu	ture Inter	section		13.7	12.4	В	В		
18	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 4	Fu	ture Inter	section		9.2	9.3	А	А		
19	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 5	Fu	ture Inter	section		8.1	9.5	Α	Α		
20	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 6	Fu	ture Inter	section		11.9	12.2	В	В		
21	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 7	Fu	ture Inter	section		9.2	9.9	Α	Α		
22	Mountain Av. & First St.	48.4	23.5	E	С	42.2	24.7	D	С		
23	Dwy. 8 & Second St.	Fu	ture Inter	section		14.6	14.2	В	В		
24	Hamner Av. & 3rd St.	42.4	32.8	D	С	42.5	33.1	D	С		
25	Hamner Av. & Second St.	78.3	173.0	E	F	82.2	187.2	F	F		
26	Hamner Av. & First St.	16.1	22.7	В	С	16.8	23.1	В	С		
27	Hamner Av. & Mountain Av./Hidden Valley Pkwy.	34.3	37.9	С	D	48.8	48.6	D	D		
28	Main St. & Parkridge Av.	40.5	38.0	D	D	40.9	39.2	D	D		
29	I-15 SB Ramp & Second St.	22.6	14.8	С	В	32.8	16.6	С	В		
30	I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	16.3	20.4	В	С	16.9	23.9	В	С		
31	I-15 SB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4.6	4.6 3.4		А	6.9	3.8	А	А		
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.	56.3	56.3 47.7		D	63.9	57.7	E	E		
33	I-15 NB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	9.6	10.3	А	В	10.1	10.4	В	В		
34	I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	25.2	25.2 15.3 C B 28.9 15.6				С	В			
35	Parkridge Av./El Paso Dr. & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	36.5	48.2	D	D	38.4	49.8	D	D		
BC	<b>DLD</b> = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirer	nents (i.e., u	nacceptab	le LOS).							
So	Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.										

As identified in Table 5.13-12, with implementation of the necessary improvements (as detailed in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures) for the impacted intersections (through the Project's payment of fair share fees), the Project's share of impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level if the necessary improvements were constructed. However, the I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements within Caltrans jurisdiction. In addition, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. As a result, traffic impacts in the existing plus Project condition would remain significant and unavoidable.

		Del	ay	Leve	el of
		(sec	Serv	vice	
#	Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM
10	Parkridge Av. (West) & Second St.				
	Existing:				
	-Without Improvements	28.0	17.1	D	С
	-With Improvements				
	E+P:				
	-Without Improvements	39.8	19.0	E	С
	-With Improvements	9.8	9.8	А	А
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Second St.				
	Existing:				
	-Without Improvements	79.9	13.3	F	В
	-With Improvements	12.4	9.8	В	А
	E+P:				
	-Without Improvements	>100.0	15.5	F	С
	-With Improvements	17.0	10.9	В	В
25	Hamner Av. & Second St.				
	Existing:				
	-Without Improvements	78.3	173.0	E	F
	-With Improvements	40.3	38.1	D	D
	E+P:				
	-Without Improvements	82.2	187.2	F	F
	-With Improvements	42.1	43.7	D	D
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.				
	Existing:				
	-Without Improvements	56.3	47.7	E	D
	-With Improvements	40.9	51.5	D	D
	E+P:			_	_
	-Without Improvements	63.9	57.7	E	E
	-With Improvements	41.9	52.1	Ď	D

#### Table 5.13-12: Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations with Improvements

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS). Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019.

**Traffic Signal Warrant.** In the existing plus Project condition, the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street (#16) is anticipated to warrant a traffic signal in the existing plus Project traffic condition. However, the proposed Project includes installation of a traffic signal at this location, which would improve traffic to an acceptable LOS. Therefore, impacts related to a traffic signal warrant in the existing plus Project condition would be less than significant.

**Off-Ramp Queuing.** A queuing analysis was performed for the off-ramps at the SR-91 at the Lincoln Avenue and Second Street interchanges and the I-15 at the Second Street and Hidden Valley Parkway interchanges to assess vehicle queues for the off-ramps to determine if the Project would result in deficient peak hour operations at the ramp-to-arterial intersections resulting in "spill back" onto the SR-91 or the I-15 mainlines. As shown on Table 5.13-13 the addition of Project traffic in the existing plus Project condition would not cause queues to spillover onto the freeway mainlines and would not result in queuing impacts during weekday

a.m. or p.m. peak 95th percentile traffic flows. Therefore, impacts related to off-ramp queuing would be less than significant in the existing plus Project condition.

		Available	95th Pe Queue	rcentile (Feet) <sup>3</sup>	Acceptable? 1		
Intersection	Movement	Stacking Distance (Feet)	a.m. Peak Hour	p.m. Peak Hour	am		
	NOVEILIEIT	215	154	212	V	<b>p</b> .m.	
7. Lincoln Ave. & Sk-91 VVB kamps	WBL/T	1,050	160	212	Yes	Yes	
	WBR	300	476 <sup>2,3</sup>	120	Yes	Yes	
9. SR-91 EB Ramps & Second Street	SBL	930	54	115	Yes	Yes	
	SBR	430	58	65	Yes	Yes	
29. I-15 SB Ramps & Second Street	SBT/L	1,500	70	102	Yes	Yes	
	SBR	340	496 <sup>2,3</sup>	147	Yes	Yes	
30. I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley	SBL	1,650	158	350 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	
Pkwy	SBL/T/R	1,650	279	364 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	
	SBR	320	254	71	Yes	Yes	
32. I-15 NB Ramp & Second	NBL/T	1,265	1,006 <sup>2</sup>	704 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	
Street	NBR	1,265	273	114	Yes	Yes	
34. I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden	NBL	1,375	305 <sup>2</sup>	181	Yes	Yes	
Valley Pkwy	NBT	1,300	97	70	Yes	Yes	
	NBR	470	57	95	Yes	Yes	

Table 5.13-13: Existing Plus	Project Off-Ramp Queuing
------------------------------	--------------------------

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

<sup>1</sup> Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided.

 $^{2}$  95<sup>th</sup> percentile volume exceeds capacity, and queue may be longer.

<sup>3</sup> Although 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue is anticipated to exceed the available storage for the turn lane, the adjacent through lane has sufficient storage to accommodate any spillover without spilling back and affecting the SR-91 mainline. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

**Freeway Segments.** As shown on Table 5.13-14 the addition of Project traffic in the existing plus Project condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street currently operates at a LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this intersection in the a.m. peak hour. Under state law, it is the responsibility of Caltrans to plan and implement improvements to reduce congestion on state-owned freeways. There is no established mechanism whereby the applicant can provide fair share funds to Caltrans to help finance improvements to improve existing conditions. Also, as the freeways are outside the jurisdiction of the City, the City does not have the authority to construct or demand the construction of improvements related to the existing condition. Therefore, impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant and unavoidable in the existing plus Project condition.

Table 5.13-14: Existing Plus Project Freeway Segment Operations

ž	n	Mainline Segment		E	xisting	(2018)		Existing Plus Project			
Ň	ctic		Lanes	Density <sup>1</sup>		LOS		Density <sup>1</sup>		LOS	
Free	Dire			АМ	РМ	AM	PM	АМ	РМ	AM	РМ
SR- 01	~~~	West of Lincoln Av.	5	18.2	22.6	С	С	18.2	22.8	С	С
	СЪ	West of Lincoln Av.	5	26.6	28.2	D	D	26.9	28.3	D	D
		North of Second St.	3	35.2	31.7	ш	D	36.3	32.1	E	D
	SB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	19.1	16.8	С	В	19.4	16.9	С	В
15		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	22.6	20.3	С	С	22.7	20.7	С	С
. <u> </u>		North of Second St.	3	30.0	27.3	D	D	30.3	28.4	D	D
	RB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	19.9	17.2	С	В	20.1	17.5	С	В
	Ī	South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	26.0	21.5	С	С	26.5	21.7	D	С

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019 **Freeway Merge/Diverge.** As shown on Table 5.13-15 the addition of Project traffic in the existing plus Project condition would not result in new freeway merge and diverge areas to operate at unacceptable levels. However, the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to the existing unacceptable freeway merge and diverge conditions at I-15 at the Second Street on and off ramps in the a.m. peak hour. Impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant in the existing plus Project condition. Under state law, it is the responsibility of Caltrans to plan and implement improvements to reduce congestion on state-owned freeways. There is no established mechanism whereby the applicant can provide fair share funds to Caltrans to help finance improvements that would alleviate the impact. Also, as the intersection and/or roadway falls outside the jurisdiction of the City, the City does not have the authority to construct or demand the construction of improvements. Therefore, there is no feasible mitigation that would alleviate or lessen this significant impact and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

>	c				Existing	(2018)		Existing Plus Project					
٧a)	tioi		Lanes on	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour			
Free	Direc	Ramp or Segment	Freeway	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS1		
-91	WB	Lincoln Av. On-Ramp	5	21.9	С	24.3	С	22.0	С	24.7	С		
SR	EB	Lincoln Av. Off-Ramp	5	33.4	D	34.7	D	33.8	D	34.9	D		
		Second St. Off-Ramp	3	36.1	E	34.5	D	36.6	E	34.7	D		
	SB	Second St. On-Ramp	3	37.9	E	32.7	D	38.4	E	33.0	D		
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	5	22.4	С	20.1	С	22.7	С	20.2	С		
5		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	24.5	С	23.0	С	24.7	С	23.6	С		
Ξ		Second St. On-Ramp	4	20.9	С	20.9	С	21.3	С	21.7	С		
		Second St. Off-Ramp	5	25.4	С	21.4	С	25.6	С	21.7	С		
	NB	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	30.3	D	28.1	D	30.5	D	28.6	D		
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	4	33.1	D	29.5	D	33.9	D	29.8	D		

Table 5.13-15: Existing Plus Project Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### **Opening Year (2022)**

The opening year 2022 condition includes the existing traffic volumes, plus an ambient growth factor of 8.24 percent, plus traffic from pending and approved development projects in the area that are anticipated to be operational by 2022. The 8.24 percent ambient growth factor is 2 percent per year, compounded annually, which is consistent with the background growth used by other agencies within Riverside County. In addition, the average RTP growth rate for Norco is 1.77 percent; therefore, the 2.0 percent provides for a conservative analysis.

**Intersection Operations.** The following study area intersections are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS in the opening year (2022) without Project traffic conditions:

- Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street (#10) LOS F a.m. peak hour; LOS E p.m. peak hour
- Parkridge Avenue (East) and Second Street (#11) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Pacific Avenue and Second Street (#12) LOS F a.m. peak hour
- Mountain Avenue and Second Street (#16) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Mountain Avenue and First Street (#22) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Hamner Avenue and Second Street (#25) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours

- Hamner Avenue and Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Pkwy. (#27) LOS E a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- I-15 Northbound Ramps and Second Street (#32) LOS E a.m. peak hour

The weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hour LOS in the opening year (2022) with Project traffic conditions are shown on Table 5.13-16. As shown, the intersections of Pacific Avenue and Second Street and I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street are anticipated to result in an unacceptable LOS with the addition of traffic from the Project during the p.m. peak hour. In addition, the Project would add to the already deficient conditions at 6 other intersections.

		202	2 Without	2022 With Project					
		De	Leve	el of	De	lay	Leve	el of	
		(se	Serv	/ice	(se	cs.)	Serv	/ice	
#	Intersection	AM	AM PM		PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
1	River Rd. & Corydon St.	34.1	38.6	С	D	34.6	39.6	С	D
2	River Rd. & Country Club Ln./Second St.	32.6	26.7	С	С	34.5	29.5	С	С
3	River Rd. & Lincoln Av.	51.0	32.7	D	С	51.2	33.0	D	С
4	Lincoln Av. & Rincon St.	21.5	27.3	С	С	21.9	27.8	С	С
5	Lincoln Av. & Railroad St.	38.2	34.4	D	С	39.9	35.1	D	D
6	Lincoln Av. & Pomona Rd.	28.8	21.1	С	С	28.8	21.1	С	С
7	Lincoln Av. & SR-91 WB Ramps	24.0	25.5	С	С	24.4	26.1	С	С
8	Lincoln Av. & D St./Second St.	29.1	43.4	С	D	30.2	45.9	С	D
9	SR-91 EB Ramps & Second St.	27.8	24.8	С	С	28.9	25.1	С	С
10	Parkridge Av. (West) & Second St.	85.3	36.0	F	E	>100.0	44.2	F	Е
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Second St.	>100.0	54.2	F	F	>100.0	76.4	F	F
12	Pacific Av. & Second St.	55.0	27.6	F	D	84.0	42.1	F	Е
13	Parkridge Av. & Lincoln Av./First St.	40.0	33.4	D	С	43.9	36.6	D	D
14	Dwy. 1 & First St.	Fu	ture Interse	ction		12.6	11.9	В	В
15	Dwy. 2 & First St.	Fu	ture Interse	ection		13.8	12.2	В	В
16	Mountain Av. & Second St.	>100.0	74.4	F	F	34.2	22.3	С	С
17	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 3	Future Intersection				13.9	12.7	В	В
18	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 4	Fu	ture Interse	ction		12.5	12.6	В	В
19	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 5	Fu	ture Interse	ction		8.1	9.5	А	А
20	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 6	Fu	ture Interse	ction		13.1	12.4	В	В
21	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 7	Fu	ture Interse	ction		9.2	10.0	А	А
22	Mountain Av. & First St.	95.7	70.5	F	F	45.8	32.5	D	С
23	Dwy. 8 & Second St.	Fu	ture Interse	ction	_	16.8	17.0	С	С
24	Hamner Av. & 3rd St.	50.5	44.8	D	D	50.7	47.9	D	D
25	Hamner Av. & Second St.	94.9	>200.0	F	F	99.2	>200.0	F	F
26	Hamner Av. & First St.	17.3	24.8	В	С	17.3	25.3	В	С
	Hamner Av. & Mountain Av./Hidden								
27	Valley Pkwy.	60.5	68.7	Е	E	73.0	72.2	Е	Е
28	Main St. & Parkridge Av.	44.5	42.2	D	D	47.1	43.5	D	D
29	I-15 SB Ramp & Second St.	28.9	17.3	С	В	44.1	20.1	D	С
	I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley								
30	Pkwy.	17.4	27.9	В	С	17.9	30.0	В	С
	I-15 SB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley								
31	Pkwy.	4.9	3.9	А	А	8.7	5.1	А	А
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.	69.5	52.5	Е	D	77.6	74.1	Е	Е
	I-15 NB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley								
33	Pkwy.	10.3	11.1	В	В	10.6	11.2	В	В
	I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley								
34	Pkwy.	27.7	16.4	С	В	30.7	16.8	С	В
	Parkridge Av./El Paso Dr. & Hidden								
35	Valley Pkwy.	33.9	50.1	С	D	34.0	52.1	С	D

Table 5.13-16: Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Intersection Operations

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix P herein) identified improvements to address these deficiencies. These roadway improvements consist of installation of traffic signals, additional turn lanes, additional through
lanes, and traffic signal modifications to accommodate right turn overlap phasing, and are detailed below in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures. Implementation of these improvements at the impacted intersections would improve the LOS, as shown on Table 5.13-17.

Table 5.13-17: Opening Year (2022) Plus Proje	ct Intersection Operations with Improvements
---	--

		De	lay	Leve	el of
		(se	cs.)	Serv	/ice
#	Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM
10	Parkridge Av. (West) & Second St. Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	85.3	36.0	F	E
	-With Improvements	10.0	9.7	Α	Α
	2022 With Project:				
	-Without Improvements	>100.0	44.2	F	E
	-With Improvements	10.0	9.7	A	Α
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Second St. Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	>100.0	54.2	F	F
	-With Improvements	27.8	10.8	С	В
	2022 With Project:				
	-Without Improvements	>100.0	76.4	F	F
	-With Improvements	39.0	11.4	D	В
12	Pacific Av. & Second St. Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	55.0	27.6	F	D
	-With Improvements	17.8	12.2	В	В
	2022 With Project:				
	-Without Improvements	84.0	42.1	F	E
	-With Improvements	17.8	12.6	В	В
25	Hamner Av. & Second St. Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	94.9	>200.0	F	F
	-With Improvements	40.3	35.0	D	D
	2022 With Project:				
	-Without Improvements	99.2	>200.0	F	F
	-With Improvements	45.5	40.7	D	D
27	Hamner Av. & Mountain Av./Hidden Valley Pkwy. Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	60.5	68.7	E	E
	-With Improvements	50.3	39.2	D	D
	2022 With Project:			_	_
	-Without Improvements	73.0	72.2	F	E
	-With Improvements	51.9	41.5	D	D
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St. Caltrans/Norco				
	2022 Without Project:				
	-Without Improvements	69.5	52.5	E	D
	-With Improvements	38.0	43.0	D	D
	2022 With Project:			_	_
	-Without Improvements	77.6	74.1	E	E
	-With Improvements	39.0	49.8	D	D

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

With payment of the fair share contribution for identified improvements to these cumulatively impacted intersections, the Project's share of impacts would be mitigated because implementation of these improvements at the impacted intersections would improve the LOS. However, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. Also, the construction/implementation of these improvements is dependent upon the payment of similar fees by other projects that contribute to the cumulative impact. As such, the exact timing of implementation of the improvements identified by the mitigation measure is uncertain. Therefore, impacts are considered significant

and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1. In addition, the intersection of I-15 and Second Street is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the City of Norco; and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of Caltrans improvements. As a result, traffic impacts to intersections in the opening year 2022 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and remain significant and unavoidable.

**Traffic Signal Warrant.** The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix P) identified that in the 2022 cumulative without Project traffic conditions, the unsignalized intersection of Parkridge Avenue (East) and Second Street (#11) is anticipated to meet the need for a traffic signal in the peak hour. Thus, Mitigation Measure TR-1 is included to require the Project to provide a fair share contribution toward installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. The Traffic Impact Analysis details that with implementation of the Project, no additional unsignalized intersections would meet the need for a traffic signal.

**Off-Ramp Queuing.** A queuing analysis was performed for the off-ramps at the SR-91 at the Lincoln Avenue and Second Street interchanges and the I-15 at the Second Street and Hidden Valley Parkway interchanges to assess vehicle queues for the off-ramps to determine if the Project would result in deficient peak hour operations at the ramp-to-arterial intersections resulting in "spill back" onto the SR-91 or the I-15 mainlines. As shown on Table 5.13-18 the addition of Project traffic in the opening year condition would not cause queues to spillover onto the freeway mainlines and would not result in queuing impacts during weekday a.m. or p.m. peak 95th percentile traffic flows. Therefore, impacts related to off-ramp queuing would be less than significant in the opening year plus Project condition.

					r	
			95th Pe	rcenfile		
		Available	Queue	(Feet) <sup>3</sup>	Acce	ptable? 1
		Stacking	a.m.	p.m.		
		Distance	Peak	Peak		
Intersection	Movement	(Feet)	Hour	Hour	a.m.	p.m.
7. Lincoln Ave. & SR-91 WB Ramps	WBL	315	169	222	Yes	Yes
	WBL/T	1,050	174	224	Yes	Yes
	WBR	300	596 <sup>2,3</sup>	169	Yes	Yes
9. SR-91 EB Ramps & Second Street	SBL	930	58	134	Yes	Yes
	SBR	430	63	71	Yes	Yes
29. I-15 SB Ramps & Second Street	SBT/L	1,500	76	100	Yes	Yes
	SBR	340	629 <sup>2,3</sup>	230	Yes	Yes
30. I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley	SBL	1,650	171	410 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
Pkwy	SBL/T/R	1,650	351	415 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
-	SBR	320	321 <sup>3</sup>	75	Yes	Yes
32. I-15 NB Ramp & Second	NBL/T	1,265	1,149 <sup>2</sup>	837 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
Street	NBR	1,265	382	148	Yes	Yes
34. I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden	NBL	1,375	350 <sup>2</sup>	215	Yes	Yes
Valley Pkwy	NBT	1,300	100	74	Yes	Yes
	NBR	470	58	135	Yes	Yes

Table 5.13-18: Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Off-Ramp Queuing

<sup>1</sup> Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided.
<sup>2</sup> 95<sup>th</sup> percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.

<sup>3</sup> Although 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue is anticipated to exceed the available storage for the turn lane, the adjacent through lane has sufficient storage to accommodate any spillover without spilling back and affecting the SR-91 mainline.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

**Freeway Segments.** As shown on Table 5.13-19, the addition of Project traffic in the opening year (2022) condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street is anticipated to operate at a LOS E in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in 2022, and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this intersection in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

١y	u		20	2022 Without Project			2022 With Project				
Ŵ	Ċţi	Mainline Seament	Der	nsity <sup>1</sup>	LOS		Density <sup>1</sup>		LOS		
Free	Dire	<b>33</b>	AM	РМ	AM	РМ	AM	PM	АМ	РМ	
R-91	WB	West of Lincoln Av.	19.9	25.2	С	С	19.9	25.4	С	С	
S	EB	West of Lincoln Av.	30.0	31.9	D	D	30.0	31.6	D	D	
			North of Second St.	40.9	37.1	E	E	43.2	37.6	E	E
	SB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	21.1	18.4	С	С	21.4	18.6	С	С	
5		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	25.2	22.6	С	С	25.4	23.0	С	С	
<u> </u>		North of Second St.	34.7	31.3	D	D	35.0	32.7	D	D	
_	-	NB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	22.0	18.9	С	С	22.2	19.2	С	С
		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	29.5	24.0	D	С	30.0	24.2	D	С	

Table 5.13-19: Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Freeway Segment Operations

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

However, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, in partnership with Caltrans, is improving the I-15 Freeway between Cajalco Road and SR-60 Freeway. The "I-15 Express Lanes Project" will add two tolled express lanes in each direction, with multiple entrances and exits. Construction began in 2018, and the express lanes will be open to traffic in 2020 (Riv 2019).

