

**ADDENDUM TO THE  
FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
FOR THE ONTARIO PLAN 2050**

**Part 150 Project  
(State Clearinghouse No. 2021070364)**

Lead Agency:



**CITY OF ONTARIO**  
Planning Department  
303 East B Street  
Ontario, CA 91764  
Contact: David F. Eoff IV, Principal Planner  
909.395.2425

Prepared By:

**MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL**  
5 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 500  
Santa Ana, CA 92707  
Contact: Frances Yau, AICP  
949.472.3505

July 1, 2025

JN 204825

This document is designed for double-sided printing to conserve natural resources.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Project Location .....	1
1.2	Previous Environmental Documents .....	4
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Description of Project Modifications .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Addendum’s Purpose and Need .....	7
2.2	Environmental Setting.....	8
2.3	Modified Project Description .....	10
2.4	Addendum Scope of Environmental Review.....	13
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Environmental Assessment.....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Impacts Having No Potential to Result in New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts .....	14
3.2	Impacts Potentially Resulting in New or Substantially More Severe Significant Impacts.....	22
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Determination/Addendum Conclusion .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>79</b>

**EXHIBITS**

1 Regional Vicinity ..... 2  
2 Site Vicinity ..... 3  
3 Tentative Parcel Map..... 12

**TABLES**

1 Proposed Modified Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions ..... 26  
2 Proposed Modified Project Localized Significance of Operational Emissions .... 30  
3 Proposed Modified Project Energy Consumption ..... 46  
4 Proposed Modified Project Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions ..... 50  
5 Consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan: AB 32 GHG Inventory Sectors ..... 52  
6 Consistency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS ..... 54  
7 Existing Traffic Noise Levels..... 62  
8 Noise Measurements..... 62  
9 Traffic Noise Levels With and Without Modified Project Comparison ..... 66

**APPENDICES**

- A Cultural/Paleo Resources Report
- B Air Quality/GHG/Energy Data
- C Biological Resources Assessment
- D Noise Data
- E VMT Analysis

## 1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

In 2009 and 2010, the City of Ontario (City), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Recirculated Draft EIR, and a Final EIR for *The Ontario Plan* (TOP). These documents are collectively referred to in this document as the 2010 TOP EIR. TOP consisted of a six-part component framework: 1) Vision, 2) Governance Manual, 3) Policy Plan (General Plan), 4) City Council Priorities, 5) Implementation, and 6) Tracking and Feedback, to guide development of Ontario 20 years or more into the future.

In 2022, the City prepared *The Ontario Plan 2050 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report* (TOP 2050 SEIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2021070364) for *The Ontario Plan 2050* (TOP 2050), which was an update to TOP to guide the City's development and conservation for the next 30 years through 2050. TOP 2050 is referred to herein as the "approved project."

The Part 150 Project (referred to herein as the "modified project") proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre project site into six parcels with a development potential of up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. This Addendum has been prepared to determine whether the modified project would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts compared to the impacts of the approved project as disclosed in TOP 2050 SEIR.

### 1.1 **PROJECT LOCATION**

The City of Ontario is in the southwestern portion of San Bernardino County and is surrounded by the cities of Upland and Rancho Cucamonga to the north; the City of Fontana and unincorporated San Bernardino County to the east; the cities of Eastvale and Jurupa Valley to the south; and the cities of Chino and Montclair and unincorporated San Bernardino County to the west; refer to Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity*.

As shown on Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity*, the approximately 81-acre project site is located in the western portion of the City. The site is bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad (Alhambra Subdivision Line) to the north, Grove Avenue to the east, Ontario Boulevard and Metrolink Railroad/Union Pacific Railroad (Los Angeles Subdivision Line) to the south, and Bon View Avenue to the west. The Ontario International Airport is located further to the east, across Grove Avenue.





Source: Google Earth Pro, January 2025

## 1.2 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

The following documents are incorporated by reference as a means of reducing redundancy and the length of the Addendum.

### **The Ontario Plan Final Environmental Impact Report**

In 2009 and 2010, the City prepared a Draft EIR, Recirculated Draft EIR, and Final EIR for TOP. These documents are collectively referred to in this document as the 2010 TOP EIR. TOP consisted of a six-part component framework: 1) Vision, 2) Governance Manual, 3) Policy Plan (General Plan), 4) City Council Priorities, 5) Implementation, and 6) Tracking and Feedback, to guide development of Ontario 20 years or more into the future.