Caltrans typically assumes a reduction of 14 percent to the freeway mainline through volumes to account for vehicles utilizing the express lanes. The reduction to the I-15 mainline volumes (14% per lane for 2 lanes, or 28% total) has been applied to account for the proposed express lanes. As shown in Table 5.13-20, the I-15 mainline segments are anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS with the improvements provided by the I-15 Express Lanes Project. As a result, Project impacts to freeway segments in the opening year would be less than significant.

ý	no			With Improvements				
ž	Ğ	Mainline Seament	_	Density <sup>1</sup>		LOS		
Free	Dire		Lanes	AM	РМ	AM	РМ	
I-15	SB	North of Second St.	3	26.5	23.7	D	С	
		Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	15.7	13.6	В	В	
		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	18.2	16.5	С	В	
		North of Second St.	3	22.6	21.4	С	С	
	RB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	16.0	14.0	В	В	
		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	20.3	17.0	С	В	

 Table 5.13-20: Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Freeway Segments with Improvements

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

Source: Urban Crossroaas, 2019

**Freeway Merge/Diverge.** As shown on Table 5.13-21, the following merge and diverge areas are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F) in the opening year (2022) without and with operation of the proposed Project. Because the proposed Project would contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to these Caltrans freeway merge/diverge areas that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS, the proposed Project would result in impacts in the following conditions.

- SR-91 Freeway, Eastbound off-ramp at Lincoln Avenue (#2) LOS E a.m. and p.m. peak hour
- I-15 Freeway, Southbound off-ramp at Second Street (#3) LOS E a.m. and p.m. peak hours

- I-15 Freeway, Southbound on-ramp at Second Street (#4) LOS F a.m. peak hour; LOS E p.m. peak hour
- I-15 Freeway, Northbound off-ramp at Hidden Valley Pkwy. (#10) LOS E a.m. peak hour

γ	n		202	2 With	out Project		20	)22 Wit	h Project	
٥ ٨	- čti	Ramp or Seament	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
Free	Dire		Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS
-91	WB	Lincoln Av. On-Ramp	23.6	С	26.0	С	23.7	С	26.4	С
SR	EB	Lincoln Av. Off-Ramp	36.3	E	37.7	E	36.5	E	37.6	E
	В	Second St. Off-Ramp	38.8	ш	36.8	ш	40.3	ш	37.0	E
		Second St. On-Ramp	41.0	F	35.4	ш	41.3	F	35.7	E
	S	Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	23.1	С	21.7	С	23.6	С	21.9	С
5		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	26.6	С	25.1	С	26.8	С	25.8	С
Ξ		Second St. On-Ramp	22.7	С	22.9	С	23.0	С	23.6	С
	B	Second St. Off-Ramp	26.7	С	23.3	С	27.0	С	23.6	С
	2	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	32.7	D	30.4	D	32.9	D	30.8	D
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	36.0	E	32.2	D	36.8	E	32.5	D

Table 5.13-21: Opening Year (2022) Project Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

As described previously, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, in partnership with Caltrans, is improving the I-15 Freeway between Cajalco Road and SR-60 Freeway. Construction began in 2018, and the express lanes will be open to traffic in 2020. As shown in Table 5.13-22, the I-15 merge/diverge operations are anticipated to be at an acceptable LOS with the improvements provided by the I-15 Express Lanes Project. As a result, Project impacts to freeway merge and diverge operations in the opening year would be less than significant.

 Table 5.13-22: Opening Year (2022) Project Freeway Merge/Diverge Operations with Improvements

y' no			With Improvements							
š	Ğ	Ramp or Segment		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour				
Free	Dire	Kump or segment	Lanes on Freeway	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS			
		Second St. Off-Ramp	3	32.0	D	30.0	D			
	SB	Second St. On-Ramp	3	34.0	D	28.3	D			
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	5	20.9	С	18.5	В			
5		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	21.9	С	21.2	С			
Ξ		Second St. On-Ramp	4	18.0	В	19.1	В			
	8	Second St. Off-Ramp	5	24.0	С	20.6	С			
	2	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	27.3	С	26.0	С			
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	4	29.1	D	25.8	С			

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Horizon Year (2040)

Traffic projections for horizon year (2040) conditions were derived from the Riverside County Transportation Analysis Model (RivTAM), which reflects the regionally anticipated growth. In addition, cumulative projects were added to determine the traffic conditions in 2040 without the proposed Project.

**Intersection Operations.** As shown in Table 5.13-22, the following additional study area intersections are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS under horizon year (2040) without Project traffic conditions.

- River Road and Corydon Street (#1) LOS E a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- River Road. & Lincoln Avenue (#3) LOS F p.m. peak hour
- Parkridge Avenue (West) & Second Street (#10) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Parkridge Avenue (East) & Second Street (#11) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Pacific Avenue & Second Street (#12) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Mountain Avenue. & Second Street (#16) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Mountain Avenue & First Street (#22) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Hamner Avenue & Second Street (#25) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Hamner Avenue & Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Pkwy. (#27) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- Main St. & Parkridge Avenue (#28) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- I-15 Southbound Ramps & Second Street (#29) LOS E a.m. peak hour
- I-15 Northbound Ramps & Second Street (#32) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours

Table 5.13-22 also identifies that the intersection of I-15 SB Ramp at Second Street would operate at a LOS of D in the p.m. peak hour without the Project, and at an unacceptable LOS of E in the p.m. peak hour with the addition of the Project traffic after 2040. The Project would also add to the anticipated deficient conditions, as shown on Table 5.13-22.

		2040 Without Project 2040 Wit			40 With Pr	Project			
		Del	ayı	Leve	el of	Del	ayı	Leve	el of
		(se	cs.)	Serv	/ice	(se	cs.)	Serv	/ice
#	Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	РМ
1	River Rd. & Corydon St.	57.4	57.1	E	E	58.8	58.6	E	E
2	River Rd. & Country Club Ln./Second St.	49.8	46.6	D	D	53.0	53.8	D	D
3	River Rd. & Lincoln Av.	87.0	37.9	F	D	88.8	39.3	F	D
4	Lincoln Av. & Rincon St.	26.7	37.0	С	D	27.6	38.1	С	D
5	Lincoln Av. & Railroad St.	35.5	44.2	D	D	37.2	45.4	D	D
6	Lincoln Av. & Pomona Rd.	32.4	24.6	С	D	32.7	24.8	С	С
7	Lincoln Av. & SR-91 WB Ramps	30.5	38.1	С	D	30.8	42.9	С	D
8	Lincoln Av. & D St./Second St.	35.8	52.1	D	D	37.5	52.1	D	D
9	SR-91 EB Ramps & Second St.	28.5	24.1	С	С	30.0	24.3	С	С
10	Parkridge Av. (West) & Second St.	>100.0	72.3	F	F	>100.0	99.2	F	F
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Second St.	>100.0	>100.0	F	F	>100.0	>100.0	F	F
12	Pacific Av. & Second St.	>100.0	61.5	F	F	>100.0	89.8	F	F
13	Parkridge Av. & Lincoln Av./First St.	44.7	42.4	D	D	51.2	49.4	D	D
14	Dwy. 1 & First St.	Future Intersection				13.8	12.6	В	В
15	Dwy. 2 & First St.	Fu	ture Interse	ction	_	15.5	13.2	В	В
16	Mountain Av. & Second St.	>100.0	>100.0	F	F	49.2	47.1	D	D
17	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 3	Fu	ture Interse	ction		14.7	13.5	В	В
18	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 4	Fu	ture Interse	ction		13.6	14.4	В	В
19	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 5	Fu	ture Interse	ction		6.0	7.7	Α	А
20	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 6	Fu	ture Interse	ction		13.9	13.1	Α	В
21	Mountain Av. & Dwy. 7	Fu	ture Interse	ction	_	9.3	10.2	Α	В
22	Mountain Av. & First St.	>100.0	>100.0	F	F	72.4	52.3	Е	D
23	Dwy. 8 & Second St.	Fu	ture Interse	ction		20.4	19.7	С	С
24	Hamner Av. & 3rd St.	51.7	42.2	D	D	52.0	44.6	D	D
25	Hamner Av. & Second St.	131.3	>200.0	F	F	135.9	>200.0	F	F
26	Hamner Av. & First St.	19.7	32.1	В	С	20.4	32.9	С	С
27	Hamner Av. & Mountain Av./Hidden Valley Pkwy.	105.6	112.3	F	F	141.3	116.1	F	F
28	Main St. & Parkridge Av.	154.4	130.2	F	F	155.5	134.1	F	F
29	I-15 SB Ramp & Second St.	60.0	42.8	E	D	84.2	75.2	F	E
30	I-15 SB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	21.6	43.8	С	D	23.6	53.3	С	D
31	I-15 SB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	3.0	7.2	А	А	3.0	15.7	А	В
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.	105.8	85.0	F	F	114.8	114.4	F	F
33	I-15 NB On-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	6.9	12.5	А	В	7.2	12.6	А	В
34	I-15 NB Off-Ramp & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	32.3	18.9	С	В	42.3	19.5	D	В

Table 5.13-23: Horizon Year (2040) Conditions Plus Project Intersection Operations

		204	2040 Without Project				40 With Pı	roject	
		Delay <sup>1</sup>		ay <sup>1</sup> Level of		Del	ayı	Leve	el of
		(secs.)		Service		(secs.)		Service	
#	Intersection	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
35	Parkridge Av./El Paso Dr. & Hidden Valley Pkwy.	40.5	46.4	D	D	42.5	49.1	D	D

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS). Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix P) identified improvements to address these deficiencies. The improvements consist of installation of traffic signals, additional turn lanes, and traffic signal modifications, and are detailed below in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures. Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented, which requires contribution of a fair share towards various improvements to mitigate the Project's impacts at these intersection locations. With payment of the fair share contribution, the Project's share of 2040 cumulative impacts would be mitigated, and implementation of these improvements at the impacted intersections would improve the LOS, as shown on Table 5.13-24.

However, most of the needed improvements are not planned improvements and do not have funding mechanisms. Also, the construction/implementation of these improvements (whether planned or not) is dependent upon the payment of similar fees by other projects that contribute to the impact. As such, the exact timing of implementation of the improvements identified by the mitigation measure is uncertain. The City does earmark fair share funds paid for traffic improvements, meaning that any fair share fees paid for a certain improvement will be spent on that specific improvement (i.e., fair share fees cannot be spent on alternative improvements, the uncertainty regarding the timing of the construction of the improvements means the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1. In addition, many intersections (as listed above) are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the City of Corona; and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements within these jurisdictions. As a result, traffic impacts at intersections in the 2040 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and significant and unavoidable.

			De	ay	Leve	el of
#	Interest's a			CS.)	Ser	
#	Intersection		AM	PM	AM	PM
1	River Rd. & Corydon St.					
	2040 Without Project:					
		-Without Improvements	57.4	57.1	E	E
		<ul> <li>With Improvements</li> </ul>	42.8	43.9	D	D
	2040 With Project:					
	-	-Without Improvements	58.8	58.6	E	E
		-With Improvements	43.9	44.8	D	D
3	River Rd. & Lincoln Av.	•				
	2040 Without Project:					
		-Without Improvements	87.0	37.9	F	D
		-With Improvements	52.7	31.5	D	C
	2040 With Project		•=	0.10	_	-
		-Without Improvements	88.8	39.3	F	D
		-With Improvements	53.4	31.9	D	Ċ
10	Parkridge Av (West) & S	Second St	0011	0117		<u> </u>
10	2040 Without Project					
	2040 Williou Projeci:		>100.0	70.0	-	-
		- vv imout improvements	/100.0	/ 2.3		
	00 (0) (0)	- vv itn improvements	9.9	9.9	А	A
	2040 With Project:				_	_
		-Without Improvements	>100.0	99.2	F	F
		-With Improvements	9.9	10.1	А	В
11	Parkridge Av. (East) & Se	econd St.				
	2040 Without Project:					

Table 5.13-24: Horizon Year (2040) Plus	Project Intersection C	Operations with In	nprovements
---	------------------------	--------------------	-------------

			De	lay	Level of	
			(se	<b>c</b> s.)	Serv	vice
#	Intersection		AM	PM	AM	PM
		-Without Improvements	>100.0	>100.0	F	F
		-With Improvements	36.9	14.0	D	В
	2040 With Project:					
		-Without Improvements	>100.0	>100.0	F	F
		-With Improvements	47.4	15.2	D	В
12	Pacific Av. & Second St.					
	2040 Without Project:				_	_
		-Without Improvements	>100.0	61.5	F	F
	2040 14/51 0	-With Improvements	18.0	12.4	В	В
	2040 With Project:	\ <b>A</b> /!al +	>100.0		-	-
		- vv ithout improvements	>100.0	12.9	P	P
22	Manustain Av. 9 Eirst St	- will improvements	17.3	12.0	Б	В
22	2040 Without Project					
		-Without Improvements	>100.0	>100.0	F	F
		-With Improvements	34.0	27.9	Ċ	Ċ
	2040 With Project:		0 110	-/ ./	C	C
		-Without Improvements	72.4	52.3	Е	D
		-With Improvements	48.0	43.3	D	D
25	Hamner Av. & Second St.	ľ				
	2040 Without Project:					
	·	-Without Improvements	131.3	>200.0	F	F
		-With Improvements	40.2	45.9	D	D
	2040 With Project:					
		-Without Improvements	135.9	>200.0	F	F
		-With Improvements	54.0	54.6	D	D
27	Hamner Av. & Mountain A	.v./Hidden Valley Pkwy.				
	2040 Without Project:				_	_
		-Without Improvements	105.6	112.3	F	F
		-With Improvements	3/./	41.1	D	D
			141.2	114 1	E	-
		- windon improvements	45 1	540	r D	
29	Main St. 8 Parkridge Av	- with improvements	45.1	54.0	D	
20	2040 Without Project					
		-Without Improvements	154.4	130.2	F	F
		-With Improvements	54.6	40.8	D.	D.
	2040 With Project:		0.10		_	_
		-Without Improvements	155.5	134.1	F	F
		-With Improvements	54.9	42.4	D	D
29	I-15 SB Ramp & Second S	it.				
	2040 Without Project:					
		-Without Improvements	60.0	42.8	E	D
		-With Improvements	33.8	20.2	С	С
	2040 With Project:					
		-Without Improvements	84.2	75.2	F	E
		-With Improvements	47.3	22.8	D	С
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second	St.				
	2040 Without Project:	14/01 · I	107.0	05.0		
		- Without Improvements	105.8	85.0	F	F
	2040 W/H Durt+	- vv itn improvements	52./	42.2	ט	ט
		-Without Improvements	114 9	114.0	F	F
		- With Improvements	520	547		
		- ++ ini inprovements	55.7	54./		

**BOLD** = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS). Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

**Traffic Signal Warrant.** The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix P) identified that in the 2040 cumulative with Project traffic conditions, the intersection of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street (#10) would meet the need for a traffic signal and an eastbound left turn lane. Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented, which requires contribution of a fair share towards implementation of the improvement to

mitigate the Project's impacts at this intersection. With implementation of the traffic signal, impacts at the intersection of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street (#10) would be less than significant. However, there is no existing planned improvement for this location and the timing of this improvement is unknown. Therefore, impacts related to the signal warrant at the intersection of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street (#10) would be less than significant.

**Off-Ramp Queuing.** As shown on Table 5.13-25, the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street (#32) is anticipated to experience queuing issues in the a.m. peak hour without the Project in 2040. The addition of traffic from the Project after 2040 would not result in queuing impacts at any other location; however, the Project would add to the deficient conditions at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street (#32).

				20	40 Witho	out Proje	ct		2040 With	n Project	
			Available	95th Pe	rcentile			95th Pe	ercentile		
			Stacking	Queue	(Feet)	Accept	able?1	Queue (Feet)		Acceptable? 1	
				AM	PM			AM	PM		
			Distance	Peak	Peak			Peak	Peak		
	Intersection	Movement	(Feet)	Hour	Hour	AM	PM	Hour	Hour	AM	PM
		WBL	315	214	423 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	214	423 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No
7	Lincoln Av. & SR-	WBL/T	1050	222	426 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	222	426 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	91 WB Ramps	WBR	300	686 <sup>2,3</sup>	224 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	686 <sup>2,3</sup>	245 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	SR-91 EB Ramps	SBL	930	64	153	Yes	Yes	65	154	Yes	Yes
9	& Second St.	SBR	430	63	68	Yes	Yes	67	68	Yes	Yes
	I-15 SB Ramp &	SBT/L	1500	96	135	Yes	Yes	96	135	Yes	Yes
29	Second St.	SBR	340	628 <sup>2,3</sup>	250	Yes	Yes	851 <sup>2,3</sup>	335 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	I-15 SB Off-	SBL	1650	221	445 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	221	487 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
30	Ramp & Hidden	SBL/T/R	1650	453 <sup>2</sup>	462 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	602 <sup>2</sup>	504 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	Valley Pkwy.	SBR	320	411 <sup>3</sup>	156	Yes	Yes	544 <sup>2,3</sup>	183	Yes	Yes
32	I-15 NB Ramps &	NBL/T	1265	1,288 <sup>2</sup>	987 <sup>2</sup>	No	Yes	1,349 <sup>2</sup>	1,009 <sup>2</sup>	No	Yes
	Second St.	NBR	1265	614 <sup>2</sup>	228	Yes	Yes	617 <sup>2</sup>	239	Yes	Yes
	I-15 NB Off-										
34	Ramp & Hidden	NBL	1375	357 <sup>2</sup>	242	Yes	Yes	437 <sup>2</sup>	274 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
	Valley Pkwy.	NBT	1300	120	86	Yes	Yes	120	86	Yes	Yes
		NBR	470	63	253 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	63	258 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes

Table 5.13-25: Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Off-Ramp Queuing

<sup>1</sup> Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided.

<sup>2</sup> 95<sup>th</sup> percentile volume exceeds capacity, and queue may be longer.

<sup>3</sup> Although 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue is anticipated to exceed the available storage for the turn lane, the adjacent through lane has sufficient storage to accommodate any spillover without spilling back and affecting the SR-91 mainline.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix P) identified improvements to address this deficiency (Table 5.13-26). The improvements consist of modifying the intersection to add a northbound left turn lane, as listed below in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures. However, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to implement this mitigation measure. In addition, the City of Norco cannot implement or guarantee implementation of improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street in the a.m. peak hour in the horizon year 2040.

				20	040 With Projec		
Intersection 32 I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.			Available Stacking	95th Percentile	Accept	Acceptable? 1	
			-	PM Peak			
Inters	ection	Movement	Distance (Feet)	AM Peak Hour	Hour AM		PM
32	I-15 NB Ramps & Second St.	NBL	650	646 <sup>2</sup>	426	Yes	Yes
	-	NBT	1265	627 <sup>2</sup>	437	Yes	Yes
		NBR	1265	620 <sup>2</sup>	225	Yes	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Stacking Distance is acceptable if the required stacking distance is less than or equal to the stacking distance provided.

 $^2$  95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, and queue may be longer.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

**Freeway Segments.** As shown on Table 5.13-27, in the 2040 horizon year the following freeway segments are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours without Project traffic conditions.

- SR-91 Freeway Eastbound, West of Second Av. (#2) LOS F p.m. peak hour
- I-15 Freeway Southbound, North of Second St. (#3) LOS F a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- I-15 Freeway Northbound, North of Second St. (#6) LOS E a.m. peak hour; LOS F p.m. peak hour

As shown on Table 5.13-27, three study area freeway segments are anticipated to operate an unacceptable LOS E or F during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hour, and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to these segments in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Table 5.13-27: Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Freeway Segment Operations

ž	n			2040 Without Project					2040 With Project			
ž	Mainline Segment		Lanes	Den	sity <sup>1</sup>	LOS		Density <sup>1</sup>		LOS		
Free	Dire			АМ	РМ	AM	PM	AM	РМ	Project LC AM D D F C D E C C	PM	
-91	WB	West of Lincoln Av.	5	29.9	24.6	D	С	30.0	24.8	D	С	
SR	EB	West of Lincoln Av.	5	29.9	<b></b> <sup>2</sup>	D	F	30.2	2040 With Project           snsity1         LOS           PM         AM         PN           24.8         D         C           2        2         D         F          2         F         F           3         24.6         C         C           3         32.8         D         D           1        2         E         F           3         25.4         C         C           3         34.7         D         D	F		
		North of Second St.	3	<b></b> 2	<b></b> <sup>2</sup>	F	F	2	<b></b> 2	F	F	
	SB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	22.7	24.5	С	С	22.8	24.6	<sup>2</sup> D F <sup>2</sup> F F .6 C C 8 D D	С	
15		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	26.7	.7 31.7 D D 26.8 32.8 D	D	D					
<u> </u>		North of Second St.	3	40.7	<b></b> <sup>2</sup>	ш	Ŀ	41.1	2	E	F	
Second St. to Hidden V       Second St. to Hidden V	RB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	24.6	25.3	C	C	24.8	25.4	С	С	
	South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	33.8	34.4	D	D	34.5	34.7	D	D		

BOLD = LOS does not meet the applicable jurisdictional requirements (i.e., unacceptable LOS).

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

 $^{2}$  HCS7 does not report density for freeway facilities operating at LOS F.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

However, as described previously, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, in partnership with Caltrans, is improving the I-15 Freeway between Cajalco Road and SR-60 Freeway. The "I-15 Express Lanes Project" will add two tolled express lanes in each direction, with multiple entrances and exits. Construction began in 2018, and the express lanes will be open to traffic in 2020.

As shown in Table 5.13-28, the I-15 mainline segments are anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS with the improvements provided by the I-15 Express Lanes Project. As a result, Project impacts to freeway segments in 2040 would be less than significant.

ž				With Improvements				
Ň	Ğ	Mainline Seament	_	Den	sity <sup>1</sup>	LOS		
Free	Dire		Lanes	AM	РМ	AM         PM           AM         PM           3.2         D         D           7.6         B         B           6         C         C           0.9         C         D           7.9         B         B           7.2         C         C	РМ	
		North of Second St.	3	28.8	28.2	D	D	
	SB	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	16.8	17.6	В	В	
15		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	19.1	21.6	vemer LC AM D B C C B C	С	
<u> </u>		North of Second St.	3	25.1	30.9		D	
	۳	Second St. to Hidden Valley Pkwy.	5	17.3	17.9	В	В	
		South of Hidden Valley Pkwy.	4	22.6	22.2	С	С	

Table 5.13-28: Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Freeway Segments with Improvements

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

**Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge.** As shown on Table 5.13-29, the following freeway ramp merge and diverge areas are anticipated to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E or LOS F) in the horizon year (2040) without and with operation of the proposed Project. Because the proposed Project would contribute 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to these Caltrans freeway ramp merge/diverge areas that are already operating at an unacceptable LOS, the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable impacts in the following conditions.

- SR-91 Freeway, Eastbound off-ramp at Lincoln Avenue (#2) LOS E a.m. peak hour and LOS F p.m. peak hour
- I-15 Freeway, Southbound off-ramp at Second Street (#3) LOS E a.m. and p.m. peak hours
- I-15 Freeway, Southbound on-ramp at Second Street (#4) LOS F a.m. peak hour; LOS E p.m. peak hour
- I-15 Freeway, Northbound off-ramp at Hidden Valley Pkwy. (#10) LOS E a.m. peak hour

Y	c		Lanes	204	0 With	out Project		20	040 Wit	h Project	
Ň	ctio	Dama an Commont	on	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
I-15 SR-91 Freeway	Dired	Ramp or Segment	Freewa	Density	LO	Density	LO	Density	LO	Density	LO
	8 1		У		3		3	3	3	•	3
-91	$\geq$	Lincoln Av. On-Ramp	5	30.6	D	27.3	С	30.7	D	27.7	С
I-15 SR-91 Freeway	EB	Lincoln Av. Off-Ramp	5	35.3	E	59.2	F	35.8	E	59.4	F
		Second St. Off-Ramp	3	42.0	F	43.3	F	43.6	F	43.7	F
		Second St. On-Ramp	3	44.4	F	48.4	F	45.3	F	48.7	F
	SB	Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off- Ramp	5	26.3	С	25.6	С	26.8	с	25.8	С
5		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On- Ramp	4	28.5	D	31.7	D	28.7	D	32.4	D
Ξ		Second St. On-Ramp	4	25.1	С	29.9	D	25.3	С	30.7	D
		Second St. Off-Ramp	5	29.1	D	26.9	С	29.3	D	27.1	С
	NB	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On- Ramp	4	35.7	E	37.4	E	35.9	E	37.8	E
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off- Ramp	4	40.1	E	40.3	E	40.8	E	40.6	E

Table 5.13-29: Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge Conditions

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

As described previously, the Riverside County Transportation Commission, in partnership with Caltrans, is improving the I-15 Freeway between Cajalco Road and SR-60 Freeway. Construction began in 2018, and the express lanes will be open to traffic in 2020. As shown in Table 5.13-30, the I-15 merge/diverge operations are anticipated to be at an acceptable LOS with the improvements provided by the I-15 Express

Lanes Project, except for the I-15 southbound on-ramp at Second Street, which is anticipated to continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the peak hours. There is no planned improvement at this location. As such, no feasible mitigation available to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, the City of Norco cannot implement or guarantee implementation of improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts after 2040 at the I-15 southbound on-ramp at Second Street merge/diverge location.

Table 5.13-30: Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge with
Improvements

tion tion		Wi	th Impr	ovements			
Š	sctio	Ramp or Segment	Lanes on	AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour	
Free	Dire		Freeway	Density <sup>1</sup>	LOS	<b>Density</b> <sup>1</sup>	LOS
		Second St. Off-Ramp	3	33.6	D	33.1	D
	SB	Second St. On-Ramp	3	36.7	E	39.0	E
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	5	24.0	С	22.3	С
5		Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	23.8	С	26.4	С
Ξ		Second St. On-Ramp	4	19.9	В	24.6	С
	<b>IB</b>	Second St. Off-Ramp	5	25.9	С	23.7	С
<u> </u>	2	Hidden Valley Pkwy. On-Ramp	4	29.7	D	31.6	D
		Hidden Valley Pkwy. Off-Ramp	4	32.4	D	32.0	D

\* **BOLD** = Unacceptable Level of Service

<sup>1</sup> Density is measured by passenger cars per mile per lane.

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2019

#### Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

The Traffic Study (Urban Crossroads 2019) identified that nominal pedestrian and bicycle activity currently exists within the study area. Hamner Avenue is planned to have a Class II bike lane south of Hidden Valley Parkway, and there are existing Class II bike lanes along River Road, Corydon Street, and Country Club Road. There are no existing sidewalks adjacent to the Project site.

As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, as part of the roadway improvements that are included in the Project, sidewalks would be installed on the western side of Pacific Avenue, along both sides of Palomino Way, and along Mountain Avenue within the Project area. These facilities implemented by the proposed Project would provide additional pedestrian facilities in the area. In addition, the proposed Project would not alter any existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

There are no existing bus or other transit routes adjacent to the Project site. However, the Corona Cruiser route includes Parkridge Avenue, which is south of the Project site, and the RTA bus Route 3 is located on Hamner Avenue, approximately 0.25 mile from the Project site. As no public transit facilities exist adjacent to the site, the proposed Project would not substantially conflict with or decrease the performance of such facilities. Thus, conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

#### Impact TR-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE HAZARDS DUE TO A GEOMETRIC DESIGN FEATURE (E.G., SHARPT CURVES OR DANGEROUS INTERSECTIONS) OR INCOMPATIBLE USES (E.G., FARM EQUIPMENT).

Less than Significant Impact. The Project includes development of business park and commercial uses, and does not include any incompatible uses, such as farm equipment. The proposed Project would be accessed by primarily by Mountain Avenue, with smaller driveways along First Street and Second Street. Specific

driveways are planned for trucks to facilitate truck movements in a manner that would be compatible with the adjacent areas and the proposed business park uses.

The Project would also not increase any hazards related to a design feature. Eleven driveways would provide access to the site. Due to the typical wide turning radius of large trucks, the Traffic Study evaluated the proposed truck access driveways (driveways 3, 4, 5, and 6 on Mountain Avenue) to ensure that they can accommodate the wide turning radius of the heavy trucks. Driveway 3 would be designed to provide a 65-foot radius on the northwest curb, a 40-foot radius on the northeast curb, and a 60-foot radius on the southeast curb. Driveway 4 would be designed to provide a 60-foot radius on the northwest curb. Driveway 5 would be designed to provide a 35-foot radius on the northeast curb and a 60-foot radius on the southeast curb; and driveway 6 would be designed to provide a 60-foot radius on the northwest curb in order to accommodate the wide turning radius of a heavy truck.

In addition, all proposed improvements would be required to be installed in conformance with City design standards. The City's construction permitting process includes review Project site plans to ensure that no potentially hazardous transportation design features would be introduced by the Project. For example, sight distance at each Project driveway would be reviewed for conformance with City of Norco sight distance standards at the time of permitting approvals for grading, landscape, onsite circulation construction, and street improvement plans. As a result, impacts related to vehicular circulation design features would be less than significant.

#### Impact TR-4: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN INADEQUATE EMERGENCY ACCESS.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

The proposed construction activities, including equipment and supply staging and storage, would occur within and adjacent to the Project area and would not restrict access of emergency vehicles to the Project site or adjacent areas. The roadway improvements and installation of driveways that would be implemented during construction of the proposed Project could require the temporary closure of travel lanes, but full roadway closure and traffic detours are not expected to be necessary. However, construction activities may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic that could increase hazards. Therefore, the construction activities would be required to implement measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required temporary road restrictions, and ensure the safety of passage in accordance with Municipal Code Section 12.05.040, which requires that prior to any activity that would encroach into a right-of-way, a traffic control plan be approved by the City to ensure that construction activities would not increase hazards and that no disruption of traffic would occur after 4:00 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. Implementation of the Project through the City's permitting process would reduce potential construction related emergency access impacts to a less than significant level.

#### Operation

As described previously, the Project includes 11 driveways to provide vehicular access to the site. Five driveways would provide access to the eastern portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, 4 driveways would provide access to the western portion of the site from Mountain Avenue, and 2 driveways would provide access to the site from First Street. As described previously, these driveways would provide adequate and safe circulation to, from, and through the Project site and would provide a variety of routes for emergency responders to access the Project site and surrounding areas.

Additionally, during operation of the Project, building tenants would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required and verified by the City and the Riverside Fire Department through operational permitting and inspections. Because the Project is required to comply with all applicable City codes, as verified by the City and Fire Department, potential impacts related to inadequate emergency access would be less than significant.

## 5.13.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

**Traffic.** As described previously, the impacts of proposed development in relation to roadway levels of service, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development would result in intersections, freeway segments, and freeway merge/diverge areas operating at unsatisfactory peak period levels of service in the opening year 2022 and horizon year 2040 cumulative traffic conditions.

As detailed above, level of service standards would be exceeded, and significant cumulative impacts would result without the proposed Project. The addition of traffic from development of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable due to the amount of traffic and significant impacts that would result from the anticipated vehicular and truck trips.

Although implementation of the proposed Project would be required to contribute a fair share towards various improvements to mitigate the Project's impacts, and with payment of the fair share contribution, the Project's share of impacts would be mitigated when improvements at the impacted locations occur, some of the improvement locations are under the jurisdiction of the City of Corona or Caltrans. Therefore, the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements, and traffic impacts would be cumulatively significant and remain significant and unavoidable. Also, because the construction/implementation of the improvements identified in Mitigation Measure TR-1 within the City of Norco is dependent upon the payment of similar fees by other projects that contribute to the impact, the exact timing of implementation of the improvements identified by the mitigation measure is uncertain. The City does earmark fair share funds paid for traffic improvement (i.e., fair share fees cannot be spent on alternative improvements or other items). However, notwithstanding this commitment to use the funds for the specified improvements, the uncertainty regarding the timing of the construction of the improvements means the impacts are considered significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1.

In addition, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to address the deficiencies caused by development projects; therefore, no feasible mitigation available to reduce potential impacts. Furthermore, the City of Norco cannot implement or guarantee implementation of improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, the proposed Project would also result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts at Caltrans facilities.

As described previously, the proposed Project would provide additional pedestrian facilities in the area and would not alter any existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Cumulative development would be subject to site-specific environmental and planning reviews that would address consistency with adopted policies, plans and provisions related to public transit, bicycle facilities and pedestrian facilities. Because the Project implements the adopted plans for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and future development would be required to be consistent with these plans, the proposed Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts related to bicycle, transit, or pedestrian facilities.

**Design and Emergency Access Hazards.** The evaluation of Impact TR-3 and Impact TR-4 concluded that the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to incompatible uses, hazards due to roadway design, or emergency access. The Project site include 11 driveways from adjacent roadways that would allow numerous points off access. The proposed circulation layout would be required to be installed in

conformance with City design standards to ensure that no potentially hazardous transportation design features or inadequate emergency access would be introduced by the Project. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), because the proposed Project would have not result in impacts, cumulative impacts would not result in combination with the Project. In addition, cumulative development in the traffic study area would be subject to site-specific reviews, including reviews by police and fire protection authorities that would not allow potential cumulatively considerable design hazards.

# 5.13.8 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

- Congestion Management Program
- SCAG 2016 2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Western Riverside County Council of Governments Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee program
- City of Norco Development Impact Fee Program
- City of Norco General Plan Circulation Element
- City of Norco Municipal Code

## 5.13.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts TR-2, TR-3 and TR-4 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

• Impact TR-1: Conflicts a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

## 5.13.10 MITIGATION MEASURES

**Mitigation Measure TR-1:** Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for the buildings that are proposed by the Project, Project applicants/developers shall make fair-share payments to the City of Norco toward implementation of the following traffic improvements:

#### **Opening Year (2022) Plus Project Improvements**

- **Parkridge Avenue (West) & Second Street. (#10 Norco):** Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal and an eastbound left turn lane.
- **Parkridge Avenue (East) & Second Street. (#11 Norco):** Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal and a westbound left turn lane.
- Hamner Avenue & Second Street (#25 Norco): Modify the intersection to provide a 2nd southbound left turn lane. Stripe a southbound right turn lane. Restripe the eastbound approach to provide two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one shared through-right turn lane. Restripe the westbound approach to provide two left turn lanes, one through lane, and one right turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to run the northbound and southbound left turns as lead-lag, with the southbound left turn running as lag, protect the eastbound and westbound left turns, and run the eastbound and westbound left turns as lead-lag, with the westbound left running as lag. As such, northbound/southbound and eastbound/westbound left turns will run separately (not concurrently).

- Hamner Avenue & Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Parkway (#27 Norco): Modify the intersection to stripe a northbound right turn lane. Restripe the westbound shared left-through lane to a westbound left turn lane. Modify the traffic signal to provide overlap phasing for the northbound and westbound right turn lanes.
- I-15 Northbound Ramps & Second Street (#32 Caltrans/Norco): Modify the intersection to add a northbound left turn lane.

#### Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project Improvements

- River Road & Corydon Street (#1 Norco/Corona): Modify the intersection to add a 2nd northbound left turn lane. North and southbound left turns may need to operate with lead-lag phasing in order to accommodate the future alignment of the turn lanes.
- River Road & Lincoln Avenue (#3 Norco/Corona): Modify the intersection to add a 2nd southbound left turn lane and add a westbound right turn lane. The existing median may need to be removed to accommodate the 2nd southbound left turn lane.
- Pacific Avenue & Second Street (#12 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal, restripe the eastbound approach to provide a left turn lane and a shared through-right lane, and add a westbound left turn lane.
- Mountain Avenue & First Street (#22 Norco): Modify the intersection to install a traffic signal, add a southbound, eastbound, and westbound left turn lane, add a southbound right turn lane, and add a 2nd westbound through lane.
- Hamner Avenue & Second Street (#25 Norco): Modify the intersection to restripe the northbound right turn lane as a shared through-right turn lane.
- Hamner Avenue & Mountain Avenue/Hidden Valley Parkway (#27 Norco): Restripe the intersection to provide a 3rd through lane and add a southbound right turn lane.
- Main Street & Parkridge Avenue (#28 Corona): Restripe the northbound free-right turn lane as a shared through-right turn lane. Restripe the eastbound approach to provide two left turn lanes and one shared through-right turn lane.
- I-15 Southbound Ramps & Second Street (#29 Caltrans/Norco): Modify the intersection to add an eastbound right turn lane.

## 5.13.11 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

**Significant and Unavoidable.** As described previously, to reduce impacts associated with Impact TR-1 and TR-2, Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented, which require a fair share contribution towards various improvements. However, many intersections are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans or the City of Corona; and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements within these jurisdictions. Also, the improvements within the City of Norco are not part of an adopted plan or program that will guarantee construction of the improvements within a specified period. As a result, traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

## REFERENCES

Palomino Business Park Traffic Impact Analysis, Prepared by Urban Crossroads, 2019.

Caltrans Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, December 2002. Accessed: <u>https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/guide\_preparation\_traffic\_impact\_studies\_caltrans.pdf</u>

Riverside County Transportation Commission I-15\_Express\_Lanes\_Fact\_Sheet (Riv 2019) Accessed: https://15project.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/I-15\_Express\_Lanes\_Fact\_Sheet\_20180717.pdf

## 5.15 Utilities and Service Systems

## INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing utility infrastructure and provision in the Project area and evaluates the potential for implementation of the Project to impact utilities and services systems. Utilities and services systems include water supply and distribution systems, wastewater (sewage) conveyance and treatment, storm drainage systems, electric power distribution systems, natural gas distribution systems, telecommunications facilities, and solid waste disposal. The analysis in this section is based in part on the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). In addition, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) that evaluates buildout of the Project prepared by Charles Marr Consulting in 2019 (WSA 2019), included as Appendix M, and Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Michael Baker International in 2019 (WQMP 2019) included as Appendix N, are incorporated into this section.

## 5.15.1 WASTEWATER

## 5.15.1.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### **Clean Water Act**

The Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes regulations to control the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the U.S. and regulates water quality standards for surface waters. Under the CWA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is authorized to set wastewater standards and oversees the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. Under the NPDES program, permits are required for all new developments that generate discharges that go directly into "waters of the U.S." The federal Clean Water Act, United States Code, Title 33, Sections 1251 et seq. requires wastewater treatment of all effluent before it is discharged into surface waters. The USEPA has delegated authority for NPDES permitting to the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which has nine regional boards that administer the Clean Water Act regionally. The City of Norco is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

#### National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit

The NPDES permit system was established in the federal Clean Water Act to regulate both point source discharges (a municipal or industrial discharge at a specific location or pipe) and nonpoint source discharges (diffuse runoff of water from adjacent land uses) to surface waters of the U.S. For point source discharges, such as sewer outfalls, each NPDES permit contains limits on allowable concentrations and mass emissions of pollutants contained in the discharge.

## State Water Resources Control Board Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Sanitary Sewer Systems

The Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems (SWRCB Order No 2006-0003-DWQ) applies to sanitary sewer systems that are greater than one mile long and collect or convey untreated or partially treated wastewater to a publicly owned treatment facility. The goal of Order No. 2006-0003 is to provide a consistent statewide approach for reducing Sanitary Sewer

Overflows (SSOs), which are accidental releases of untreated or partially treated wastewater from sanitary sewer systems, by requiring that:

- 1. In the event of an SSO, all feasible steps be taken to control the released volume and prevent untreated wastewater from entering storm drains, creeks, etc.
- 2. If an SSO occurs, it must be reported to the SWRCB using an online reporting system developed by the SWRCB.
- 3. All publicly owned collection system agencies with more than one mile of sewer pipe in the State must develop a Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP), which must be updated every five years.

## 5.15.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Norco owns and operates a sewer system that includes 12 lift stations and approximately 106 miles of pipeline. The Project site is currently served by the existing sewer system, including sewer lines that run adjacent to and through the Project site that include: a 24-inch transmission sewer main runs within Mountain Avenue through the Project site, 8-inch sewer lines are located within Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street, and an 18-inch sewer line is located northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection.

The City of Norco is a member agency of the Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority (WRCRWA), a Joint Powers Authority. WRCRWA owns and operates a wastewater conveyance, treatment and disposal system. Five agencies have the right to discharge to the WRCRWA treatment facility and collection system; including: Home Gardens Sanitary District, Jurupa Community Services District, Western Municipal Water District, the City of Corona, and the City of Norco.

The WRCRWA treatment facility currently has a maximum treatment plant capacity of 14 million gallons per day (MGD) and currently treats approximately 7.75 MGD (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). The City of Norco owns 27.5 percent of the WRCRWA treatment facility's total capacity, or a total capacity or 2.70 mgd, and currently discharges 1.71 mgd (WRCRWA 2019). Hence, the City has approximately 0.99 mgd additional capacity at the WRCRWA treatment facility. The City also owns 100,000 gpd of sewer capacity and wastewater treatment capacity in the City of Corona wastewater system.

## 5.15.1.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect related to wastewater utilities if it were to:

- UT-1 Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- UT-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 project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

## 5.15.1.4 METHODOLOGY

For the analysis of wastewater related impacts, the volume of wastewater that would be generated by the proposed Project was estimated using indoor water generation volumes that determined by the Water

Supply Assessment (WSA), included as Appendix M. The analysis is conservative as it assumes that all of the water for indoor uses would be discharged into the sewer system. The project's estimated wastewater generation was compared with the available capacity within the wastewater treatment system to determine if expansions to capacity would need to be constructed and if flows would be accommodated by the wastewater provider's facilities.

## 5.15.1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT UT-1: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OR EXPANDED WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

Less than Significant Impact. As described above, the Project area is served by existing sewer lines and infrastructure that run through and adjacent to the Project site. The proposed Project would install new onsite sewers to serve each of the new buildings and would connect to the existing 8-inch sewer lines that are located within Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. The three commercial buildings would connect to an the 18-inch sewer line that is located northwest of the First Street and Mountain Avenue intersection. The proposed Project does not require expansion of these existing sewer facilities to serve the proposed development.

The estimate of the Project's wastewater generation is conservative as it assumes that all of the water for indoor uses would be discharged into the sewer system. As detailed in the discussion of Impact UT-4, the Project is anticipated to require 180,117 gpd (0.18 mgd) of water for indoor uses. As described above, City of Norco owns 27.5 percent of the WRCRWA treatment facility's total capacity, or a total capacity or 2.70 mgd, and currently discharges 1.71 mgd (WRCRWA 2019). Hence, the City has approximately 0.99 mgd additional capacity at the WRCRWA treatment facility. Thus, the addition of 180,117 gpd (0.18 mgd) from operation of the proposed Project would not require or result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Therefore, although construction of the onsite sewer lines and connection to the existing sewers are included as part of the Project and would be necessary for operation of the planned land uses, no extensions or expansions to the existing sewer or wastewater treatment system serving the region would be required. The necessary installation of onsite sewer line and connection to the existing line is included as part of the proposed Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified in other sections of this EIR. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT UT-2: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN A DETERMINATION BY THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER WHICH SERVES OR MAY SERVE THE PROJECT THAT IT HAS ADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECT'S PROJECTED DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDER'S EXISTING COMMITMENTS.

**Less than Significant Impact.** As described above, the operational buildout of the proposed Project would generate approximately 180,117 gpd (0.18 mgd) of wastewater that would be conveyed to the WRCRWA treatment facility. The WRCRWA facility currently treats 7.75 MGD and has the capacity to treat 14 mgd (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). Of this, the City has a contracted capacity of 2.70 mgd, and is currently discharging approximately 1.71 mgd (WRCRWA 2019). Thus, the addition of 180,117 gpd

(0.18 mgd) from operation of the proposed Project would be accommodated by the City's remaining capacity of 0.99 mgd and would not result in a capacity constraint related to serving the proposed Project in addition to WRCRWA treatment facility's existing commitments. Impacts related to wastewater treatment plant capacity would be less than significant.