The 2009 Draft EIR identified six environmental topical areas (Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Global Climate Change, Noise, and Traffic and Transportation) with significant and unavoidable impacts.

The 2009 Recirculated Draft EIR was released to provide additional analysis related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts associated with buildout of TOP.

Pursuant to Section 15088.5(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that if an EIR revision is “limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified,” only the following topic areas were analyzed in the 2009 Recirculated Draft EIR:

- Global Climate Change; and
- Additional Project Alternative: 15 percent GHG Reduction Alternative.

Remaining topics previously analyzed in the 2009 Draft EIR were determined to be adequately addressed. Analysis in the 2009 Recirculated Draft EIR found that significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the 2009 Draft EIR would remain significant and unavoidable. These determinations were reiterated in the 2010 TOP EIR when it was certified on January 27, 2010.

Under the 2010 TOP, the project site was designated Industrial and Airport and thus, the 2010 TOP EIR analyzed buildout of the project site based on the Industrial and Airport land use designations and zoning.

### **The Ontario Plan 2050 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report**

In 2022, the City prepared TOP 2050 SEIR for *The Ontario Plan 2050* (TOP 2050), which was an update to TOP to guide the City’s development and conservation for the next 30 years through 2050. TOP 2050 is a focused effort, with particular emphasis on technical refinements to the Policy Plan to comply with State housing mandates; conform with new State laws related to community health, environmental justice, climate adaptation,

resiliency, and mobility; bring long-term growth and fiscal projections into alignment with current economic conditions; and advance the Implementation Plan and Tracking and Feedback system.

TOP 2050 fulfills the City's mandatory Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) obligation. TOP 2050 brings long-term growth and fiscal projections into alignment with current economic conditions as well as property owner and stakeholder requests, to support the vision for Ontario.

TOP 2050 SEIR identified significant and unavailable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation.

The project site's land use designations remained the same between the 2010 TOP and updated TOP 2050. As such, similar to the 2010 TOP EIR, TOP 2050 SEIR analyzed buildout of the site based on the Industrial and Airport land use designations. Specifically, the Industrial land use designation has a 0.55 floor area ratio (FAR) and is intended for a variety of light industrial uses, including warehousing/distribution, assembly, light manufacturing, research and development, storage, repair facilities, and supporting retail and professional office uses. The Airport land use designation is intended for airport-related uses, including terminals, parking, service commercial, distribution, hangers, repair, and warehousing. Based on the maximum 0.55 FAR, the 81-acre project site would accommodate approximately 1.9 million square feet of industrial use, which was contemplated as part of TOP 2050 full buildout and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR.

Overall, TOP 2050 assumed all areas designated Industrial and Airport within the City would result in approximately 181 million square feet of industrial development capacity.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **2.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT MODIFICATIONS**

### **2.1 ADDENDUM'S PURPOSE AND NEED**

When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent or supplemental environmental review documentation shall be required unless one or more of the following events occurs:

- 1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- 2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- 3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - A. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - B. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - C. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - D. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162).

When none of the above events has occurred, yet minor technical changes or additions to the previously adopted EIR or negative declaration are necessary, an addendum may be prepared (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(b)).

As demonstrated in this Addendum, none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of subsequent environmental review have occurred. This Addendum supports the conclusion that the modified project's proposed changes are minor or technical changes that do not result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. In addition, as discussed below, the modified project modifications would not result in any new or substantially increased significant environmental impacts, no new mitigation measures, or no new alternatives that would substantially reduce significant impacts. As a result, an addendum is an appropriate CEQA document for analysis and consideration of the modified project modifications.

In determining whether subsequent environmental review is required, a lead agency is also required to determine whether mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be infeasible are now feasible and would substantially reduce previously identified significant impacts. TOP 2050 SEIR addressed a reasonable range of alternatives for the approved project. As demonstrated throughout this Addendum, the severity of previously identified significant impacts would not be increased upon implementation of the modified project, and as such it is not necessary to consider mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be infeasible. As such, there is no new information indicating that an alternative or mitigation measure that was previously rejected as infeasible is in fact feasible, or that a considerably different alternative than those previously studied would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

Circulation of an addendum for public review is not necessary (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subdivision (c)); however, the addendum must be considered in conjunction with the adopted Final EIR by the decision-making body (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, subdivision (d)). The modified project is an Addendum to TOP 2050 SEIR (i.e., the certified Final EIR).

## 2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Located in a highly developed and urbanized environment, the project site is a mostly vacant, disturbed site. Existing developments on-site include industrial uses in the northeastern portion of the site and the former Ontario Access Center in the southwestern corner of the site.<sup>1</sup> An existing well site is also present along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to Grove Avenue.

A network of local streets (partially improved with sidewalk, curb, and gutter) provides access throughout the project site. Several concrete barricades prohibit access to certain internal roadways on-site. Street signs and aboveground utility poles are also present throughout the site; however, there is no street lighting on-site.

Ruderal vegetation and ornamental landscaping are present on-site, including nonnative trees and shrubs. Building pads and debris from historic uses on-site (e.g., industrial and

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Ontario Housing Services Department, *Continuum of Care*, <https://www.ontarioca.gov/ContinuumCare>, accessed December 31, 2024.

residential) are also present throughout the site. The project site is surrounded by development on all four sides, including the Union Pacific Railroad (Alhambra Subdivision Line) to the north and Metrolink Railroad/Union Pacific Railroad (Los Angeles Subdivision Line) to the south.

## GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

According to TOP 2050 Figure LU-01, *Land Use Plan*, the project site is designated Industrial and Airport. The Industrial land use designation has a 0.55 floor area ratio (FAR) and is intended for a variety of light industrial uses, including warehousing/distribution, assembly, light manufacturing, research and development, storage, repair facilities, and supporting retail and professional office uses. This designation also accommodates activities that could potentially generate impacts, such as noise, dust, and other nuisances. The Airport land use designation is intended for airport-related uses, including terminals, parking, service commercial, distribution, hangers, repair, and warehousing.

## ZONING

According to the City's *Official Zoning Map*, dated January 1, 2016, the site is zoned General Industrial (IG) and Ontario International Airport (ONT). The IG zoning district is established to accommodate a wide range of manufacturing and assembly activities, storage and warehousing activities, and other similar uses developed at a maximum intensity of 0.55 FAR. The ONT zoning district is established to accommodate the Ontario International Airport and surrounding properties directly impacted by airport operations. This zoning district includes uses such as airport terminals (including commercial and service uses related to the terminals), car rental agencies, and airport-related industrial, and delivery uses developed at a maximum intensity of 0.55 FAR.

## SURROUNDING LAND USES

Surrounding land uses include a mix of commercial, residential, airport, and industrial uses, which are further described as follows:

- ***North:*** The Union Pacific Railroad (Alhambra Subdivision Line) bounds the project site to the north. Single-family residences and commercial uses, including Suppose U Drive, Lariz's Furniture Manufacturing, Logos Logistics Distribution, and the Social Security Administration, are located further north. These land uses are designated Business Park, and zoned Industrial Park (IP).
- ***East:*** Grove Avenue bounds the project site to the east. Further east are commercial uses, including Extra Space Storage and Career Advantage Personnel Services. The Ontario International Airport and airport-related industrial uses are also located to the east of Grove Avenue. Land uses to the east are designated Industrial and Airport, and zoned General Industrial (IG) and Ontario International Airport (ONT).

- South: Ontario Boulevard and the Metrolink Railroad/Union Pacific Railroad (Los Angeles Subdivision Line) bound the project site to the south. Further south are commercial and industrial uses, including Fleet RV & Boat Storage, Klein Products, Patton's Steel Corporate Offices, California Auto Auction, and Chinatex Oriental USA. Land uses to the south are designated Industrial and Business Park, and zoned IG and Light Industrial (IL).
- West: Bon View Avenue bounds the project site to the west. Further west are industrial and commercial uses, including D&M Metals, Olivas Auto Body, and HOLT Auto Body, among others. Land uses to the west are designated Industrial and zoned IG.

### 2.3 MODIFIED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The modified project proposes a Tentative Parcel Map that would consolidate 248 small individual parcels located on an approximately 81-acre site into six parcels, with dedicated right-of-way in order to accommodate up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. TOP 2050 SEIR contemplated and analyzed this use (i.e., development of up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space) at this site based on the site's Industrial and Airport land use designations and IG and ONT zoning (maximum 0.55 FAR), consistent with TOP 2050. However, under existing State land use law, the development of this industrial warehouse space is not possible unless the 248 small parcels are consolidated through the proposed Tentative Parcel Map. The modified project thus facilitates the development of the industrial warehouse space that was proposed and previously analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. In total, 248 parcels would be consolidated into six proposed numbered parcels as part of a Tentative Parcel Map. As shown on Exhibit 3, Tentative Parcel Map, Parcels 1, 2, and 3 would encompass approximately 29 acres north of State Street; Parcels 4, 5, and 6 would encompass approximately 41 acres south of State Street. The proposed Tentative Parcel Map would also reflect eight existing lots; these lots are not a part of the modified project.