## 5.15.2 WATER

## 5.15.2.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### Safe Drinking Water Act

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) administers the Safe Drinking Water Act, which is the primary federal law that regulates the quality of drinking water and establishes standards to protect public health and safety. The Department of Health Services (DHS) implements the requirements of the Act and oversees public water system quality statewide. DHS establishes legal drinking water standards for contaminates that could threaten public health.

#### California Urban Water Management Planning Act

Section 10610 of the California Water Code established the California Urban Water Management Planning Act (CUWMPA) and requires urban water suppliers to initiate planning strategies to ensure an appropriate level of reliability in its water service. CUWMPA states that every urban water supplier that provides water to 3,000 or more customers, or that annually provides more than 3,000 acre-feet of water service, should make every effort to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its water service to meet the needs of its various categories of customers during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years. The CUWMPA describes the contents of Urban Water Management Plans as well as methods for urban water suppliers to adopt and implement the plans.

#### Senate Bill 610 (Chapter 643, Statutes of 2001)

Senate Bill (SB) 610 requires public urban water suppliers with 3,000 or more service connections to identify existing and planned sources of water for planned developments of a certain size. It further requires the public water system to prepare a specified water supply assessment (WSA) for projects that meet the following criteria:

- a) A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units;
- b) A proposed shopping center employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space;
- c) A commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space;
- d) A hotel or motel, or both, with more than 500 rooms;
- e) An industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 sf of floor area; and
- f) A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects above.

The components of a WSA include existing water demand, future water demand by the project, and must ensure that water is available for the project during normal years, a single dry year, and multiple dry years during a 20-year future projection period. The WSA must also describe whether the project's water demand is accounted for in the water supplier's UWMP. Supplies of water for future water supply must be documented in the WSA.

#### Senate Bill 221 (Chapter 642, Statutes of 2001)

SB 221 requires the local water provider to provide "written verification" of "sufficient water supplies" to serve the project. SB 221 applies only to residential projects of 500 units or more (infill or low-income or very-low-income housing subdivisions are exempt) and requires the land use planning agency to include as a condition of approval of a tentative map, parcel map, or development agreement a requirement that "sufficient water supply" be available. Sufficiency under SB 221 differs from SB 610 in that it is determined by considering the availability of water over the past 20 years; the applicability of any urban water shortage contingency analysis prepared per Water Code Section 10632; the reduction in water supply allocated to a specific use by an adopted ordinance; and the amount of water that can be reasonably relied upon from other water supply projects, such as conjunctive use, reclaimed water, water conservation, and water transfer. In most cases, the WSA prepared under SB 610 meets the requirement for proof of water supply under SB 221.

#### CalGreen Building Code

California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11, establishes the California Green Building Code or CALGreen. The CALGreen Code was recently updated in 2016 and went into effect January 1, 2017. CALGreen sets forth water efficiency standards (i.e., maximum flow rates) for all new federally-regulated plumbing fittings and fixtures.

#### City of Norco General Plan

The following policies contained in the Conservation Element are relevant to the proposed Project.

**Policy 2.2.1a:** Continue to promote water conservation through the use of xeriscape designs in new development. Additionally, public spaces shall incorporate xeriscape landscaping where feasible.

**Policy 2.2.1d:** Insure that there are adequate increases in water production and distribution capabilities to meet future growth demands.

Policy 2.3.2a: Require the installation of flow restriction fixtures in all new development.

#### City of Norco Municipal Code

**Municipal Code Chapter 18.55, Water Efficient Landscaping:** All new development in Norco is required to include landscape and irrigation plans that demonstrate an aggregate reduction in the demand for and consumption of water, as designated by this municipal code.

## 5.15.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Water System Infrastructure

The City's water system serves water to approximately 26,000 people through 7,500 residential, commercial and industrial service connections, and 156 miles of pipe in length with includes pipe ranging in size from 2-inch to 24-inch (WT 2019). Additionally, the City has 4 active groundwater wells, located in southwesterly portions of Norco that have a combined capacity of 3,200 gallons per minute (gpm), and 3

purchased water connections with the Western Municipal Water District's (WMWD) Arlington Desalter Facility and Chino Desalter Authority, and the City of Corona (WT 2019). The City's minimum annual delivery of Arlington Desalter water is 4,400 AF, which can be increased up to 7,000 AF annually. The Chino Desalter Authority delivers water supplies to the City at a constant rate for an annual volume of 1,000 AF.

The project site is currently connected to the water distribution system at various locations. Second Street contains a 12-inch water line and First Street, Pacific Avenue, and Mountain Avenue contain 6-inch water lines.

#### Water Supply and Groundwater

The City's local groundwater provides approximately 38 percent of the City's water demands and imported water from the Municipal Water District of Southern California (MWD) accounting for the remaining 62 percent of the water demand. During 2017, groundwater supplied in the City of Norco was approximately 84.1 percent purchased treated groundwater and 15.9 percent groundwater from Norco's Temescal groundwater basin wells (WT 2019). The City's service area and distribution system overlies the unadjudicated Temescal Groundwater Basin, with a small portion of the service area overlying the southern end of the Chino Groundwater Basin. The Chino Groundwater Basin is an adjudicated basin, managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster. The City is a member of the Appropriative Pool in the Chino Basin. The City's local groundwater supplies are pumped from the Temescal and Chino groundwater basins through four City groundwater wells.

#### Water Demands

The City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) estimates that in 2020 the City's water demand would be approximately 7,652 acre-feet and increase to be approximately 7,800 AFY by Year 2040 (WSA 2019). The UWMP projected water demands were determined based upon the existing demands, the General Plan land use designations to identify future service needs, and the unit demand factors developed for future development, and are listed in Table 5.15-1.

		Pro	jected (A	FY)	
	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Demand					
Potable	6,808	6,970	6,982	6,894	6,956
Recycled	844	844	844	844	844
Total Water Demand	7,652	7,814	7,826	7,738	7,800
Supply					
Local Groundwater Production Rights	3,000	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
Desalter and Imported Water	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Total Potable Supply	9,000	9,200	9,200	9,200	9,200
Total Recycled Supply	1,825	1,825	1,825	1,825	1,825
Total Water Supply	10,825	11,025	11,025	11,025	11,025
Potable Water Supply Surplus	3,173	3,211	3,199	3,287	3,225

[able 5.15-1:	<b>Projected Water</b>	Demand and	Supply for	City of Norco
---------------	------------------------	------------	------------	---------------

Source: WSA 2019.

## 5.15.2.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- UT-3 Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- UT-4 Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.

## 5.15.2.4 METHODOLOGY

The water supply infrastructure in the Project area was identified along with the proposed improvements, which were evaluated to ensure design capacity would be adequate to supply the Project area, or to identify if expansions would be required to serve the proposed development. The evaluation of water supply quantifies the amount of water that would be required to support operation of the proposed Project, and compares the demand to the City's available water supply to identify if additional water supplies would be needed to serve the proposed Project in addition to existing service needs.

## 5.15.2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT UT-3: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OR EXPANDED WATER FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is currently connected to the water distribution system at various locations. The existing water infrastructure adjacent to the Project site is located within Second Street that contains a 12-inch water line and First Street, Pacific Avenue, and Mountain Avenue that all contain 6-inch water lines.

The proposed Project would remove the existing onsite water infrastructure and install a new onsite water distribution system. In addition, the Project includes off-site improvements to accommodate the water supply needs of the Project. The Project would replace the existing 6-inch water lines in Mountain Avenue and First Street with 12-inch water lines; and would install a new public 12-inch water line that would bisect the Project site and connect to the water lines in First Street and Second Street to provide a looped fire water system.

The new water infrastructure would be designed to meet requirements of Municipal Code Chapter 14.04, Water System, which would be verified by the Fire Department and/or the Norco Building and Safety Division prior to permit approval.

Although construction related to onsite and off-site water lines would be necessary for operation of the Project land uses, these facilities have been planned to only serve the Project site and the existing water demands and no extensions or capacity expansions beyond those serving the Project area would be required. The necessary installation of water lines is included as part of the proposed Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified in other sections of this EIR, such as Section 5.2, Air Quality, Section 5.3, Biological Resources, Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, etc. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new or expanded water facilities that could cause significant environmental effects not described within this EIR. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

#### IMPACT UT-4: THERE ARE SUFFICIENT WATER SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE PROJECT AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT DURING NORMAL, DRY AND MULTIPLE DRY YEARS.

Less than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would develop the project site pursuant to the General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations, which have been used by the City to estimate future water demands from development of the project site and included in the City's 2015 UWMP. Therefore, the proposed Project has been included in the water demand (and indirectly, water supply) projections of the latest UWMP.

The WSA that was prepared for the proposed Project includes a water demand estimate, which is provided as Table 5.15-2.

		A	rea Acre	age	Indoor					
Buildings	Land Use	Total	Bldg.	Irrig.	Water Demand Factor	Irrigation Water Demand Factor (gpd/ac)	Indoor Water Demand	Irrigation Demand		
A-C	Retail: 13,040 SF Restaurant: 8,370 SF	5.0	4.3	0.8	5,700 gpd/ac 1,000 gpd/ksf	2,900	24,225 gpd 8,370 gpd	2,175 gpd		
1 – 18	Warehouse: 1,368,075 SF Office: 88,000 SF	76.0	64.6	11.4	1,250 gpd/ac 5,700 gpd/ac	2,900	75,870 gpd 22,254 gpd	33,060 gpd		
19 and 35	Warehouse: 475,510 SF Office: 97,005 SF	29.0	24.7	4.4	1,250 gpd/ac 5,700 gpd/ac	2,900	25,592 gpd 23,807 gpd	12,615 gpd		
Total	Retail/Rest: 21,410 SF Warehouse: 1,843,585 SF Office: 158,005 SF	110.0	93.5	16.5	-	-	180,117 gpd	47,850 gpd		
	227,967 gpd       Total Water Demand     (255.36 AFY)									

Table 5.15-2: Water Demand from Buildout of the Proposed Project

Source: WSA 2019

As shown on Table 5.15-2 operation of the proposed Project is anticipated to generate a demand for 227,967 gpd (255.36 AFY) of water. As described by the City's 2015 UWMP and the WSA that was prepared for the proposed Project and shown previously in Table 5.15-1, the City has estimated that a surplus of potable water supply of between 3,173 and 3,287 AFY between 2020 and 2040. The WSA also describes that sufficient water supply would be available during both normal years and multiple dry year conditions between 2020 and 2040 to meet all of the City's estimated needs, which includes the proposed Project as it is consistent with the land uses that area utilized to determine water demand in the 2015 UWMP.

As shown in Table 5.15-3, with inclusion of the proposed Project the City would continue to have available water supplies that range between 2,917 and 3,031 AF per year through 2040.

Table 5.15-3: City of Norce	Surplus Supply and	Project Water Demand	(AFY)
-----------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-------

	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
Water Supply Surplus <sup>1</sup>	3,173	3,211	3,199	3,287	3,225
Project Demand	255.36	255.36	255.36	255.36	255.36

Difference	2,917.64	2,955.64	2,943.64	3,031.64	2,999.64
Per Table 5.5.1 previously					

Source: WSA 2019

Therefore, the City of Norco's projected water supply would meet the projected water demand associated with the proposed Project, in addition to the City's existing and planned future uses (WSA 2019), and sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the project. As a result, impacts related to water supply from implementation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

## 5.15.3 STORMWATER DRAINAGE AND OTHER UTILITIES

## 5.15.3.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### **Clean Water Act**

The Clean Water Act established the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into "waters of the U.S." The act specifies a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to manage stormwater runoff. Clean Water Act Section 402 is relevant to drainage in the proposed Project area.

Section 402 regulates point- and nonpoint-source discharges to surface waters through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) oversees the NPDES program, which is administered by the RWQCBs. The NPDES program provides for both general permits (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual permits.

#### National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

The NPDES permit program under the Clean Water Act controls point and nonpoint water sources that discharge into "waters of the U.S." California has an approved state NPDES program. The USEPA has delegated authority for NPDES permitting to the SWRCB, which has nine regional boards. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) area includes the City of Norco. Under this system, discharge of stormwater runoff from construction areas of one acre or more requires either an individual permit issued by the RWQCB or coverage under the statewide Construction General Stormwater Permit for stormwater discharges. In addition, operational water discharges from land use operations that have direct stormwater discharges to navigable waters, are also required to obtain either an individual permit or obtain coverage under the statewide General Industrial Stormwater Permit.

#### **California General Permit**

The State of California adopted a Statewide NPDES Permit for General Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) on September 2, 2009 (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The last Construction General Permit amendment became effective in 2012. The Construction General Permit regulates construction site storm water management. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the general permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activity. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility.

To obtain coverage under this permit, project operators must electronically file Permit Registration Documents, which include a Notice of Intent, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance-related documents. The SWPPP is required to identify specific BMPs that would be implemented to control drainage from project sites.

#### California Water Resources Control Board Low Impact Development Policy

The SWRCB adopted the Low Impact Development (LID) Policy which, at its core, promotes the idea of "sustainability" as a key parameter to be prioritized during the design and planning process for future development. The SWRCB has directed its staff to consider sustainability in all future policies, guidelines, and regulatory actions. LID is a proven approach to manage stormwater. The RWQCBs are advancing LID in California in various ways, including provisions for LID requirements in renewed Phase I municipal stormwater NPDES permits.

#### Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Santa Ana RWQCB is charged with the protection of beneficial uses of surface water, including stormwater runoff, throughout Riverside County, including the City of Norco. Stormwater discharges are regulated through the Riverside County MS4 Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0033 NPDES No. CAS618033, as amended by Order No. R8-2013-0024) pursuant to section 402(p) of the Federal Clean Water Act.

As a co-permittee, the City of Norco is required to develop and implement a local implementation plan (LIP) to manage the urban runoff within the City. This includes requiring applicants permanently connect to drainage facilities and are notified of their obligations to comply with Storm Water Ordinances, a WQMP, and the State General Construction Permit post construction standards. The LIP describes the City's legal authority, and its ordinances, policies, and standard operating procedures, in addition to establishing internal departmental coordination and reporting requirements to ensure accountability and consistency.

## 5.15.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### **Drainage Facilities**

Several existing drainage features are adjacent to the Project area. Existing stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. In addition, the South Norco Channel conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction. Off-site flows enter the Project site from the culverts on Mountain Avenue to the culvert crossings on First Street. The channel meanders through the site as an unimproved, natural channel. Currently, most of the Project site (approximately 90 to 95 percent) is tributary to the South Norco Channel. The remaining area flows to the north and is tributary to the North Norco Channel.

## 5.15.3.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-5 Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

## 5.15.3.4 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation related to stormwater drainage facilities identifies the potential of the project to generate additional runoff, such that new storm drain facilities or expansions to the storm water drainage system would be required. If new or expanded facilities are required, the evaluation identifies if those expansions would those expansions have the potential to result in an impact on the environment.

## 5.15.3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT UT-5: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OR EXPANDED STORMWATER FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

Less than Significant Impact. As described previously the existing stormwater drainage infrastructure includes a 15-inch storm drain within Second Street; a 36-inch storm drain within Mountain Avenue; an 18-inch storm drain and 48-inch culvert pipes within First Street; and 24-inch and 42-inch storm drains within Pacific Avenue. In addition, the South Norco Channel is an unimproved, natural channel that conveys off-site flows through the southeastern portion of the Project site in a southwesterly direction; from the culverts on Mountain Avenue to the culvert crossings on First Street.

The Project would install new drainage facilities within these roadways, including: a 24-inch storm drain within the eastern portion of Second Street, a 36-inch storm drain within the western portion of Second Street, a 36-inch storm drain within First Street. The Project also proposes to construct three onsite infiltration basins designed to hold and infiltrate stormwater runoff. One basin would be located south of First Street, and the other basins would be located at the northwest corner of the Project site adjacent to Second Street and Pacific Avenue.

The Project would construct a series of onsite storm drains that would route storm water runoff to one of the three infiltration basin that would be constructed by the Project. In addition, the Project would improve the South Norco Channel to provide a concrete bottom trapezoidal channel from the existing culverts in Mountain Avenue to the existing culverts in Second Street. The improvement would increase the capacity of the channel to accommodate the ultimate flow conditions, per the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan as directed by the Riverside County Flood Control District.

The installation of these drainage improvements is included as part of the proposed Project. The construction impacts of these drainage improvements have been analyzed as part of overall Project construction in other sections of this EIR and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those previously identified. Therefore, the Project would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects beyond those evaluated within this EIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## 5.15.4 ELECTRIC POWER, NATURAL GAS, TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES

## 5.15.4.1 REGULATORY SETTING

California Public Utilities Commission Plans and Programs

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has authority to set electric rates, regulate natural gas utility service, protect consumers, promote energy efficiency, and ensure electric system reliability. The CPUC has established rules for the planning and construction of new transmission facilities, distribution facilities, and substations. Utility companies are required to obtain permits to construct certain power line facilities or substations. The CPUC also has jurisdiction over the siting of natural gas transmission lines.

The CPUC regulates distributed energy generation policies and programs for both customers and utilities. This includes incentive programs (e.g., California Solar Initiative) and net energy metering policies. Net energy metering allows customers to receive a financial credit for power generated by their on-site system and fed back to the utility. The CPUC is involved with utilities through a variety of energy procurement programs, including the Renewable Portfolio Standard program.

In 2008, the CPUC adopted the Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan, which is a road map to achieving maximum energy savings in California through 2020. Consistent with California's energy policy and electricity "loading order," the Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan indicates that energy efficiency is the highest priority resource in meeting California's energy needs. The CPUC also adopted energy goals that require all new residential construction in California to be zero net energy by 2020. The zero net energy goal means new buildings must use a combination of improved efficiency and distributed renewable energy generation to meet 100 percent of their annual energy need. In addition to the zero net energy goals for residential buildings by 2020, the CPUC has adopted goals that all new commercial construction in California will be zero net energy by 2030, and 50 percent of existing commercial buildings will be retrofit to zero net energy by 2030.

#### Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

The California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 6 provides efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings. The standards are updated periodically to allow for incorporation of new energy efficient technologies and methods. The existing Title 24 regulations became effective on January 1, 2017. The 2019 Title 24 standards go into effect on January 1, 2020 and are applicable to building permit applications submitted on or after that date. The 2019 Title 24 standards require solar photovoltaic systems for new homes, establish requirements for newly constructed healthcare facilities, encourage demand responsive technologies for residential buildings, update indoor and outdoor lighting for nonresidential buildings.

The CEC anticipates that single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 7 percent less energy compared to the residential homes built under the 2016 standards. Additionally, after implementation of solar photovoltaic systems, homes built under the 2019 standards will about 53 percent less energy than homes built under the 2016 standards. Nonresidential buildings will use approximately 30 percent less energy due to lighting upgrades.

## 5.15.4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### Electricity and Telecommunication

Southern California Edison (SCE) is the electrical purveyor in the City of Norco. SCE provides electricity service to more than 14 million people in a 50,000 square-mile area of central and coastal Southern California. SCE is in the process of implementing infrastructure upgrades to ensure the ability to meet future demands. In the project region, SCE is currently implementing the following infrastructure projects:

• Circle City Substation and Mira Loma-Jefferson Sub-transmission Project that will serve the Cities of Norco, Ontario, Corona, Chino, and Eastvale. The project would construct a 66 kV sub-

transmission line approximately 10.7 miles in length. A combination of both overhead and underground construction, it would be constructed from the existing Mira Loma Substation in Ontario to an existing substation in Corona (SCE 2019).

• Riverside Transmission Reliability Project that will provide additional transmission capacity to serve existing and projected electrical demand, to provide for long-term system capacity for load growth, and to provide needed system reliability (SCE 2019).

There are various telecommunication service providers within the Norco area. The telecommunication and electricity infrastructure run along the same conduits and share infrastructure. The Project area is currently served by electricity and telecommunication services. Currently, above ground electricity and telecommunications lines exist along First Street, Second Street, Mountain Avenue, and Pacific Avenue.

#### Natural Gas

The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the natural gas purveyor in the City of Norco and is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California. SoCalGas estimates that gas demand will decline at an annual rate of 0.5 percent from 2018 to 2035 due to modest economic growth, mandated energy efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity goals, and conservation savings linked to advanced metering infrastructure (CGEU 2018). The gas supply available to SoCalGas is regionally diverse and includes supplies from California sources (onshore and offshore), Southwestern U.S. supply sources, the Rocky Mountains, and Canada (CGEU 2018). SoCalGas designs its facilities and supplies to provide continuous service during extreme peak demands and has identified the ability to meet peak demands through 2035 in its 2018 report (CGEU 2018).

The Project area is currently being served by SoCalGas. Existing natural gas lines are located within First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue.

## 5.15.4.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-6 Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

### 5.15.4.4 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation related to electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities identifies the potential of the Project to generate additional demand for electricity, natural gas or telecommunication services, such that infrastructure facilities or expansions to the electrical, natural gas and telecommunication systems would be required. If new or expanded facilities are required, the evaluation identifies if those expansions would have the potential to result in a significant impact on the environment.

### 5.15.4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IMPACT UT-6: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OR EXPANDED ELECTRIC POWER, NATURAL GAS, OR TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OR RELOCATION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS. Less than Significant Impact. As described previously, the Project site is currently served by natural gas, electricity, and telecommunications systems that exist within and adjacent to the Project site. Currently, above ground electricity and telecommunications lines exist along First Street, Second Street, Mountain Avenue, and Pacific Avenue. Existing natural gas lines are located within First Street, Second Street, and Pacific Avenue.