The modified project would not change the land use designations or zoning of the project site and would therefore accommodate industrial development in accordance with the site's existing Industrial and Airport designations and IG and ONT zoning districts. As stated, the Industrial and Airport land use designations and IG and ONT zoning districts accommodate a number of industrial uses, including warehousing. Future industrial warehouse development on-site would be subject to a maximum 0.55 FAR intensity and height restrictions by the *Ontario Development Code* (Development Code) Chapter 6, Division 6.01, *District Standards and Guidelines*, the Ontario Land Use Compatibility Plan (ONT ALUCP), and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). At full buildout, the 81-acre site would accommodate up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial use. Specifically, the modified project would allow up to 1,140,000 square feet warehouse, 570,000 square feet manufacturing, and 190,000 square feet high cube cold storage warehouse uses. As no changes are proposed to the site's existing Industrial and Airport land use designations and IG and ONT zoning districts, buildout of the approximately 81-acre site with up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial use (based on a maximum 0.55 FAR intensity) under the

modified project was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Further, as detailed in TOP 2050 SEIR Table 3-3, *TOP 2050 Proposed Land Use Summary*, TOP 2050 SEIR projected a total of approximately 181 million square feet of industrial development capacity within Ontario, including buildout of the project site based on the site's existing land use and zoning.

In accordance with *Ontario Municipal Code* (Municipal Code) Section 7-4.02, *Required improvements*, additional future improvements would include new on-site local roadways, connecting the modified project site with surrounding off-site roadways. Street frontage improvements for on-site roadways, including sidewalk, curb, gutter, street paving, streetlights, and parkway tree, would also be provided. Other site improvements that future industrial development on-site would be required to provide include utilities and infrastructure connections to existing City services (e.g., water, wastewater, storm drain, and dry utilities). Further, future development on-site would be subject to off-street parking, landscaping, the ONT ALUCP, and other development standards specific to IG and ONT zoning districts.

## **DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS**

The modified project is anticipated to require the following City discretionary permits and approvals:

- CEQA Clearance; and
- Tentative Parcel Map.



## 2.4 ADDENDUM SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

As discussed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts or no impact with regard to the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics;
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources;
- Biological Resources;
- Energy;
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing;
- Public Services;
- Recreation;
- Utilities; and
- Wildfire.

TOP 2050 SEIR established that, with mitigation, the approved project would result in less than significant impacts related to the following environmental issue areas:

- Geology and Soils; and
- Tribal Cultural Resources.

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that the approved project would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- Air Quality;
- Cultural Resources;
- Noise; and
- Transportation.

This Addendum addresses changes resulting from implementation of the modified project to each of the environmental resource areas noted above.

### **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

This comparative analysis has been undertaken to analyze whether the modified project would result in any new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts as compared to the approved project that has been subject to TOP 2050 SEIR. The comparative analysis discusses whether impacts are greater than, less than, or similar to the conclusions discussed in TOP 2050 SEIR.

#### **3.1 IMPACTS HAVING NO POTENTIAL TO RESULT IN NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS**

- Aesthetics: Ontario is in a highly developed, urban/suburban area. According to TOP 2050 SEIR, the dominant scenic resource in the City is the San Gabriel Mountain range to the north; other prominent scenic resources are the Jurupa Mountains and the San Bernardino Mountains to the east, the Santa Ana Mountains to the south, and the Chino Hills to the southwest. There are no officially designated State scenic highways in the City; however, the Euclid Corridor and the Mission Boulevard Corridor are designated local scenic corridors. Additionally, scenic vistas are available along formal and informal recreational trails throughout the City.

The modified project site is relatively flat. The San Gabriel Mountain range is visible to the north, but partially obstructed due to existing development on-site, long distance, and intervening vegetation and development. Views of the modified project site from surrounding uses and adjacent roadways include industrial developments in the northeastern portion of the site, the former Ontario Access Center in the southwestern corner of the site, and vacant and disturbed land throughout the remainder of the site. Surrounding urban development includes a mix of commercial, residential, airport, and industrial uses. The site is bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad (Alhambra Subdivision Line) to the north, Grove Avenue to the east, Ontario Boulevard and the Metrolink Railroad/Union Pacific Railroad (Los Angeles Subdivision Line) to the south, and Bon View Avenue to the west. A network of local streets provides access throughout the modified project site.