The proposed Project would remove the existing onsite utility infrastructure and install new onsite utility systems, which include gas, electricity, and telecommunication systems. The new infrastructure would be designed to meet requirements of SCE, SoCalGas, and the telecommunications service providers, which would be mandatory prior to commencement of utility services being turned on by the providers. The new onsite infrastructure would connect to the existing offsite infrastructure, which currently serves the site. No offsite expansions to the existing natural gas, electricity, or telecommunications systems would be required to service the proposed Project.

Therefore, although construction of the onsite systems and connection to the existing offsite infrastructure is included as part of the Project and would be necessary for operation of the planned land uses, no extensions or expansions to the existing offsite infrastructure would be required. The necessary installation of the onsite infrastructure systems for gas, electricity, and telecommunications and connection to the existing offsite infrastructure is included as part of the proposed Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified in other sections of this EIR. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new gas, electricity, and telecommunications facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

## 5.15.1 SOLID WASTE

## 5.15.5.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) redefined solid waste management in terms of both objectives and planning responsibilities for local jurisdictions and the State. The Act was adopted in an effort to reduce the volume and toxicity of solid waste that is land-filled and incinerated by requiring local governments to prepare and implement plans to improve the management of waste resources. AB 939 required each of the cities and unincorporated portions of the counties to divert a minimum of 25 percent of the solid waste sent to landfills by 1995, and 50 percent by the year 2000. To attain goals for reductions in disposal, AB 939 established a planning hierarchy utilizing new integrated solid waste management practices. These practices include source reduction, recycling and composting, and environmentally safe landfill disposal and transformation.

Other state statutes pertaining to solid waste include compliance with the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Act of 1991 (AB 1327), which requires adequate areas for collecting and loading recyclable materials within a project site.

#### California Assembly Bill 341

On October 6, 2011, Governor Brown signed AB 341 establishing a state policy goal that no less than 75 percent of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by 2020, and requiring CalRecycle to provide a report to the Legislature that recommends strategies to achieve the policy goal by

January 1, 2014. The bill also mandates local jurisdictions to implement commercial recycling by July 1, 2012.

#### 2016 California Green Building Standards

Section 5.408.1 Construction waste diversion. Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste.

**5.410.1 Recycling by occupants.** Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, organic waste, and metals, or meet a lawfully enacted local recycling ordinance, if more restrictive.

## 5.15.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A large majority (97 percent in 2017) of the City's solid waste disposed of at landfills is transported to the El Sobrante Landfill in the City of Corona at 10919 Dawson Canyon Road (CalRecycle 2019). The El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 16,054 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2051 (CalRecycle 2019). In March 2019, the landfill averaged 11,439 tons per day and had a maximum disposal of 14,414 tons in a day. Thus, the landfill has an average daily additional capacity of 4,616 tons per day, and an additional capacity of 1,640 tons on a maximum disposal day.

## 5.15.5.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- UT-7 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.
- UT-8 Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

## 5.15.5.4 METHODOLOGY

Solid waste generation from construction and operation of the project was estimated using EPA and CalRecycle solid waste generation factors derived for industrial warehouse/manufacturing, and commercial uses. Solid waste volumes were then compared with recent estimates of remaining disposal capacity of the landfill serving the City. In addition, potential impacts related to compliance with solid waste regulations was evaluated by identifying how the proposed Project would be implement the relevant requirements.

### 5.15.5.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### IMPACT UT-7: THE PROJECT WOULD NOT 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.

#### Less than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

Project construction would generate solid waste for landfill disposal in the form of demolition debris from the existing improvements. Demolition waste would be properly characterized as required by law and recycled or disposed of at an appropriate type of landfill for such materials. Construction waste in the form of packaging and discarded materials would also be generated by the proposed Project. Utilizing a construction waste factor of 4.34 pounds per square foot (EPA 2003), development of the Project would generate approximately 10,920 tons of waste during demolition and additional waste during construction, which would occur over a 24-month period. However, Section 5.408.1 of the 2016 California Green Building Standards Code requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste. Thus, the demolition and construction solid waste that would be disposed of at the landfill would be approximately 35 percent of the waste generated. Therefore, demolition activities, which would generate the most solid waste would generate approximately 3,822 tons of solid waste. As shown in Table 3-1 of Section 3.0, *Project Description*, demolition activities would occur over a 40 workday (8 week) period. This equates to approximately 95.55 tons of debris per day.

As described above, the El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 16,054 tons per day of solid waste. In March 2019, the landfill averaged 11,439 tons per day and had a maximum disposal of 14,414 tons in a day. Thus, the landfill has an average daily additional capacity of 4,616 tons per day, and an additional capacity of 1,640 tons on a maximum disposal day. Therefore, the El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 95.55 tons of waste per week during construction of the proposed Project.

#### Operation

Based on the daily solid waste generation rates from CalRecycle, warehouse/manufacturing uses produce 1.42 pounds per 100 square feet of building area per day and commercial retail uses generate approximately 2.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet of building area per day. Based on this, operation of the Project at buildout would generate approximately 27,244.19 pounds (13.62 tons) of solid waste per day, at least 50 percent of which is currently required by California law to be recycled. However, implementation of AB 341 in 2020 (described previously) requires that 75 percent of solid waste be source reduced, recycled, or composted by operation of the Project in 2022, which would reduce the volume of landfilled solid waste to approximately 6,811.05 pounds (3.41 tons) per day, as shown on Table 5.15-4.

1,914,835 sf	1.42 lbs per 100 sf per day	27,190.66
21,410 sf	2.500 lbs per 1,000 sf per day	53.53
		27,244.19 lbs per day
Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)		
	1,914,835 sf 21,410 sf 75% Reduction)	1,914,835 sf         1.42 lbs per 100 sf per day           21,410 sf         2.500 lbs per 1,000 sf per day           75% Reduction)

Table 5.15-4: Solid Waste Demand from Buildout of the Proposed Project

In March 2019, the landfill averaged 11,439 tons per day and had a maximum disposal of 14,414 tons in a day. Thus, the landfill has an average daily additional capacity of 4,616 tons per day, and an additional capacity of 1,640 tons on a maximum disposal day. Therefore, the El Sobrante Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 3.41 tons of waste per day from operation of the proposed Project at buildout. Therefore, the proposed Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs, and impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

## IMPACT UT-8: THE PROJECT WOULD COMPLY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS RELATED TO SOLID WASTE.

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would result in new development that would generate an increased amount of solid waste. All solid waste-generating activities within the City is subject to the requirements set forth in AB 939 that requires diversion of a minimum of 50 percent of construction and demolition debris. In addition, after 2020 the operations within the Project area and the City's solid waste hauler would be required to divert 75 percent of solid waste pursuant to AB 341. Implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with all state regulations. All projects in the City undergo development review and permitting, which includes an analysis of project compliance with these programs. Therefore, development by the proposed Project would comply with all solid waste policies and objectives; and impacts related to compliance with regulations related to solid waste would not occur.

## 5.15.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative study area for utilities and service systems includes the geographical area that is served by each purveyor or system.

#### Wastewater Services

Cumulative wastewater infrastructure impacts are considered on a systemwide basis and are associated with the overall capacity of existing and planned infrastructure. The cumulative system evaluated includes City's sewer system and the conveyance system through wastewater disposal at the WRCRWA treatment facility. As described previously, during construction of the Project, sewer lines would be installed to serve the proposed buildings and connect to the existing system that is adjacent to the project site within Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street. With implementation of the project sewer improvements, the proposed Project would not combine with other development projects to result in a cumulatively substantial increase in wastewater such that new or expanded facilities would be required, which could result in an environmental impact. Thus, increases in wastewater in the system would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

Additionally, the WRCRWA treatment facility currently treats 7.75 MGD has the capacity to treat 14 mgd (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). As described above, City of Norco owns 27.5 percent of the WRCRWA treatment facility's total capacity, or a total capacity or 2.70 mgd, and currently discharges 1.71 mgd (WRCRWA 2019). As detailed previously, the Project would be accommodated by the existing facilities and additional capacity would remain, which would accommodate future growth. Thus, the increase in wastewater flow from the proposed Project in combination with cumulative projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable significant impact. As a result, impacts related to cumulative projects wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

#### Water Supply

Cumulative water supply impacts are considered on a citywide basis and are associated with the capacity of the infrastructure system and the adequacy of the City's primary sources of water that include groundwater pumped through City wells, deliveries from imported sources.

As described previously, during construction of the Project water lines would be installed to serve the proposed buildings and connect to the existing system that is adjacent to the project site. As described previously, the water system has been designed to accommodate buildout of the Project area. Thus, with implementation of the project's water infrastructure improvements, the proposed Project would not combine with other development projects to result in a cumulatively substantial need for new or expanded water

facilities would be required, which could result in an environmental impact. Thus, increases in water deliveries in the system from implementation of the proposed Project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

Additionally, as described above, the City anticipates increasing its total water supply from 10,825 AFY in 2020 to 11,025 AFY in 2040, which would meet all of the City's projected water needs in regular and multiple dry years and have a surplus of supply. Because these projections include water supply needs from the proposed Project, which is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan land uses as included in the UWMP projections, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

#### Stormwater Drainage

The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to stormwater drainage includes the geographic area served by the existing stormwater infrastructure for the Project area, from capture of runoff through final discharge points. As described above the proposed Project includes installation of an onsite subsurface storm drain system that would discharge runoff into two onsite infiltration basins that would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through storm drain connections to the 24-inch storm drain within Second Street, 36-inch storm drain within the western portion of Second Street, 36-inch storm drain within First Street, which would be installed by the Project.

In addition, pursuant to state and regional regulations that require development projects to maintain preproject hydrology, no net increase of offsite stormwater flows would occur. RWQCB Permit conditions require a hydrology/drainage study to demonstrate that all runoff would be appropriately conveyed and not leave the project sites at rates exceeding pre-project conditions, prior to receipt of necessary permits. As a result, increases of runoff from cumulative projects that could cumulatively combine to impact stormwater drainage capacity would not occur, and cumulative impacts related to drainage infrastructure would be less than significant.

#### Landfills

The geographic scope of cumulative analysis for landfill capacity is the service area for the El Sobrante Landfill in the City of Corona, which serves the Project area. The projections of future landfill capacity based on the entire projected waste stream going to these landfills is used for cumulative impact analysis. As described previously, the El Sobrante Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 16,054 tons per day takes in an average of 11,439 tons per day (CalRecycle, 2019). The 3.41 tons of solid waste per day from operation of the proposed Project would be accommodated by the existing facility. In addition, as described above, development of the Project area has been included in the City's land use planning and growth projections, which are used in regional landfill capacity planning. As a result, increases in solid waste from cumulative projects that could cumulatively combine with the proposed Project to impact landfill capacity would be less than significant.

# 5.15.3 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND PLANS, PROGRAMS, OR POLICIES

#### **Existing Regulations**

#### Federal

- Clean Water Act
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

#### State

- Assembly Bill 939 (Integrated Waste Management Act)
- Assembly Bill 341 (Chapter 476, Statutes of 2011)
- California Green Building Standards Code

#### Local

Norco General Plan Conservation Element

## 5.15.4 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impact UT-1 through UT-8 would be less than significant.

## 5.15.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

## 5.15.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to utilities and service systems have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

## REFERENCES

California Gas and Electric Utilities 2018 California Gas Report (CGEU 2018). Accessed at: https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2018\_California\_Gas\_Report.pdf.

CalReycyle Solid Waste Generation Rates. Accessed at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates

CalReycyle Solid Waste Information System. Accessed at: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx

CalReycyle Disposal Reporting System: Jurisdiction Tons by Facility. Accessed at: https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/DisposalReporting/Destination/DisposalByFacility

City of Norco 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP 2015). Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/pw/urban\_water\_management\_plan.asp

City of Norco Water Utility Division (WT 2019). Accessed at: http://www.norco.ca.us/depts/pw/water\_utility/default.asp

Southern California Edison. Infrastructure Upgrades. (SCE 2019). Accessed at: <a href="http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability">http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability</a>.

United States Environmental Protection Agency Building Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amounts (EPA 2003). Accessed at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-11/documents/cdmeas.pdf Water Supply Assessment for the Palomino Business Park. Prepared by Charles Marr Consulting, 2019 (WSA 2019).

Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority Board of Directors Agenda Item 5.B. March 18, 2019 (WRCRWA March 18, 2019). Accessed at: http://www.wrcrwa.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/\_03182019-109

Western Riverside County Regional Wastewater Authority Fiscal-Year-2018-2019 Approved Budget (WRCRWA 2019). Accessed: https://www.wrcrwa.org/DocumentCenter/View/117/WRCRWA-Approved-Budget---Fiscal-Year-2018-2019-PDF
# 6. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

## 6.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to describe "any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance." Potential environmental effects of the proposed Project and proposed mitigation measures are discussed in detail in Section 5 of this EIR. As summarized below and detailed in Section 5.2, *Air Quality*, Section 5.4, *Cultural Resources*, Section 5.7, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, and Section 5.13 *Transportation*, impacts in the following areas would remain significant and unavoidable, even with the incorporation of Project Design Features; existing regulations; plans, programs, policies; and feasible mitigation measures.

#### 6.1.1 Air Quality

As detailed in Section 5.2, *Air Quality*, the proposed Project would result operational-source emissions that would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds of significance for VOC and NOx. Even with implementation of PPPs and mitigation measures, the operational source emissions would continue to exceed SCAQMD thresholds for emissions of these pollutants. Approximately 89 percent of the operational-source emissions (by weight) would be generated by traffic trips generated by the proposed Project. Neither the applicant nor the City of Norco has the ability to substantially reduce vehicular emissions. Similarly, VOC emissions are derived from consumer products that are not under the control of the City and cannot be mitigated. Therefore, operational-source NOx and VOC emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

As described in Section 5.2, Air Quality, per SCAQMD's methodology, if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants (including VOC and NOx) that exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

As described previously, emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for VOC and NOx; and because approximately 89 percent of all operational-source emissions would be generated by Project vehicles, it cannot be reduced by the Project applicant nor the City. Similarly, VOC emissions are derived from consumer products that are not under the control of the City and cannot be mitigated. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### 6.1.2 Cultural Resources

As detailed in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, the proposed Project would demolish the Norco Egg Ranch, which meets the definition of an historical resource and is locally eligible for designation under Municipal Code Title 20 and under the criteria of the CRHR. The Norco Egg Ranch is comprised of four Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building.

The Historical Resource Analysis Report describes that the property retaina a sufficient degree of integrity to physically convey its identified significance under CRHR Criterion 1 for an association with poultry

farming in Norco and under CRHR Criterion 2 for an association with Harry and Hilda Eisen, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors (Urbana 2019). In addition, under the City of Norco Landmark criteria A, the Contributing Structures are associated with poultry farming, which was an important aspect of the City's economic history since the 1920s; and under the City of Norco Landmark criterion B, the Contributing Structures are associated with the locally prominent Eisen family and their Norco Egg Ranch.

Demolition or removal of the Norco Egg Ranch would result in a significant impact to a historical resource. As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package for the Norco Egg Ranch. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 is included and requires the installation on-site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to Norco Egg Ranch would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

#### Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts

Because all historical resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. Federal, state, and local laws and regulations protect historic resources when feasible. However, it is not always feasible to protect historical resources. As described previously, the Project would result in demolition of a CRHR historical resource and a historic resource that meets the City of Norco Landmark criterion. Because the resources are state and local historic resources, the cumulative study area for historic resources includes the City of Norco and State of California.

As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package for the Norco Egg Ranch. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 is included and requires the installation on-site signage or a historic exhibit. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; and the loss of the historic resource would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to historic resources.

#### 6.1.3 Land Use and Planning

As detailed in Section 5.10, *Land Use and Planning*, the proposed Project has been prepared in conformance with the goals and policies of the City of Norco General Plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with most of the applicable General Plan policies; however, the Project would conflict with policies related to preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources and significant impacts related to historic resources would occur, as detailed in Table 5.10-4. As a result, a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would occur.

#### 6.1.4 Transportation

As detailed in Section 5.13, *Transportation*, the proposed Project would result in traffic impacts within the City of Norco and on Caltrans facilities. The EIR has provided mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts of the proposed Project, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as described below.

#### Existing Plus Project

**Intersections.** In the existing plus Project condition, the Project would result in impacts at Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street, Hamner Avenue and Second Street, and I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street. The Mitigation Measures for these deficiencies would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, the I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements within Caltrans jurisdiction. In addition, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of improvements at the intersections of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street, and Hamner Avenue and Second Street. As a result, traffic impacts in the existing plus Project condition would be significant and unavoidable.

**Traffic Signal Warrant.** In the existing plus Project condition, the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street is anticipated to warrant a traffic signal in the existing plus Project traffic condition. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, which would require a fair share payment of costs related to implementation of a traffic signal at this location would be required. However, the City does not have a formally adopted plan or program that would ensure implementation of this improvement. Therefore, impacts related to this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

**Freeway Segments and Merge/Diverge Locations.** The addition of Project traffic in the existing plus Project condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street currently operates at a LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this intersection in the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant and unavoidable in the existing plus Project condition. Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to address the deficiencies caused by development projects, and the City of Norco cannot implement improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, there is no feasible mitigation available, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Opening Year (2022) Plus Project**

**Intersections.** In the 2022 plus Project condition, the intersections of Pacific Avenue and Second Street and I-15 NB Ramps & Second Street are anticipated to result in an unacceptable LOS with the addition of traffic from the Project during the p.m. peak hour. In addition, the Project would add to the already deficient conditions at 6 other intersections. With payment of the fair share contribution for identified improvements to these impacted intersections, the Project's share of impacts would be mitigated. However, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. Also, the construction/implementation of these improvements is dependent upon the payment of similar fees by other projects that contribute to the cumulative impact. As such, the exact timing of implementation of the improvements identified by the mitigation measure is uncertain. Therefore, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Caltrans; and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of Caltrans improvements. As a result, traffic impacts to intersections in the opening year 2022 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and remain significant and unavoidable.

#### Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project

**Intersections.** In the 2040 plus Project condition, the Project would add to the anticipated deficient conditions as several intersections. Roadway improvements have been identified to mitigate these deficiencies and Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented to ensure that the Project pays its fair share. However, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. Also, many improvement areas are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements outside of its

jurisdiction. As a result, traffic impacts to intersections in the horizon year 2040 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

**Off-Ramp Queuing.** The I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street is anticipated to experience queuing issues in the a.m. peak hour without the Project in 2040. The addition of traffic from the Project after 2040 would not result in queuing impacts at any other location; however, the Project would add to the deficient conditions at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street. The improvements consist of modifying the intersection to add a northbound left turn lane, as listed below in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures. However, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to implement this mitigation measure. In addition, the City of Norco cannot implement or guarantee implementation of improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street in the a.m. peak hour in the horizon year 2040.

**Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge Locations.** The addition of Project traffic in the 2040 plus Project condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street would operate at a LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this location in the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant and unavoidable in the 2040 plus Project condition. As described previously, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to address the deficiencies caused by development projects, and the City of Norco cannot implement improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, there is no feasible mitigation available, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

# 7. Alternatives

This section addresses alternatives to the proposed Project and describes the rationale for including them in the EIR. The section also discusses the environmental impacts associated with each alternative and compares the relative impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Project.

## 7.1 INTRODUCTION

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental part of the environmental review process pursuant to CEQA. Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21002.1(a) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, "the purpose of an environmental impact report is ... to identify alternatives to the project."

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project or to the project's location that would feasibly avoid or lessen its significant environmental impacts while attaining most of the proposed project's objectives. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) emphasizes that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce impacts relative to the proposed project. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the identification and evaluation of an "Environmentally Superior Alternative".

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), discussion of each alternative presented in this EIR Section is intended "to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project." As permitted by CEQA, the significant effects of each alternative are discussed in less detail than those of the proposed Project, but in enough detail to provide perspective and allow for a reasoned choice among alternatives to the proposed Project.

In addition, the "range of alternatives" to be evaluated is governed by the "rule of reason" and feasibility, which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives that are feasible and necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the lead agency and to foster meaningful public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)). CEQA generally defines "feasible" to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors and other considerations (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091(a)(3), 15364).

Based on the CEQA requirements described above, the alternatives addressed in this EIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative could avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the proposed Project;
- The extent to which the alternative could accomplish the objectives of the proposed Project;
- The potential feasibility of the alternative;
- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a "reasonable range" of alternatives that would allow an informed comparison of relative advantages and disadvantages of the proposed Project and potential alternatives to it; and
- The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a "no project" alternative; and to identify an "environmentally superior" alternative in addition to the no project alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)).

Neither the CEQA statute, the CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a specific number of alternatives to be evaluated in an EIR. Rather, "the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason that sets forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice" (CEQA Guidelines 15126(f)).

### 7.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

CEQA requires the alternatives selected for comparison in an EIR to avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project being evaluated. In order to identify alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of implementation of the proposed Project, the significant impacts must be considered, although it is recognized that alternatives aimed at reducing the significant and unavoidable impacts would also avoid or reduce impacts that were found to be less than significant or reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures. The analysis in Chapter 5 of this EIR determined that buildout of the proposed Project would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts, which are also summarized in Chapter 6 of this EIR.

#### Air Quality

As detailed in Section 5.2, *Air Quality*, the proposed Project would produce operational-source emissions that would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds of significance for VOC and NOx. Even with implementation of Policies, Plans and Procedures (PPPs) and mitigation measures, the operational source emissions would continue to exceed SCAQMD thresholds for emissions of these pollutants. Approximately 89 percent of the operational-source emissions (by weight) would be generated by traffic trips generated by the proposed Project. Neither the applicant nor the City of Norco has the ability to substantially reduce vehicular emissions. Although it can encourage ride sharing, the use of hybrid vehicles, or the use of public transportation, neither the City nor applicant can mandate whether those accessing the site use any of these measures. Similarly, VOC emissions are derived from consumer products that are not under the control of the City and cannot be mitigated. Therefore, operational-source NOx and VOC emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

As described in Section 5.2, Air Quality, per SCAQMD's methodology, if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants (including VOC and NOx) that exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

As described previously, emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for VOC and NOx; and because approximately 89 percent of all operational-source emissions would be generated by Project vehicles, it cannot be reduced by the Project applicant nor the City. Similarly, VOC emissions are derived from consumer products that are not under the control of the City and cannot be mitigated. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### Cultural Resources

As detailed in Section 5.4, Cultural Resources, the proposed Project would demolish the Norco Egg Ranch, which meets the definition of an historical resource and is locally eligible for designation under Municipal Code Title 20 and under the criteria of the CRHR. The Norco Egg Ranch is comprised of four Contributing

Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building.

The Historical Resource Analysis Report describes that the property retains a sufficient degree of integrity to physically convey its identified significance under CRHR Criterion 1 for an association with poultry farming in Norco and under CRHR Criterion 2 for an association with Harry and Hilda Eisen, who are regarded as pioneers in poultry farming and successful participants in the displaced persons retraining programs available for Holocaust survivors (Urbana 2019). In addition, under the City of Norco Landmark criteria A, the Contributing Structures are associated with poultry farming, which was an important aspect of the City's economic history since the 1920s; and under the City of Norco Landmark criterion B, the Contributing Structures are associated with the locally prominent Eisen family and their Norco Egg Ranch.

Demolition or removal of the Norco Egg Ranch would result in a significant impact to a historical resource. As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package for the Norco Egg Ranch. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 is included and requires the installation on-site signage or a historic exhibit detailing the historical appearance and uses at the property related to the Norco Egg Ranch and the Eisen Family. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to Norco Egg Ranch would remain significant and unavoidable after implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 and Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

#### **Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts**

Because all historical resources are unique and nonrenewable members of finite classes, all adverse effects or negative impacts erode a dwindling resource base. Federal, state, and local laws and regulations protect historic resources when feasible. However, it is not always feasible to protect historical resources. As described previously, the Project would result in demolition of a CRHR historical resource and a historic resource that meets the City of Norco Landmark criterion. Because the resources are state and local historic resources, the cumulative study area for historic resources includes the City of Norco and State of California.

As a result, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included, which requires preparation of a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation package for the Norco Egg Ranch and Mitigation Measure CUL-3 requires interpretive signage. However, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; and the loss of the historic resource would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to historic resources.

#### Land Use and Planning

As detailed in Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning, the proposed Project has been prepared in conformance with the goals and policies of the City of Norco General Plan. The proposed Project would be consistent with most of the applicable General Plan policies; however, the Project would conflict with policies related to preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources and significant impacts related to historic resources would occur, as detailed in Table 5.10-4. As a result, a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would occur.

#### Transportation

As detailed in Section 5.13, *Transportation*, the proposed Project would result in traffic impacts within the City of Norco and on Caltrans facilities. The EIR has provided mitigation measures that would reduce the

impacts of the proposed Project, however, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, as described below.

#### Existing Plus Project

**Intersections.** In the existing plus Project condition, the Project would result in impacts at Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street, Hamner Avenue and Second Street, and I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street. The Mitigation Measures for these deficiencies would reduce the Project's impacts to a less than significant level; however, because the City does not control implementation of the required freeway improvements, and the Project's pro rata contribution to identified traffic mitigation measures requires the contribution of others and implementation by the City, these impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable. Specifically, the I-15 NB Ramps and Second Street intersection is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements within Caltrans jurisdiction. In addition, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of improvements at the intersections of Parkridge Avenue (West) and Second Street, and Hamner Avenue and Second Street. As a result, traffic impacts in the existing plus Project condition would be significant and unavoidable.

**Traffic Signal Warrant.** In the existing plus Project condition, the intersection of Mountain Avenue and Second Street is anticipated to warrant a traffic signal in the existing plus Project traffic condition. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, which would require a fair share payment of costs related to implementation of a traffic signal at this location would be required. However, the City does not have a formally adopted plan or program that would ensure implementation of this improvement. Therefore, impacts related to this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

**Freeway Segments and Merge/Diverge Locations.** The addition of Project traffic in the existing plus Project condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street currently operates at a LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this intersection in the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant and unavoidable in the existing plus Project condition. Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to address the deficiencies caused by development projects, and the City of Norco cannot implement improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, there is no feasible mitigation available, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Opening Year (2022) Plus Project**

**Intersections.** In the 2022 plus Project condition, the intersections of Pacific Avenue and Second Street and I-15 NB Ramps & Second Street are anticipated to result in an unacceptable LOS with the addition of traffic from the Project during the p.m. peak hour. In addition, the Project would add to the already deficient conditions at 6 other intersections. With payment of the fair share contribution for identified improvements to these impacted intersections, the Project's share of impacts would be mitigated. However, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. Also, the construction/implementation of these improvements is dependent upon the payment of similar fees by other projects that contribute to the cumulative impact. As such, the exact timing of implementation of the improvements identified by the mitigation measure is uncertain. Therefore, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Caltrans; and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of Caltrans improvements. As a result, traffic impacts to intersections in the opening year 2022 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and remain significant and unavoidable.

#### Horizon Year (2040) Plus Project

**Intersections.** In the 2040 plus Project condition, the Project would add to the anticipated deficient conditions as several intersections. Roadway improvements have been identified to mitigate these deficiencies and Mitigation Measure TR-1 would be implemented to ensure that the Project pays its fair share. However, the City of Norco does not have a formally adopted plan or program for the implementation of these improvements. Also, many improvement areas are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of the improvements outside of its jurisdiction. As a result, traffic impacts to intersections in the horizon year 2040 plus Project condition would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

**Off-Ramp Queuing.** The I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street is anticipated to experience queuing issues in the a.m. peak hour without the Project in 2040. The addition of traffic from the Project after 2040 would not result in queuing impacts at any other location; however, the Project would add to the deficient conditions at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street. The improvements consist of modifying the intersection to add a northbound left turn lane, as listed below in Section 5.13-10, Mitigation Measures. However, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to implement this mitigation measure. In addition, the City of Norco cannot implement or guarantee implementation of improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, the proposed Project would result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts at the I-15 northbound ramps at Second Street in the a.m. peak hour in the horizon year 2040.

**Freeway Ramp Junction Merge/Diverge Locations.** The addition of Project traffic in the 2040 plus Project condition would not result in new freeway segments operating at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or worse) during the peak hours. However, the I-15 southbound north of Second Street would operate at a LOS E in the a.m. peak hour and the Project would add 50 or more one-way peak hour trips to this location in the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, impacts related to freeway merge/diverge would be significant and unavoidable in the 2040 plus Project condition. As described previously, Caltrans has no fee programs or other improvement programs in place to address the deficiencies caused by development projects, and the City of Norco cannot implement improvements on Caltrans facilities. Thus, there is no feasible mitigation available, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

## 7.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Palomino Business Park site plan has been designed to meet a series of Project-specific objectives that have been carefully crafted in order to aid decision makers in their review of the proposed Project and its associated environmental impacts. The Project objectives have been refined throughout the planning and design process for the proposed Project, and are listed below:

- To diversify the City of Norco economy with a mixed-use business park with a variety of buildings, including industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, R&D and commercial to ensure the site has a diversity of uses and long-term economic viability.
- Redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure of egg ranching from California.
- To create a high quality, master planned mixed-use business park development on a large underutilized area that attracts an array of businesses and provides a variety of employment opportunities in the city of Norco thereby reducing the need for members of the local workforce to commute outside the area for employment.
- To provide industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, research and development and commercial uses within the Project boundaries which are compatible with surrounding uses and will also leverage the site's prime location and other regional transportation facilities to bring economic benefit to the area.

- To develop a mixed-use light industrial business park with structures flexible in design to meet the needs of an ever-changing business market that implements the General Plan and the Gateway Specific Plan.
- To provide a plan for roadways, infrastructure, and utilities to support onsite land uses and the City of Norco.
- To promote sustainability by providing opportunities for water efficiency in the Project architecture and Project landscaping to promote water conservation.
- To develop a Project that meets the architectural design guidelines of the Gateway Specific Plan that incorporates a quality western/southwestern/early Californian design character within the Project Area.
- To provide a Project with attractive and functional buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses that include a combination of walls, plantings, earth berms, trees and varying setback depths.
- Provide safe sidewalks and equestrian trails to enhance for pedestrian and equestrian access.

## 7.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible and need not be considered further. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f), (f)(3)). This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency but rejected as infeasible and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.

Alternative Site: An alternative site was considered and eliminated from further consideration. CEQA specifies that the key question regarding alternative site consideration is "whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project at another location." In addition, an alternative site need not be considered when implementation is "remote and speculative," such as when the alternative site is beyond the control of a project applicant.

For this Project, there are no suitable alternative sites within the control of the Project applicant (or the City of Norco as much of the City is built-out). In the event land could be purchased of suitable size and developmental characteristics, based on the known general conditions in the City, an alternative site would likely have similar impacts to traffic and air quality after mitigation as the Project. Given the size and nature of the proposed Project and the project objectives, it would be impractical and infeasible to propose the Project on an alternate site in the area.

Also, given the size of the proposed Project, a similarly sized project at an alternative location elsewhere within the South Coast Air Basin would result in the same project-level or cumulative air quality and transportation impacts that would occur with implementation of the proposed Project. Likewise, a similarly sized project at an alternative location would result in similar traffic impacts in other jurisdictions that would be significant and unavoidable, because the City of Norco cannot guarantee implementation of improvements outside of its jurisdiction. Therefore, analysis of an alternative site for the proposed Project is neither meaningful nor necessary, because the significant impacts resulting from the Project would not be avoided or substantially lessened by its implementation.

**Relocation of Norco Egg Ranch Contributing Elements:** Relocation of the Norco Egg Ranch Contributing Elements was considered and eliminated from further consideration because it would not reduce impacts related to historic resources. As detailed in Section 5.4, *Cultural Resources*, there are four Contributing Structures: the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. The Historical Resource Analysis Report (Urbana 2019) describes that relocation of the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch would not reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level because the location, setting, and association aspects that provide integrity to the historical resource would be completely lost as part of the relocation. Relocation of the Eisen Residence and/or the other Contributing Elements would offer an opportunity to memorialize the Eisen's and the Norco Egg Ranch as important individuals and places in Norco history, but it would not adequately convey their role as pioneers in poultry farming because the building(s) would no longer be associated with the site where the important poultry farming activities occurred and because the building would no longer maintain its visual and spatial relationship with the other contributing elements at the Norco Egg Ranch, and as such would not physically convey their identified significance under CRHR Local Criterion 1/A or 2/B.

The location, setting, and association aspects of integrity are of primary importance to the resource's ability to convey its identified significance. The resource's CRHR Local eligibility is not based on architectural significance, or specific aesthetic qualities or construction methods that could be retained as part of an offsite relocation. Rather, the property's eligibility for an association with events and important persons relies on its location, setting, and associative elements to remain in place. The association with egg ranching, and with the Eisen's as important poultry farmers, would be lost if the building(s) were to be moved offsite. Therefore, the significant historic resource impacts would not be avoided or substantially lessened by relocation of the resources. As a result, this potential alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

## 7.5 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Three alternatives to the proposed Project have been identified for further analysis as representing a reasonable range of alternatives that attain most of the objectives of the Project, may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed Project, and are feasible from a development perspective. These alternatives have been developed based on the criteria identified in Section 7.1, and are described below:

• Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative. Under this alternative, the proposed Project would not be developed, and no development would occur. The existing egg processing facility, building remnants, and single-family residential uses would remain. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states that, "In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."

Accordingly, Alternative 1: No Project/No Build provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed Project in contrast to the result from not approving, or denying, the proposed Project. Thus, this alternative is intended to meet the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) for evaluation of a no project alternative.

• Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity Alternative. Under this alternative, only Phase 1 of the proposed Project would occur. As shown in Table 3-2 in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, Phase 1 of the proposed Project includes 18 business park industrial buildings that include 1,456,075 square feet of space and three commercial buildings that would provide 21,410 square feet of space. Under this alternative, the proposed industrial warehousing and business park use would be

reduced by a minimum of 18 buildings and a total of 572,515 square feet. This equates to a 28 percent reduction in square footage at build out of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. A proportional reduction in the amount of surface parking area would also occur by the Reduced Intensity Alternative. This alternative assumes that access to the site would be similar to the proposed Project with access from driveways on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.

Alternative 3: Historic Resource Retention Alternative. Under this alternative the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, would be retained to avoid impacts to the historical resource on the Project site. This alternative includes redesign of the Project to avoid removal of the historic resources, the stabilization of unoccupied contributing elements, and the continued use of the Norco Egg Ranch buildings for egg processing activities. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing features that convey the period of significance, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings commercial/industrial uses due to lack of demand for the older buildings. Retention of the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch would reduce the overall proposed Project by 24.4 percent. Under this alternative, the 60-foot main driveway would be redesigned and shifted south of Building 13; the other two driveways would be removed, leaving only two driveways for Phase 1. See Figure 7-1, Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan. As shown, six buildings would be removed for the Project (Building 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) and three others would be reduced in size (Building 7, 9 and 13). Street improvements along Mountain Avenue north of the northern driveway, including the horse trail, would not be possible to implement because the modern Egg Processing Building is immediate adjacent to Mountain Avenue, leaving insufficient width for improvements.

## 7.6 NO PROJECT/NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires analysis of the No Project Alternative. The no project alternative analysis must discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation was published and considers conditions that would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Project were not approved. The No Project Alternative applies to the following scenarios:

- (1) When the project is a revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative is the continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future; or
- (2) If the project is other than a land use or regulatory plan, for example a development project on identifiable property, the "no project" alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed.

Therefore, under Alternative 1: No Project/No Build, the proposed Project would not be developed, and the Project site would continue its current uses as light industrial uses, vacant land, and single-family residential. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build provides a comparison between the environmental impacts of the proposed Project and the result of not approving, or denying, the proposed Project.

#### **Environmental Impacts**

#### Aesthetics

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no new development would occur within the Project site, and the visual character and quality of the site would be maintained in its existing condition. No additional structures or landscaping would be introduced on the property beyond the existing residential and light industrial uses and related structures. No additional lighting or sources of glare would be installed. Thus, implementation of the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid the Project's less than significant

## Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan



Palomino Buisness Park Draft EIR City of Norco Figure 7-1

This page intentionally left blank.

impacts to aesthetics. However, the visual improvements that would be introduced throughout the Project site that include: new and improved landscaping, providing a consistent design theme for the area that is consistent with the Gateway Specific Plan design guidelines, removal of aged structures, and improvements to the public realm by streetscaping, would not be implemented by the No Project/No Build Alternative. Thus, improvements to the existing views, character, and quality of the Project site would not occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Overall, the aesthetic impacts from this alternative would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Air Quality

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no new development would occur, which means that no construction or demolition activities and the related emissions would occur either. In addition, by maintaining existing light industrial and residential uses, an increase in traffic and associated air emissions would not occur. Therefore, overall air quality impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project, and the significant and unavoidable impacts related to VOC and NOx emissions from operation of the proposed Project would not occur. Therefore, all air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced to the proposed Project would not occur. Therefore, and significant and unavoidable impacts related to VOC and NOx emissions from operation of the proposed Project would not occur. Therefore, all air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed Project, and significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality would occur by the No Project/No Build Alternative. Thus, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed Project.

#### **Biological Resources**

The No Project/No Build Alternative would continue the existing light industrial and residential uses on the Project site. No grading or development would occur under this alternative and there would be no potential impacts to burrowing owl, Stephens' kangaroo rat, raptors, and migratory and nesting birds that may be present on the Project site. Additionally, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in impacts to jurisdictional features. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid construction and new operational disturbances on the Project site and the Project's potential impacts to biological resources would not occur, and mitigation would not be required. Thus, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed Project.

#### **Cultural Resources**

The No Project/No Build Alternative would continue the existing light industrial and residential uses on the Project site. No demolition or development would occur under this alternative and there would be no potential impacts to historic resources or subsurface archaeological resources. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid site disturbances that could impact resources; and Project impacts would not occur under this alternative.

#### Energy

The existing number of residents and workers in the Project area would remain under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for energy. Although the proposed Project's demands for energy were determined to be less than significant, the amount of energy used by the No Project/No Build Alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed Project.

#### **Geology and Soils**

No new construction activities, including demolition and grading, would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, there would be no potential for additional workers, building and structures to experience seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse within the

Project site. However, the buildings and structures that exist in the Project site were built before current seismic safety codes; therefore, this alternative, by retaining older buildings and structures, could expose

people to greater hazards from strong ground shaking than the proposed Project. Additionally, the Project's impacts to geology and soils were determined to be less than significant with compliance with the California Building Code. Therefore, the geologic hazard impacts from this alternative would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

In addition, because the No Project/No Build Alternative does not involve grading or other ground disturbance activities, potential impacts to paleontological resources would not occur and Mitigation Measure PAL-1 would not be required. Thus, impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed Project.

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no new development would occur, which means that no construction or demolition activities would generate GHG emissions. In addition, by maintaining existing light industrial and residential uses on the Project site, an increase in traffic and associated GHG emissions would not occur. Therefore, overall GHG impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Because no development would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials would occur. The light industrial and residential uses on the site would remain and the existing hazardous materials that include underground storage tanks (USTs), asbestos containing materials, and lead based paint in place on-site. Although this alternative would avoid the Project's potential effects related to hazards and hazardous materials, no removal of the existing hazardous materials would occur as a result of the property's redevelopment. Removal of the hazardous materials from the site is a benefit of the proposed Project that would not be realized under this alternative. Therefore, hazards impacts would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to implementation of the proposed Project.

#### Hydrology and Water Quality

Existing water quality conditions, groundwater supplies, drainage patterns, and runoff water amounts would remain "as is" under this alternative because no new development would occur. This alternative would not introduce new sources of water pollutants from either the construction or operation phases of development to the Project site, because no new development would occur. Additionally, this alternative would not require the storm drain facility improvements that are included in the proposed Project. However, this alternative would not include installation of new low-impact development (LID), source control, site design, and treatment control best management practices (BMPs) to minimize runoff and water pollution, which would occur under the proposed Project. The storm water leaving the site would not be filtered and would continue to contain sediment and other potential pollutants associated with the existing conditions of the site. Therefore, the No Project/No Build Alternative would reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality that would occur from the proposed Project. However, the beneficial improvements would not occur, which could result in water quality degradation effects that are greater than those of the proposed Project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant, and neutral or potentially greater in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Land Use and Planning

The No Project/No Build Alternative would continue the existing light industrial and residential uses on the Project site and the Gateway Specific Plan would not be implemented for the Project site. However, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in demolition of a historic resource and would not conflict

with policies related to preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources. As a result, a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur from implementation of the No Project/No Build Alternative. Hence, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in a significant impact and would result in reduced land use impacts in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Noise

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in construction and, therefore, would not generate any noise associated with construction. Mobile-source and stationary noise volumes would be lower under this alternative compared to the proposed Project, given the reduced vehicular traffic noise, noise from industrial warehousing and commercial uses, HVAC equipment, and other noise sources. Additionally, the No Project/No Build Alternative would result in fewer people exposed to noise from surrounding development and roadways because no additional employees would be onsite. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and less than those associated with the proposed Project.

#### **Public Services**

The existing number of residents and workers on the Project site area would remain under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for fire or police services. Although the proposed Project's impacts related to fire and police services were determined to be less than significant, the public services impacts would be reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed Project.

#### Transportation

Under this alternative, no new employees from commercial or industrial warehouse uses would be introduced on the Project site. The existing daily vehicular trips would remain at current conditions and all roadway segments and intersections would maintain existing levels of service. Therefore, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level under this alternative and the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project would not occur from implementation of the No Project/No Build Alternative. Impacts under this alternative would be less than the proposed Project.

#### Tribal Cultural Resources

The No Project/No Build Alternative would continue the existing uses on the Project site. No grading or development would occur under this alternative and there would be no potential impacts to subsurface tribal cultural resources that may exist beneath the ground surface. Therefore, the Project's potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would not occur and impacts under this alternative would be less than the proposed Project.

#### Utilities and Service Systems

Because no new development and employee increases would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the existing onsite water and sewer systems would continue to be used, and no water or wastewater infrastructure would be developed. No additional demand for regional water supplies would occur, and no additional wastewater would be conveyed to the wastewater treatment facility. Thus, the impacts related to water supplies and wastewater would be reduced compared to the less than significant impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

Similarly, no additional drainage infrastructure would be developed by the No Project/No Build Alternative, and runoff in the Project area would remain in its current condition and no storm water system improvements would be required. Also, solid waste generation would remain the same as existing condition and increases in needs for landfill capacity would not occur with the No Project/No Build Alternative.

Therefore, impacts to utilities and service systems would be less under this alternative than the less than significant impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### 7.6.1 CONCLUSION

#### **Ability to Reduce Impacts**

The No Project/No Build Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, historic resources, land use and planning, and transportation that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project. This alterative would also eliminate the impacts related to biological resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources that would require mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level under the proposed Project. In addition, the No Project/No Build Alternative would reduce the Project's less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions, public services, utilities, and energy.

However, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not provide removal and disposal of hazardous substances on the Project site, and would not implement the Gateway Specific Plan, which are benefits of the proposed Project.

#### **Ability to Achieve Project Objectives**

Implementation of the No Project/No Build Alternative would stop any new development from occurring within the Project site, and none of the Project objectives would be achieved under this alternative. The No Project/No Build Alternative would not diversify the City of Norco economy with a mixed-use business park, redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure of egg ranching from California, redevelop the underutilized area to provide new employment needs that are compatible with surrounding land uses, and the other objectives listed in Table 7-2.