There are no scenic resources located within or adjacent to the modified project site, and the modified project does not propose any physical development of the site or changes to the existing land uses and zoning designations on-site. Nonetheless, as the modified project is consistent with the land use designations, zoning, FAR intensity, the ONT ALUCP, and height restrictions for the project site as identified in TOP 2050, future buildout of the site in accordance with the modified project has been previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, existing views of the San Gabriel Mountains from the modified project site would not be further obstructed due to future site buildout, and views

of the modified project site from adjacent roadways and uses would not be further impacted.

No local scenic corridors exist within or adjacent to the modified project site; additionally, the nearest eligible State scenic highway to the modified project site is a segment of State Route 142 in Chino Hills, located approximately 7.6 miles to the southwest.<sup>2</sup> As such, the modified project would not impact a State scenic highway.

Upon compliance with existing Municipal Code, Development Code, ONT ALUCP, and FAA requirements related to building height restrictions, and adherence to the design review process, future development within the modified project site would not conflict with existing zoning and regulations governing scenic quality. Additionally, future development would be subject to the Municipal Code and Development Code regarding potential light and glare impacts. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that aesthetic impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources: According to the California Department of Conservation, the modified project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land.<sup>3</sup> As such, no agriculture or forestry resources occur on-site. TOP 2050 SEIR determined that agriculture and forestry resources impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.
  
- Geology and Soils: According to the California Geologic Survey (CGS), the project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone.<sup>4</sup> The closest fault line is the Red Hill-Etiwanda Avenue fault, located approximately 2.6 miles north of the project site.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, Southern California has numerous active seismic faults subjecting residents to potential earthquake and seismic-related hazards. Therefore, the modified project site is anticipated to experience moderate to occasionally high levels of ground motion from nearby faults as well as ground

---

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Transportation, *California State Scenic Highway System Map*, <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>, accessed January 19, 2025.

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Conservation, *California Important Farmland Finder*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

<sup>4</sup> California Department of Conservation, *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

<sup>5</sup> California Department of Conservation, *Fault Activity Map of California*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

motions from other active seismic areas of the Southern California region. As such, future buildout of the modified project site would be required to comply with the seismic safety provisions of the California Building Code (CBC) (Title 24, Part 2 of the California Code of Regulations). Such compliance would minimize potential hazards arising from ground shaking.

The modified project site and surrounding area are relatively level and built out with no nearby hills or slopes that could result in landslide hazards. Thus, potential landslide hazards are negligible. Based on Figure 5.7-1, *Geologic Map*, of TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project site is underlain by artificial fill, which varies widely in size, age, and composition. Non-engineered fills are not suitable foundation materials; as such, future development on the modified project site would likely require excavation of the fill and replacement with compacted, engineered fill before loads such as buildings and roads can be constructed. Overall, in order to reduce impacts related to liquefaction, seismically induced settlement, ground subsidence, compressible soils, and expansive soils, future development on the modified project site would be required to comply with TOP 2050 Safety Element, the Municipal Code, the Development Code, ONT ALUCP, the CBC, and all other applicable federal, State, and local regulations associated with these risks.

Future development projects on the modified project site would also require compliance with the CBC and review of grading plans for future development by the City Engineer to ensure no significant impacts regarding soil erosion occur. In addition, future development would be required to comply with the requirements of the State's Construction General Permit (CGP), including preparation of a Notice of Intent and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Following compliance with existing regulations, impacts pertaining to soil erosion would be minimized. Nonetheless, the modified project would not involve any development and as such would not result in soil erosion.

The *Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Ontario Part 150 Project, City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California* (Cultural/Paleo Resources Report), prepared by Michael Baker International, and dated February 27, 2025, included a records search with the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC), a geological map review, and a literature review of relevant paleontological databases; refer to [Appendix A, \*Cultural/Paleo Resources Report\*](#). The NHMLAC records search identified no previously recorded fossil localities within the modified project area, but several fossil localities were found within 10 miles of the site, including mammoth, horse, camel, and whip snake fossils from the Pleistocene epoch. The modified project area consists of Holocene to late Pleistocene alluvial deposits, which have a low potential for containing significant paleontological resources. The geological context suggests that while the potential for encountering paleontological resources is low, it cannot be entirely ruled out due to the presence of similar fossil-bearing formations nearby. While the modified project itself does not propose any development that could lead to the

discovery of paleontological resources, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 would be applicable to the modified project, which requires that, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources during grading and excavation of the site, a qualified archaeologist is required to assess the find and develop a course of action to preserve the find. Accordingly, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a level that is less than significant.

Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that geology and soils impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would result be less than significant with implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The modified project site is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, the nearest school to the modified project site, Lincoln Elementary School, is located approximately 0.40-mile to the north at 440 North Allyn Avenue. Further, the modified project does not involve any construction or development, and as such would not result in risks involving hazardous materials.

Future buildout of the modified project site could involve the use and storage of hazardous materials typically associated with and in standard quantities for the operation and maintenance of construction equipment, such as paints and solvents, gasoline, and diesel fuels. However, the presence of such materials would be limited to the short-term construction phase, and all modified project-related construction activities would be subject to applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, specifically those established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and California Highway Patrol, as well as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act. Additionally, similar to the approved project, operation of future industrial and airport uses that would involve the use of hazardous materials would be regulated by the California Fire Code, as well as other federal, State, the ONT ALUCP, and local regulations related to the protection of the public's health and safety. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency, *Cortese List Data Resources*, <http://calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

- Hydrology and Water Quality: According to Figure 5.10-2, *Flood Hazard Zones*, of TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project site is located outside of a flood hazard zone. The modified project does not involve any development; nonetheless, and similar to the approved project, future buildout of the modified project site is not anticipated to exacerbate risk of flood hazards, tsunamis, or seiches or risk release of pollutants due to inundation.

Future development would increase impervious areas, thus increasing runoff and flows into storm drainage systems. However, proposed buildout of the modified project site is consistent with buildout of the site as contemplated in TOP 2050 SEIR and as such would not result in increase in impervious area above what TOP 2050 analyzed. Further, future project-specific development on-site would be required to prepare hydrology and hydraulic studies in accordance with the County Hydrology Manual and analyze stormwater flows that result from the 100-year storm event to ensure that the capacities of existing and planned storm drain systems are not exceeded. Additionally, future projects would be required to comply with the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) multiple separate storm sewer system (MS4) permit and the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program. Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, including low impact design (LID) strategies and construction and post-construction BMPs, future development would not result in significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that hydrology and water quality impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- Land Use and Planning: TOP 2050 SEIR analyzed buildout of the site based on the Industrial and Airport land use designations. Overall, TOP 2050 assumed all areas designated Industrial and Airport within the City would result in approximately 181 million square feet of industrial development capacity. The modified project site is currently designated Industrial and Airport, and is zoned IG and ONT. The modified project does not propose any physical development on the site, or changes to existing land uses and zoning designations on-site. Based on the maximum 0.55 FAR, the 81-acre project site would accommodate approximately 1.9 million square feet of industrial use, which was contemplated as part of TOP 2050 full buildout and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, future buildout of the site following implementation of the modified project would be the same as the buildout anticipated by and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Future development would be required to demonstrate consistency with the existing TOP 2050, Municipal Code, Development Code, the ONT ALUCP, and FAA policies, standards, and requirements. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that land use and planning impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP

2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- Mineral Resources: According to Figure 5.12-1, *Areas of Mineral Resources Significance*, of TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project site is identified as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), which is defined as areas where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be determined from the available data. Future development in an MRZ-3 area would not result in significant impacts because mineral resources of Statewide or local importance are not identified in those areas on the California Geological Survey's maps. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that mineral resources impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.
  
- Population and Housing: No new housing is proposed, and no existing residences would be displaced under the modified project. Additionally, the modified project would not change existing land use designations or zoning on site. Given that the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, and FAR for the project site identified and analyzed in TOP 2050, population and employment growth due to implementation of the modified project was previously forecasted and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR and incorporated into the City's and SCAG's growth projections. Therefore, buildout potential of the modified project site, including employment generation and resulting population growth related to new industrial and airport uses, would be consistent with TOP 2050 SEIR. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that population and housing impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.
  
- Public Services: TOP 2050 SEIR determined that buildout of the modified project site in accordance with the site's existing land use designations and zoning would be adequately served by existing and planned public services. As discussed above under *Population and Housing*, given that the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, and FAR for the project site identified in TOP 2050, population and employment growth due to implementation of the modified project was previously forecasted and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, while future industrial development on-site may be growth-inducing and consequently increase demand for public services, including police protection, fire protection, school, and library services compared to existing conditions, this demand was contemplated in TOP 2050 SEIR. Thus, buildout of the modified project site would be adequately served by existing and planned public services. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that public services impacts associated with

buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- Recreation: TOP 2050 SEIR determined that buildout of the modified project site in accordance with the site's existing land use designations and zoning would be adequately served by existing and planned parks and other recreational facilities. Given that the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, and FAR for the project site identified in TOP 2050, anticipated growth due to implementation of the modified project was previously analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, while future industrial development on-site may be growth-inducing and consequently increase demands for parks and other recreational facilities compared to existing conditions, this demand was contemplated in TOP 2050 SEIR. Thus, buildout of the modified project site would be adequately served by existing and planned park facilities. Additionally, no housing is proposed under the modified project. As such, demand for parks and other recreational facilities would not substantially increase. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that recreation impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.
  
- Utilities and Service Systems: TOP 2050 SEIR determined that buildout of the modified project site in accordance with the site's existing land use designations and zoning would be adequately served by existing and planned utilities and services systems. Given that the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, and FAR for the project site identified in TOP 2050, anticipated growth due to implementation of the modified project was previously analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, while future industrial development on-site would increase demand for utilities and services systems (i.e., water, wastewater, stormwater, dry utilities, and solid waste) compared to existing conditions, this demand was contemplated in TOP 2050 SEIR. Additionally, future development on-site would be required to undergo separate environmental review under CEQA to evaluate project-level impacts with regards to utilities and service systems. Specifically, a Water Supply Assessment shall be required for the entire project area to determine whether adequate water supply would be available to serve future industrial development on-site once a development plan is in place. Furthermore, future development would be subject to payment of applicable standard connection fees and compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulatory requirements. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that utilities and service system impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP

2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

- **Wildfire:** According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire, the modified project site is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zone.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, according to Figure 5.20-2, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones*, of TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project site is not located in or near a fire hazard zone. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that wildfire impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:**

- 5-2 In areas of documented or inferred from evident archaeological and/or paleontological resource presence, City staff shall require applicants for development permits to provide studies to document the presence/absence of such resources. On properties where resources are identified, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:
- a) Archaeologists and/or paleontologist shall be retained for the modified project and will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.
  - b) Should any cultural resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director or designee is satisfied that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.
  - c) Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by a San Bernardino County Certified Professional Archaeologist/Paleontologist. If significance criteria are met, then the modified project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates, and other special studies; submit materials to a museum for permanent curation; and provide a comprehensive final report including a catalog with museum numbers.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures: None.**

---

<sup>7</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area*, effective April 1, 2024, <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008>, accessed January 19, 2025.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

## **3.2 IMPACTS POTENTIALLY RESULTING IN NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS**

### **3.2.1 Air Quality**

#### **Approved Project Findings**

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, TOP 2050 would be inconsistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)'s *Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)* because buildout under TOP 2050 would generate short- and long-term emissions that exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). Additionally, operation of industrial and warehousing land uses accommodated under TOP 2050 could expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic air contaminant concentrations.

Incorporation of mitigation measures that would apply to a development project's construction phase (2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1) and operational phase (2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1) would reduce short- and long-term emissions and subsequently, reduce impacts associated with consistency with the SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP. Additionally, TOP 2050 goals and policies would promote increased capacity for alternative transportation modes.

However, due to the magnitude of residential units that would be planned under TOP 2050 to accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment requirements, no additional mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts to below SCAQMD thresholds. Impact pertaining to consistency with an adopted AQMP, short-term and long-term air pollutants emissions, and health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors would remain significant and unavoidable.

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, TOP 2050 would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

#### **Modified Project Analysis**

##### Project Consistency with AQMP

In December 2022, SCAQMD released the 2022 AQMP. The 2022 AQMP continues to evaluate current integrated strategies and control measures to meet the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), 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. Like the 2016 AQMP, the 2022 AQMP incorporates scientific and technological information and planning

assumptions, including the *2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (2020-2045 RTP/SCS), a planning document that supports the integration of land use and transportation to help the region meet the Federal Clean Air Act requirements. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) updates the RTP/SCS every four years and the most recent plan, the 2024-2050 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal 2024) was adopted on April 4, 2024. Connect SoCal 2024 is a vision for the future of southern California that includes policies, strategies, and projects to advance the region's mobility, economy, and sustainability through 2050. While SCAG recently adopted the Connect SoCal 2024, the SCAQMD has not released an updated AQMP. As such, this consistency analysis is based off the 2022 AQMP and the RTP/SCS that was adopted at the time, the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The modified project's consistency with the AQMP will be determined using the 2022 AQMP as discussed below.