### 7.7 REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

As described above, Under the Reduced Intensity alternative, only Phase 1 of the proposed Project would occur. As shown in Table 3-2 in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, Phase 1 of the proposed Project includes 18 business park industrial buildings that include 1,456,075 square feet of space and three commercial buildings that would provide 21,410 square feet of space. Under this alternative, the proposed industrial warehousing and business park use would be reduced by a minimum of 18 buildings and a total of 572,515 square feet. This equates to a 28 percent reduction in square footage at build out of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. A proportional reduction in the amount of surface parking area would also occur by the Reduced Intensity Alternative. This alternative assumes that access to the site would be similar to the proposed Project with access from driveways on Mountain Avenue, First Street, and Second Street.

#### **Environmental Impacts**

#### Aesthetics

Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, the same type of light industrial business park and commercial development would occur within the western portion of the Project site that is located to the west of Mountain Avenue. After development of the Reduced Intensity Alternative the area would be visually less dense because the Phase 2 parcels that are located on the east side of Mountain Avenue would not be developed and would remain in their current state. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would include construction of buildings to the same height and the same architectural character as the proposed Project. The visual character and quality of the developed parcels would be the same as the proposed condition. The new structures and landscaping would be implemented, similar to that of the proposed Project; however, greater visual space would be provided by the underdeveloped parcels located to the east of

Mountain Avenue and the existing offsite industrial buildings that are located to the east of the Project site. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would also result in fewer sources of light and glare because the proposed buildings on the east side of Mountain Avenue would not be developed.

Overall, implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in the same less than significant impacts related to aesthetics as the proposed Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would implement the same type of visual improvements to the Project site on western side of Mountain Avenue that includes: new and improved landscaping, providing a consistent design theme for the area, removal of aged structures, and improvements to the public realm by streetscaping. Thus, improvements to the existing views, character, and quality of the western portion of the Project site would occur under the Reduced Density Alternative. The aesthetic impacts from this alternative would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Air Quality

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the Project site with the same type of light industrial business park and commercial uses, but with a 28 percent reduction in square footage. Therefore, a reduced volume of construction activities and the related emissions would occur. In addition, the reduced amount of square footage that would be developed by this alternative would result in less stationary source emissions from equipment onsite, and less traffic and associated emissions than the proposed Project. Therefore, overall air quality impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project However, the volume of VOC and NOx emissions from operation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable due to the volume of vehicular and truck trips that would occur from operation of 1,456,075 square feet of industrial business park space and three 21,410 square foot commercial buildings. The maximum pounds per day of VOC and NOx that would be generated from the operation of the proposed Project is 98.02 and 511.81 (as shown in Table 5.2-9), which are far above the 55 pounds per day threshold. Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative VOC and NOx emissions would be approximately 28 percent less, which would result in approximately 70.57 ponds per day of VOC and 368.50 pounds per day of NOx, which are still above the 55 pounds per day SCAQMD threshold. Therefore, although less emissions would occur, significant and unavoidable impacts would still occur from operation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Thus, the direct Project and cumulative impacts under this alternative would be the same as the proposed Project.

#### **Biological Resources**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the amount of building area and associated parking stalls proposed for the Project site. However, the development would continue to result in disturbance on the western portion of the Project site. Any on-site biological resources, including habitat, potential specialstatus species, and jurisdictional waters, would be removed, and mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to such resources to a less than significant level. As such, impacts would be similar to those that would result from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### **Cultural Resources**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a similar significant and unavoidable impacts to historic resources because the Norco Egg Ranch Contributing Elements are located within the Phase 1 development area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Phase 1 development would result in demolition of the existing historic resources. As described previously, demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts related to historic resources would be significant and unavoidable under the Reduced Intensity Alternative.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a similar potential to adversely affect any undiscovered archaeological resources on the Project site, despite the reduction in building area and associated surface

parking. However, like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts to archaeological resources from the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant, which is similar to those associated with the proposed Project.

#### Energy

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project site by approximately 28 percent compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the demand for energy in comparison to the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project's demands for energy were determined to be less than significant, the amount of energy used by the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less and would comply with the same regulations/incorporate the same measures to ensure no wasteful or inefficient use of energy. Therefore, impacts to energy would be less under this alternative than the less than significant impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### **Geology and Soils**

Grading and development of the Project area would still occur under the Reduced Intensity Alternative, and therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be similar to those that would be generated from the proposed Project. The new structures under this alternative, even with the reduction in overall ground disturbance and total building area, would still result in additional persons and structures in the Project area that would be subject to risks associated with seismic ground shaking and geologic hazards. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be required to meet the same regulatory requirements as the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant, which is the same as the proposed Project.

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a similar potential to adversely affect any paleontological resources on the Project site as the proposed Project, despite the reduction in building area and associated surface parking. However, like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources from the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project.

#### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the Project site with the same type of light industrial business park and commercial uses, but with a 28 percent reduction in square footage Therefore, a reduced volume of construction activities and related production of GHG emissions would occur. In addition, the reduced amount of square footage that would be developed by this alternative would result in less stationary source emissions from equipment onsite, and less traffic associated GHG emissions than the proposed Project. The increase in GHG emissions that would be generated from the operation of the proposed Project is 54,039.84 CO<sub>2</sub>e per year (as shown in Table 5.7-2). Under the Reduced Intensity Alternative GHG emissions would be approximately 28 percent less, which would be approximately 38,908.08 CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, the overall volume of GHG emissions would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the proposed Project.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would develop the Phase 1 portion of the Project site for industrial business park and commercial uses (including the proposed gas station), and therefore the same type of hazardous materials would be used for construction and operation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Similarly, the use and storage of hazardous materials would be regulated by the same federal, state, and local laws and permitting requirements as would be done by the proposed Project.

In addition, this alternative would include removal of the underground storage tanks, which are located within the Phase 1 portion of the Project site; and would remove and dispose of the asbestos containing materials and lead based paint within the structures to be demolished within the Phase 1 area. Removal of the hazardous materials would be implemented according to existing laws and regulations, which are detailed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. Any asbestos containing materials and lead based paint within the site would remain. Thus, under this alternative less removal of existing hazardous materials would occur. However, like the proposed Project, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts, and impacts that would occur by the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Hydrology and Water Quality

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the total area of impervious surfaces compared to the Project. The pervious surfaces located on the eastern side of Mountain Avenue within the Project site would remain. No change to runoff conditions would occur within the Phase 2 portion of the Project site. This would reduce the and potential for impacts to drainage, erosion, and water quality. However, like the proposed Project, this alternative would introduce new sources of water pollutants from Phase 1 construction and operation activities. Additionally, this alternative would be required to include storm drain facility improvements, LID, source control, site design, and treatment control BMPs in the Phase 1 area that are similar to those that are included in the proposed Project. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in impacts to hydrology and water quality that are similar to those that would occur from the proposed Project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Land Use and Planning

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would implement the General Plan land use designations and Gateway Specific Plan for the Phase 1 portion of the Project site. However, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in demolition of a historic resource and would conflict with policies related to preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources. As a result, a significant and unavoidable impact related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would occur from implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Hence, like the proposed Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would result in a significant and unavoidable impact; and would be neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Noise

Construction and operational noise impacts would be reduced under the Reduced Intensity Alternative because this alternative would not develop the Phase 2 portion of the site, which is located on the east side of Mountain Avenue. Although construction of this alternative would generate the same type and volume of construction noise at the same distance to existing sensitive receptors as the proposed Project, the length of time of construction and the associated noise would be shorter. Operational noise would also be reduced under this alternative as traffic-generated and stationary noise sources would decrease in relation to the reduction in industrial business park square footage. However, the location of the Phase 1 industrial business park uses would be the same distance to sensitive receptors as the proposed Project. Thus, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 that provides noise barriers to reduce operational noise, would continue to be required for the Reduced Intensity Alternative. Overall, noise impacts from the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation and would be neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Public Services

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project area by 572,515 square feet compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the number of employees on the Project site in

relation to the reduction in industrial business park square footage. However, as with the proposed Project, this alternative is not anticipated to result in new residences that could generate demand new services. Impacts under this alternative would be less than significant and would be incrementally reduced in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Transportation

Construction and operation-related traffic and truck trips would be reduced under the Reduced Intensity Alternative because this alternative would decrease the development area by 572,515 square feet. The daily trips would be reduced in relation to the reduction of the building area (approximately 28 percent), which would reduce volumes on all roadway segments and intersections. However, due to the existing LOS in the traffic study area and the volume of traffic that would be generated by the 1,456,075 square feet of industrial business park space and 21,410 square feet of commercial space that would be developed by the Reduced Intensity Alternative, this alternative would still require implementation of the mitigation measures that involve roadway improvements in locations that are (1) not within the jurisdiction of the City of Norco, and thus, the City cannot guarantee implementation of the mitigation measure improvements and (2) within the City of Norco, but not accounted for in an adopted plan or program for improvements. As a result, traffic volumes generated from this alternative would be less, however, impacts from implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would also be significant and unavoidable.

#### Tribal Cultural Resources

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the area of potential impact to tribal cultural resources because the Phase 2 portion of the site would not be developed. However, the alternative would have a similar potential to adversely affect any tribal cultural resources on the Phase 1 portion of the Project site. Thus, like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts that could occur by the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed Project.

#### Utilities and Service Systems

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project area by 572,515 square feet compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the number of employees on the Project site in relation to the reduction in industrial business park square footage; and would also reduce the demand for utilities and service systems.

The demand for regional water supplies and generation of wastewater would be approximately 28 percent less than the proposed Project. Thus, the impacts related to water supplies and wastewater would be less than the less than significant impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project. Similarly, solid waste generation would be less than the proposed Project and require less landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service system under this alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### 7.7.1 CONCLUSION

#### Ability to Reduce Impacts

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would reduce the volume of vehicular trips, which would decrease the impacts related to air quality emissions and traffic. However, significant and unavoidable impacts related to historic resources, land use and planning, air quality, and transportation would continue to occur from implementation of this alternative. This alterative would reduce potential impacts related to biological resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources compared to the proposed Project. However, the mitigation required for implementation of the proposed Project be required for the Reduced Intensity Alternative to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Overall, although the volume of impacts would be less by the Reduced Intensity

Alternative in comparison to the proposed Project, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would not eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project or eliminate the need for mitigation.

#### Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

Implementation of the Reduced Intensity Alternative would meet the Project objectives, but some of them would not be met to the extent as would be achieved by the proposed Project, as listed in Table 7-2. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would provide for the development of industrial business park and commercial uses on the underdeveloped Norco Egg Ranch Property. Because the Reduced Intensity Alternative provides 572,515 square feet less of industrial business park space than the proposed Project, it would have the ability to attract fewer or smaller businesses and less employment opportunities to area residents. In addition, the smaller development would provide less flexibility to meet the needs of an everchanging business market.

## 7.8 HISTORIC RESOURCE RETENTION ALTERNATIVE

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain and the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. This alternative includes redesign of the Project to avoid removal of the historic resources, the stabilization of unoccupied contributing elements, and the continued use of the Norco Egg Ranch buildings for egg processing activities. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing features that convey the period of significance, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings commercial/industrial uses due to lack of demand for the buildings. Any adaptive reuse would require the rehabilitation of the four contributing buildings in compliance with The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and the associated Standards for Rehabilitation to retain the period of significance. For the property, the period of significance is 1956, when the ranch opened, through circa 1965, when the property was expanded and a modern 65,000 square foot Egg Processing Building was opened at the north end of the ranch.

Retention of the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch would reduce Phase 1 of the Project by approximately 500,000 square feet, or 34.3 percent, and would reduce the overall proposed Project by 24.4 percent. Under the proposed Project, the Eisen Residence, Garage, and original Egg Processing Building are all located at the main Project entry and location of the 60-foot main driveway. The modern Egg Processing Building has a 700-foot long frontage immediately adjacent to Mountain Avenue and is located in an area where two other driveways for Phase 1 are planned. Under this alternative, the 60-foot main driveway would be redesigned and shifted south of Building 13; the other two driveways would be removed, leaving only two driveways for Phase 1. See Figure 7-1, *Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan.* As shown, six buildings would be removed for the Project (Building 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) and three others would be reduced in size (Building 7, 9 and 13). Street improvements along Mountain Avenue north of the northern driveway, including the horse trail, would not be possible to implement because the modern Egg Processing Building is immediate adjacent to Mountain Avenue, leaving insufficient width for improvements.

#### **Environmental Impacts**

#### Aesthetics

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. These historic buildings would have a different character than the proposed new development that would have a western theme and character, site design, parking, walls and fences, lighting, and landscaping. Thus, the character of the Project site would not be consistent throughout, as would occur by the proposed Project, as the historic buildings would be different than the new buildings that would provide a western visual character

In addition, the architecture of the historic buildings would be inconsistent with the development theme of the anticipated surrounding uses in the City, which are also within the Gateway Specific Plan and are subject to the same design guidelines as the Project. The historic building would retain their 1950's/1960's character and would appear to be in disrepair compared to the proposed Project's new buildings. Further, the frontage of historic buildings along Mountain Avenue would lack of street improvements and lack an enhanced horse trail compared to the remainder of the site. However, these inconsistencies would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to aesthetics.

#### Air Quality

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, which would result in a reduction in the overall buildout of the Project by approximately 550,000 square feet (a 24.4 percent reduction) and would reduce Phase 1 by 34.3 percent. Thus, a reduced volume of construction activities and related emissions would occur. In addition, the 500,000 square foot reduction of light industrial space that would be developed by this alternative would result in less stationary source emissions from equipment onsite, and less traffic and associated air emissions than the proposed Project. Therefore, overall air quality impacts would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project. However, the volume of VOC and NOx emissions from operational vehicular and truck trips generated by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would remain significant and unavoidable due to the volume of vehicular and truck trips that would occur from operation of 1,550,000 square feet of industrial and commercial business park space.

The maximum pounds per day of VOC and NOx that would be generated from the operation of the proposed Project is 98.02 and 511.81 (as shown in Table 5.2-9), which is far above the 55 pounds per day threshold. Under the Historic Resource Retention Alternative VOC and NOx emissions would be approximately 24.4 percent less, which would be approximately 74.10 and 386.93 pounds per day, which would still exceed the 55 pounds per day threshold. Therefore, although less emissions would occur from this alternative, significant and unavoidable impacts would result. Thus, impacts related to air quality by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less than the proposed Project, but still significant and unavoidable.

#### **Biological Resources**

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, which are located on developed portions of the site. This alternative would result in disturbance to the same type of biological resource areas that would occur by the proposed Project. Therefore, like the proposed Project, any on-site biological resources, including habitat, potential specialstatus species, and jurisdictional waters, would be removed, and mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce impacts to such resources to a less than significant level. As such, impacts would be similar to those that would result from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### **Cultural Resources**

As described previously, the Historic Resource Retention would retain the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, which would avoid impacts to the historical resource on the Project site. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing features that convey the period of significance, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings commercial/industrial uses due to lack of demand for the buildings. The use of the buildings for

egg processing activities would continue. As a result, this alternative would reduce impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level and would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur by the proposed Project.

The soils disturbance from implementation of this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Project but would not occur in the area of the historic resources. Thus, any unknown archaeologic resources under or near the historic structures would not be affected by this alternative. However, development of the remainder of the Project site pursuant to this alternative would have the potential to adversely affect undiscovered archaeological resources located within that area. Like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to be implemented during construction of this alternative to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Although the potential impacts of that could occur by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed Project, the same mitigation measures would be required to ensure that impacts related to archaeological resources are less than significant.

#### Energy

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project site by 500,000 square feet compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the demand for energy in comparison to the proposed Project by 24.4 percent. Although the proposed Project's demands for energy were determined to be less than significant, the amount of energy used by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less because of the decrease in overall square footage that would be developed on the Project Site and the newly developed buildings would comply with the same regulations/incorporate the same measures to ensure no wasteful or inefficient use of energy occurs. Therefore, impacts to energy would be less under this alternative than the less than significant impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### **Geology and Soils**

Grading and development that would occur from implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Project, except the existing for contributing structures would remain. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing features and protect the resources from deteriorating, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings and their occupancy for commercial/industrial uses. The new structures would result in additional persons and structures in the Project area that would be subject to risks associated with seismic ground shaking and geologic hazards. Therefore, the new structures developed Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be required to meet the same regulatory requirements as the proposed Project. Overall, impacts to geology and soils would be less than significant, which is the same as the proposed Project.

In addition, the soils disturbance from implementation of this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed Project but would not occur in the area of the historic resources. Thus, any unknown paleontological resources under or near the historic resources would not be affected by this alternative. However, development of the remainder of the site pursuant to this alternative would have the potential to adversely affect paleontological resources. Like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to be implemented during construction of this alternative to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources under this alternative would be the same as the proposed Project.

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project site by 500,000 square feet compared to the proposed Project. Therefore, a reduced volume of construction activities and the

related GHG emissions would occur. In addition, the reduced amount of square footage that would be developed by this alternative would result in less stationary source emissions from equipment onsite, and less traffic associated GHG emissions than the proposed Project. The increase in GHG emissions that would be generated from the operation of the proposed Project is 54,039.84 CO<sub>2</sub>e per year (as shown in Table 5.7-2). Under the Historic Resource Retention Alternative GHG emissions would be approximately 24.4 percent less, which would be approximately 40,854.12 CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, the overall volume of GHG emissions would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project and impacts under this alternative would be less than significant, which is the same as the proposed Project.

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. The egg processing uses would continue onsite. At such time that egg processing operations cease, this alternative assumes stabilization of the buildings to retain the existing historic features and protect the resources from deteriorating, but not the adaptive reuse of the buildings and their occupancy. The remainder of the Project site would be developed with industrial and commercial business park uses (including the proposed gas station), and therefore the same type of hazardous materials would be used for construction and operation of this alternative. Similarly, the use and storage of hazardous materials would be regulated by the same federal, state, and local laws and permitting requirements as would be done by the proposed Project.

However, this alternative would not include removal of the underground storage tanks that are part of the modern Egg Processing facility; and would not remove and dispose of the asbestos containing materials and lead based paint within the 4 structures to be retained because construction on those structure would not occur under this alternative. Removal of the hazardous materials in the remainder of the site structures that would be demolished would be implemented according to existing laws and regulations, which are detailed in Section 5.8, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. Thus, under this alternative less removal of existing hazardous materials would occur. However, like the proposed Project, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts, and impacts that would occur by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Hydrology and Water Quality

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, and the remainder of the site would be redeveloped for industrial and commercial business park uses. Like the proposed Project, this alternative would introduce new sources of water pollutants from construction and operation activities from development of the industrial and commercial business park space. Additionally, this alternative would be required to include storm drain facility improvements, LID, source control, site design, and treatment control BMPs, that are similar to those included in the proposed Project. Therefore, the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would result in impacts to hydrology and water quality that are similar to those that would occur from the proposed Project. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### Land Use and Planning

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would implement the General Plan land use designations and Gateway Specific Plan for the Project site. In addition, the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would not result in demolition of a historic resource and would not conflict with any policies related to preservation of historic resources. As a result, impacts related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur from

implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative; and this alternative would avoid the land use and planning impact that would result from the proposed Project.

#### Noise

Construction and operation noise impacts would be similar under the Historic Resource Retention Alternative. Construction of this alternative would generate the same type and volume of construction noise as the proposed Project, the length of time of construction and the associated noise would be similar and the noise generated would affect the same sensitive receptors. Operational noise would be slightly less under this alternative as traffic-generated and stationary noise sources would decrease in relation to the reduction in industrial business park square footage. Additionally, this alternative would result in fewer employees being onsite that could generate noise and be exposed to noise from surrounding development and roadways. However, the location of the industrial business park uses would be the same distance to sensitive receptors as the proposed Project. Thus, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 that provides noise barriers to reduce operational noise, would continue to be required for the Historic Resource Retention Alternative. Overall, noise impacts from the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation and would be neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

#### **Public Services**

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project area by 500,000 square feet compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the number of employees on the Project site in relation to the reduction in square footage. However, as with the proposed Project, this alternative is not anticipated to result in new residents that could demand new services. Therefore, the needs for public services would be marginally reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed Project and impacts from the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less than significant, which is the same as the proposed Project.

#### Transportation

Construction and operation related traffic and truck trips would be reduced under the Historic Resource Retention Alternative because this alternative would decrease the development area by 500,000 square feet. The existing 126,500 square foot egg processing facility would continue to be operated. However, an overall reduction of 373,500 square feet of traffic generating uses would not occur from implementation of this alternative. The daily trips would be reduced in relation to the reduction of the building area, which would reduce volumes on all roadway segments and intersections. However, due to the existing LOS in the traffic study area and the volume of traffic that would be generated by the new 1,550,000 square foot industrial and commercial business park that would be developed by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative, this alternative would still require implementation of mitigation measures that involve roadway improvements in locations that are (1) not within the jurisdiction of the City of Norco, and thus, the City cannot guarantee implementation of the mitigation measure improvements, and (2) within the City of Norco, but not accounted for in an adopted plan or program for improvements. Under this alternative, the 60-foot main driveway would be redesigned and shifted south of Building 13; the other two driveways would be removed, leaving only two driveways for Phase 1. See Figure 7-1, Historic Resource Retention Alternative Site Plan. This would result in congestion at the two access driveways compared to the proposed Project's five driveways for Phase 1. The street and horse trail improvements along the west side of Mountain Avenue north of the northern driveway would not be possible to implement because the modern Egg Processing Building is immediate adjacent to Mountain Avenue. Compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would not protect pedestrians and horse riders from vehicle traffic. As a result, although traffic volumes generated from this alternative would be slightly less, impacts from implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would continue to be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, and the remainder of the site would be redeveloped for industrial and commercial business park uses. This alternative would not disturb the ground surface under or directly adjacent to the four historic resource buildings. Thus, any unknown tribal cultural resources under or subsurface and adjacent to these four buildings would not be affected by this alternative. However, development of the remainder of the site pursuant to this alternative would have the potential to adversely affect unknown tribal cultural resources. Like the proposed Project, mitigation measures would be required to be implemented during construction of this alternative to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, although the potential impacts that could occur from the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be slightly less than those associated with the proposed Project, the same mitigation measures would be required to ensure that impacts are less than significant.

#### **Utilities and Service Systems**

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would reduce buildout of the Project area by 550,000 square feet compared to the proposed Project. This would reduce the amount of water used and wastewater generated by the development. In addition, the number of employees on the Project site would be reduced along with the square footage of development, which would also reduce the demand for utilities and service systems. Furthermore, the demand for regional water supplies and generation of wastewater would be less than the proposed Project. Thus, the impacts related to water supplies and wastewater would be less than significant impacts, which is consistent with the proposed Project. Similarly, solid waste generation also would be less than the proposed Project and would require less landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts to utilities and service system from the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would be less than significant and consistent with the impacts that would occur from implementation of the proposed Project.

#### 7.8.1 CONCLUSION

#### Ability to Reduce Impacts

The Historic Resource Retention Alternative would retain the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building, which would avoid impacts to the historical resource on the Project site. Likewise, this alternative would not conflict with any policies related to preservation of historic resources. As a result, impacts related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur from implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative.

In addition, the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would reduce the volume of vehicular trips, which would decrease the impacts related to air quality and traffic. However, significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, and transportation would continue to occur from implementation of this alternative. This alterative would result in similar potential impacts related to biological resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources compared to the proposed Project; and the mitigation required for implementation of the proposed Project would continue to be required for the Historic Resource Retention Alternative to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Overall, although the volume of impacts would be less by the Historic Resource Retention Alternative in comparison to the proposed Project, it would not eliminate the need for mitigation to reduce impacts related to these resources.

#### **Ability to Achieve Project Objectives**

Implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives to redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the

departure of egg ranching from California. In addition, other objectives that include diversification of the economy, providing additional employment opportunities, implementation of the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan, and provision of a western/southwestern/early Californian design character, would not be met to the extent as would be achieved by the proposed Project.

### 7.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the "environmentally superior alternative" when significant environmental impacts result from a proposed project. The Environmentally Superior Alternative for the proposed Project would be the No Project/No Build Alternative. No substantially significant and long-term impacts would occur to the environment as a result of this No Project/No Build alternative. However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(3)(1) states:

The "no project" analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. (Emphasis added).

The Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives is the Historic Resource Retention Alternative, which would retain the four contributing elements of the Norco Egg Ranch that include the Eisen Residence and Garage, the original Egg Processing Building, and the modern Egg Processing Building. This alternative would avoid impacts to the historical resource on the Project site. Likewise, the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would not conflict with any policies related to preservation of historic resources. As a result, impacts related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would not occur from implementation of the Historic Resource Retention Alternative.

In addition, potential impacts from this alternative are less than the proposed Project because a 550,000 square foot reduction in development would occur from this alternative. However, the environmental topic areas that would require mitigation under the proposed Project would continue to be required for the Historic Resource Retention Alternative to reduce impacts to a less than significant level, and the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, and transportation would remain.

Regarding Project objectives, the Historic Resource Retention Alternative would not meet the Project objective to redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure of egg ranching from California. In addition, other objectives that include diversification of the economy, providing additional employment opportunities, implementation of the General Plan and Gateway Specific Plan, and provision of a western/southwestern/early Californian design character, would not be met to the extent as would be achieved by the proposed Project.

CEQA does not require the lead agency (the City of Norco) to choose the environmentally superior alternative. Instead, CEQA requires the City to consider environmentally superior alternatives, weigh those considerations against the environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and make findings that the benefits of those considerations outweigh the harm.

Table 7-1 provides, in summary format, a comparison between the level of impacts for each alternative and the proposed Project. In addition, Table 7-2 provides a comparison of the ability of each of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the proposed Project.

		Alternative 1: No	Alternative 2:	Alternative 3: Historic
	Proposed Project	Project/No Build	Reduced Intensity	Resource Retention
Aesthetics	Less than Significant	Same as proposed	Same as proposed	Greater than the
		Project	Project	proposed Project, but
			-	remain less than
				significant
Air Quality	Significant and	Less, no significant and	Less, but remains	Less, but remains
Unavoidable		unavoidable impact	Significant and	Significant and
onavoidable			Unavoidable	Unavoidable
Biological Resources	Less than Significant	Less, no impacts, no	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
-	with Mitigation	mitigation required Project		Project
Cultural Resources				
Historic	Significant and	Less, no significant and	Same as proposed	Less, no significant and
	Unavoidable	unavoidable impact	Project	unavoidable impact
			·	
Archaeologic	Less than Significant	Less, no impacts, no	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
-	with Mitigation	mitigation required	Project	Project
Energy	Less than Significant	Less than proposed	Less than proposed	Same as proposed
•	Ū.	Project	Project	Project
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant	Same as proposed	Same as proposed	Same and proposed
		Project	Project	Project
Greenhouse Gas	Less than Significant	Less than proposed	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
Emissions	Emissions		Project Project Pr	
Hazards and	Less than Significant	Less, but no hazardous	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
Hazardous Materials	lazardous Materials with Mitigation		Project	Project
		would occur		
Hydrology and Water	Hydrology and Water Less than Significant		Same as proposed	Same as proposed
Quality	Quality		Project	Project
Land Use and	Land Use and Significant and		Same as proposed	Less, no significant and
Planning	anning Unavoidable		Project	unavoidable impact
Noise	Less than Significant	Less, no impacts, no	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
	with Mitigation	mitigation required	Project	Project
Public Services	Less than Significant	Less than proposed	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
		Project	Project	Project
Transportation	Significant and	Less, no significant and	Less, but remains	Less, but remains
	Unavoidable	unavoidable impact	Significant and	Significant and
			Unavoidable	Unavoidable
Tribal Cultural	Less than Significant	Less, no impacts, no	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
Resources		mitigation required	mitigation required Project	
Utilities and Service Less than Significant		Less than proposed	Same as proposed	Same as proposed
Systems		Project Project F		Project
Eliminato Cignificant Impacts of the Project2		Voc. all	Ne none	Yes, Historic and
Enminate Significant Im	pucis of the Project:	res, dii	ino, none	Land Use and Planning
Areas of Reduced Impa	cts Compared to the	13	3	5
Project		13	5	5

#### Table 7-1: Impact Comparison of the Proposed Project and Alternatives

#### Table 7-2: Comparison of the Proposed Project and Alternatives Ability to Meet Objectives

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build	Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity	Alternative 3: Historic Resource Retention
To diversify the City of Norco economy with a mixed-use business park with a variety of buildings, including industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, R&D and commercial to ensure the site has a diversity of uses and long-term economic viability.	Yes	No	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
Redevelop former egg ranching properties in the economic nucleus of the City left underutilized with the departure	Yes	No	Yes	No

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build	Alternative 2: Reduced Intensity	Alternative 3: Historic
of egg ranching from California	110/00		Reduced michally	
To create a high quality, master planned mixed-use business park development on a large underutilized area that attracts an array of businesses and provides a variety of employment opportunities in the City of Norco thereby reducing the need for members of the local workforce to commute outside the area for employment.	Yes	No	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To provide industrial, warehousing, light manufacturing, flex, research and development and commercial uses within the Project boundaries which are compatible with surrounding uses and will also leverage the site's prime location and other regional transportation facilities to bring economic benefit to the area.	Yes	No	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To develop a mixed-use light industrial business park with structures flexible in design to meet the needs of an ever- changing business market that implements the General Plan and the Gateway Specific Plan.	Yes	No	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To provide a plan for roadways, infrastructure, and utilities to support onsite land uses and the City of Norco.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To promote sustainability by providing opportunities for water efficiency in the Project architecture and Project landscaping to promote water conservation.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To develop a Project that meets the architectural design guidelines of the Gateway Specific Plan that incorporates a quality western/southwestern/early Californian design character within the Project Area and provides enhanced.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, but not to the same extent as the proposed Project.
To provide a Project with attractive and functional buffers for sensitive adjacent land uses that include a combination of walls, plantings, earth berms, trees and varying setback depths.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Provide safe sidewalks and equestrian trails to enhance for pedestrian and equestrian access.	Yes	No	Yes	No

This page intentionally left blank.

# 8. Growth Inducement and Significant Irreversible Effects

## 8.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

This section analyzes the growth inducement potential of the proposed Project and the associated secondary effects of growth the Project might permit. As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d), an EIR must:

"Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a recycled water plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment."

A project can have a direct effect on population growth, for example, if it would involve construction of substantial new housing. A project could also have indirect growth-inducement potential if it would:

- Establish substantial new permanent employment opportunities (e.g., commercial, industrial, governmental, or other employment-generating enterprises) or otherwise stimulate economic activity;
- Remove a physical or regulatory obstacle to additional growth and development, such as removing a constraint to or increasing the capacity of a required public service (physical obstacle). For example, an increase in the capacity of utility or road infrastructure could allow either new or additional development in the surrounding area. A project could also include growth by removing a regulatory obstacle, such as by increasing allowable development intensity; or
- Stimulate economic activity within an area such that is would result in the need for additional housing, businesses, and services to support increased economic activities.

CEQA Guidelines do not distinguish between planned and unplanned growth for purposes of considering whether a project would foster additional growth. Therefore, for purposes of this EIR, to reach the conclusion that the project is growth inducing as defined by CEQA, the EIR must find that it would foster (i.e., promote or encourage) additional growth in economic activity, population, or housing, regardless of whether the growth is consistent with local plans or is beyond the level of growth that is anticipated by local plans. The conclusions set forth in this EIR regarding growth inducement do not address or imply whether such induced growth is beneficial or detrimental, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d).

If the analysis contained in this section determines that the proposed Project has growth inducing effects, the next question is whether that growth may cause adverse effects on the environment. Environmental effects resulting from induced growth (i.e., growth-induced effects) fit the CEQA definition of "indirect"

effects in Section 15358(a)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines. These indirect or secondary effects of growth may result in significant environmental impacts.

While CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to "discuss the ways" a project could induce growth, and to discuss project characteristics that may "encourage... activities that could significantly affect the environment," CEQA Guidelines do not require an EIR to attempt to predict where, when, or in what form induced growth might occur. The answers to such questions require substantial speculation, which CEQA discourages (CEQA Guidelines Section 15145).

Thus, any decision whether to allow projects that might result from induced growth is the subject of separate decision making by the lead agency responsible for considering such projects. Because the decision to allow growth is subject to separate discretionary decision making, and such decision making is itself subject to CEQA, the analysis of growth-inducing effects is not intended to determine site-specific environmental impacts or mitigation for the potentially induced growth. Rather, the discussion is intended to disclose the potential for environmental effects to occur more generally, such that decision makers are aware that additional environmental effects are a possibility if growth-inducing projects are approved. The decision of whether impacts do occur, their extent, and the ability to mitigate them is appropriately left to consideration by the agency responsible for approving such projects at such times as complete applications for development are submitted.

## Establish substantial new permanent employment opportunities or otherwise stimulate economic activity:

The proposed Project would result in development of 2,050,000 square feet of non-residential employment generating uses. Based on Riverside County's employment generation factors, (the City of Norco does not have estimated employment generation rates for land uses), Business Park land uses generate approximately one employee per 600 square feet (Riv GP). Therefore, buildout the proposed Project would result in approximately 3,417 new jobs/employment opportunities. In addition, the proposed business park would stimulate economic activity, as intended by the existing Gateway Specific Plan. As further described in Section 5.10, Land Use, the goal of the Gateway Specific Plan is to expand the economic base of the area through commercial and industrial development.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) growth projections estimates that employment in the City of Norco will increase from 19,000 in 2020 to 25,700 in 2040, which is an increase of 6,700 jobs or 35 percent. This is generally consistent with the projected growth throughout Riverside County, which is anticipated to increase from 848,700 jobs in 2020 to 1,174,300 jobs in 2020, which is a 38.4 percent increase (SCAG 2016 growth forecast). The employment generated by the proposed Project would represent 51 percent of the projected job growth, and the proposed employment growth would be within, and not exceed, SCAG's population forecast.

In addition, the proposed business park is consistent with the designated land uses in the Gateway Specific Plan and the General Plan. Because SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in land use plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a General Plan or Specific Plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's growth projections. Thus, the new employment opportunities would be within the forecasted and planned growth of the City; and would be consistent with the goal of the Gateway Specific Plan to stimulate economic activity. As such, the proposed Project would result in direct employment growth at a level that is already anticipated in regional projections; and thus, would be less than significant.

Additionally, the new jobs that would be generated by the proposed Project would accommodate the forecasted employment in an environmentally sustainable manner by improving the jobs to housing balance, that would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The land use within City of Norco is largely residential. The proposed Project would provide jobs near the existing housing base and would be easily accessible from I-15 that provides access to the site from surrounding communities. Also, as listed below, the City of Norco has had unemployment rates ranging between 3.7 and 11.4 percent over the last 10 years. As shown in Table 8-1, these unemployment rates are slightly lower, but trending similarly as the County as a whole (EDD, 2019). Table 8-1 shows that unemployment throughout the County of Riverside ranged between 4.4 and 13.3 percent over the last 10 years. The Project would assist with unemployment and accommodate projected growth within the City of Norco, which is consistent with the goals of the Gateway Specific Plan.

Date	City of Norco Unemployment Rates	County of Riverside Unemployment Rates
March 2019	4.3%	4.6%
March 2018	3.7%	4.4%
March 2017	4.6%	5.4%
March 2016	5.6%	6.4%
March 2015	5.5%	6.9%
March 2014	7.1%	8.8%
March 2013	8.1%	10.5%
March 2012	9.7%	12.0%
March 2011	10.7%	13.2%
March 2010	11.4%	13.3%

Table	8-1:	Unem	olovme	nt Rate	Trends
IGNIC	<b>U</b> -1.	<b>U</b> IICIII	<b>310 y 111</b> 0		1101103

Source: California Employment Development Department Local Area Unemployment Statistics program, 2019

The new jobs that would be created by the proposed Project would provide new employment opportunities to employees that are already living in Norco and the surrounding cities. As described previously, the City of Norco and surrounding areas are housing rich, and the increase in jobs from the Project would not create a corresponding increase in population or need for housing. Most of the new jobs that would be created by the proposed business park uses would be positions that do not require a specialized workforce. Thus, it is anticipated that these jobs would be filled by people who would already be living within Norco and surrounding communities and would not induce an unanticipated influx of new labor into the region. Overall, the proposed Project would develop the Project site pursuant to the Gateway Specific Plan designated land uses, which would accommodate forecasted employment growth consistent with SCAG's regional forecasts. Therefore, although the Project would establish new permanent employment opportunities and would stimulate economic activity, these impacts are planned for and would be less than significant.

#### Remove a physical or regulatory obstacle to additional growth and development:

The elimination of a physical obstacle to growth is considered to be a growth inducing impact. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The proposed Project would induce growth if it would provide public services or infrastructure with excess capacity to serve lands that would otherwise not be developable.

The Project would provide improvements to infrastructure to serve the Project. As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project includes various roadway improvements, as identified in Section 3.0, Project Description, which would provide safe passage to the Project site; but would not extend roadways into new undeveloped areas that would allow for additional growth and development.

The Project would also install new and/or improved water, sewer, and stormwater drainage facilities that would accommodate the proposed Project and would connect to the existing infrastructure. The water and sewer improvements would be designed to serve the proposed Project and would not be designed with excess capacity. Because the infrastructure improvements would only provide services to proposed development and accommodate existing development, and not provide excess capacity, water and sewer infrastructure improvements would not result in significant growth inducing impacts. The Project also includes offsite drainage infrastructure improvements, which would be developed to the specifications of the Riverside County Flood Control Master Drainage Plan that are planned improvements to meet the anticipated build out of the area, including the anticipated development of the Gateway Specific Plan. The drainage improvements would not accommodate growth beyond the existing needs of the area.

## Stimulate economic activity within an area such that is would result in the need for additional housing, businesses, and services to support increased economic activities:

Induced growth can occur outside of a project site as the result of direct and indirect investment and spending by residents, employees, and businesses. Such growth stems from the "induced" employment generated by a project's economic activity. Indirect employment growth generated by a direct increase in economic activity can be due to the increases in spending that would occur on the part of the businesses, employees, and employee households. It could also be due to the additional spending that would occur on the part of suppliers of goods and services demanded by a project's direct economic activity (households, businesses and employees).

As described previously, the proposed Project would implement economic activity that is intended by the Gateway Specific Plan and would result in an improvement in the jobs-household ratio by providing employment within the largely residential City of Norco, which is a benefit of the proposed Project. In addition, the location of the new employment opportunities would be easily accessible from I-15 and would also accommodate employees in surrounding communities. The City of Norco has had unemployment rates ranging between 3.7 and 11.4 percent over the last 10 years (EDD, 2019), and most of the new jobs that would be created by the Project would be positions that do not require a specialized workforce, and this type of workforce exists in the City and surrounding communities. Thus, due to the unemployment and the availability of a workforce, it is anticipated that new jobs that would be generated from implementation of the Project would be filled by people within Norco and surrounding communities and would not induce an unanticipated influx of new labor into the region or the need for additional housing. Additionally, the proposed business park would develop locations for new business and services. Thus, the Project would not result in the need to develop additional business or services to serve the increased economic activities that would result from the Project.

In summary, the economic activity resulting from the Project would be consistent with the intent of the Gateway Specific Plan and would accommodate the projected employment demands per SCAG's 2016 projections. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### Environmental Impacts of Induced Growth:

As described above, implementation of the proposed Project would provide development in compliance with the Gateway Specific Plan to accommodate SCAG's forecasted employment demands. All physical environmental effects from construction of development has been analyzed in all technical sections of this EIR. For example, activities such as excavation, grading, and construction as required for the proposed business park were analyzed in the Sections 5.2, Air Quality, 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 5.11, Noise, and 5.13, Transportation. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project has been analyzed in this EIR and would be adequately mitigated through implementation of existing regulations, plans, policies, and programs and/or mitigation measures contained within Chapter 5 of this EIR.
# **8.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS**

State CEQA Guidelines require the EIR to consider whether "uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely.... Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified." (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c)). "Nonrenewable resource" refers to the physical features of the natural environment, such as land, waterways, mineral resources, etc. These irreversible environmental changes may include current or future uses of non-renewable resources, and secondary or growth-inducing impacts that commit future generations to similar uses.

Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The proposed irretrievable commitments of nonrenewable resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

The proposed Project would result in or contribute to the following irreversible environmental changes:

- Lands in the Project area would be committed to business park uses once the proposed buildings are constructed. Secondary effects associated with this irreversible commitment of land resources include:
  - Changes in views associated with construction of the new buildings and associated development (see Section 5.1, Aesthetics).
  - Increased traffic on area roadways (see Section 5.13, Transportation).
  - Emissions of air pollutants associated with Project construction and operation (see Section 5.2, Air Quality).
  - Consumption of non-renewable energy associated with construction and operation of the Project due to the use of automobiles, lighting, heating and cooling systems, appliances, and the like (see Section 5.5, Energy).
  - Increased ambient noise associated with an increase in activities and traffic associated with the Project (see Section 5.11, *Noise*).
- Construction of the proposed Project as described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, would require the use of energy produced from non-renewable resources and construction materials.

In regard to energy usage from the proposed Project, as demonstrated in the analyses contained in Section 5.5, Energy, the proposed Project would not involve wasteful or unjustifiable use of non-renewable resources, and conservation efforts would be enforced during construction and operation of proposed development. The proposed development would incorporate energy-generating and conserving project design features, including those required by the California Building Code, California Energy Code Title 24, which specify green building standards for new developments. In addition, as listed in Section 3.0, Project Description and Section 5.5, Energy Resources, the proposed Project includes sustainability features that result in additional energy-efficiency. Project specific information related to energy consumption is provided in Section 5.5, Energy Resources, of this EIR.

# REFERENCES

California Employment Development Department Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program. Accessed at: https://data.edd.ca.gov/Labor-Force-and-Unemployment-Rates/Local-Area-Unemployment-Statistics-LAUS-/e6gw-gvii/data

County of Riverside General Plan Socioeconomic Build-out Projections Assumptions & Methodology (Riv GP). Accessed at:

https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general\_plan\_2008/technical\_appendices/App\_E\_Metho dology\_Adopted\_Final.pdf

# 9.0 EIR Preparers and Persons Contacted

# 9.1 EIR Preparers

## **City of Norco**

Steve King, Director of Planning Brent Arnold, Planning Consultant Dominic Milano, City Engineer Chad Blais, Public Works Director

## E | P | D Solutions, Inc.

Jeremy Krout, AICP Konnie Dobreva, JD Meghan Macias, TE Renee Escario Lauren Lockwood Alex Garber Brandon Whalen

## **Caldwell Land Solutions**

**Brent Caldwell** 

Carlile Coatsworth Architects, Architectural Plans Debra L. Sands, AIA

Glenn Lukos Associates, Inc., Biological Resources, Jurisdictional Delineation Lexi Kessans

Material Culture Consulting, Paleontological and Cultural Studies Tria Belcourt

## Michael Baker International, Civil Engineering Andy Torres

#### **Urban Crossroads, Air Quality Impact Analysis** Charlene So, P.E. Haseeb Qureshi

Jessica Wang

#### Urban Crossroads, Greenhouse Gas Analysis Haseeb Qureshi

Alyssa Tamase

Urban Crossroads, Noise Impact Analysis Bill Lawson, PE, INCE

**Urban Crossroads, Traffic Impact Analysis** Charlene So, P.E. Aric Evatt

# Urbana Preservation & Planning, LLC

Wendy Tinsley