- *Consistency Criterion No. 1:* Will the modified project result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP?

As demonstrated below in Table 1, *Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*, the modified project would have a volatile organic compound (VOC) exceedance during operations of future industrial development, which is consistent with the findings of TOP 2050 SEIR. However, as the modified project would only consolidate parcels under a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, future development would be within the scope of TOP 2050 and would not generate emissions beyond what was forecasted in TOP 2050 SEIR. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. TOP 2050 SEIR concluded the approved project would have significant and unavoidable impact due to exceedance of VOC despite of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1. 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 requires all developments to include access or linkages to alternative modes of transportation. TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1 requires project applicants to prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation-phase-related air quality impacts and apply possible mitigation measures if thresholds are exceeded. The modified project would be required to implement 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1 and would not result in impacts more than the approved project, which was evaluated as significant and unavoidable impact in TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR regarding AQMP consistency.

- *Consistency Criterion No. 2:* Will the modified project exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of project buildout phase?

There is no specific construction or development proposed within the modified project site at this time. Future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Furthermore, as the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, the population and employment growth of the modified project was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR and incorporated into the City's and SCAG's growth projections. Subsequently, the modified project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or affect the City's or SCAG's buildout projections. Moreover, the 2022 AQMP was adopted after TOP 2050 SEIR, and therefore the 2022 AQMP already incorporated growth projected under the TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, the modified project's growth has been accounted for in the 2022 AQMP. As the modified project would be consistent with land uses previously envisioned for the site based on the General Plan, the modified project would be considered consistent with the growth forecasts in the 2022 AQMP.

TOP 2050 designates the modified project site as Industrial and Airport. The site is zoned IG and ONT. Existing on-site land use and zoning designations would remain as-is and would accommodate industrial development in accordance with the site's Industrial and Airport designations and IG and ONT zoning districts. As such, the future industrial development on-site would be subject to a maximum 0.55 floor to area ratio intensity and height restrictions by Development Code Chapter 6, Division 6.01, *District Standards and Guidelines*, the ONT ALUCP, and the FAA. Since the modified project's proposed land uses are consistent with TOP 2050, operational-source air pollutant emissions would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR. Further, future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as well as other control measures to reduce construction and operational emissions. Therefore, the modified project is determined to be consistent with the second criterion.

In conclusion, the modified project would have the potential to result in or cause federal and/or State ambient air quality standards (i.e., National Ambient Air Quality Standards [NAAQS] and/or CAAQS) violations as the operational emissions from the modified project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for VOC, which is consistent with the findings of the TOP 2050 SEIR. However, the modified project would only consolidate parcels through a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050. As such, future development would be within the scope of TOP 2050. Also, the approved project was concluded to result in significant and unavoidable impacts despite implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1. The modified project's proposed uses are consistent with the site's land use designation and the modified project would not result in any new impacts related to construction and operational emissions. As such, the

modified project would be consistent with the 2022 AQMP and would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

### Construction Emissions

The modified project proposes a Tentative Parcel Map to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to accommodate development of up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. TOP 2050 SEIR assumed buildout of the site based on the site's IG and ONT zoning and maximum 0.55 FAR intensity. TOP 2050 SEIR contemplated and analyzed the impacts of such industrial warehouse development at the site and the modified project does not propose any changes in use for the site. However, there is no construction or development proposed at this time.

Future construction-related activities associated with development within the modified project site would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors from site preparation (e.g., demolition, excavation, grading, and clearing); exhaust from off-road equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commute vehicles; vehicle travel on roads; and other miscellaneous activities (e.g., building construction, asphalt paving, application of architectural coatings, and trenching for utility installation). Construction emissions depend on multiple factors, including but not limited to, start and duration of construction phases, types and numbers of construction equipment to be used, soil import and export volumes, hauling trips distance, etc., all of which cannot be determined at this stage of the planning process. As such, because implementation of the modified project does not propose any specific development and construction details are unknown, construction-related emissions that may occur at any one time in any scale are speculative and cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, and therefore the associated construction emissions impact was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as well as other mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions, such as 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1, which requires future developments to prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts and apply mitigation measures if needed. Upon complying with the existing SCAQMD regulations, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1, and applicable building code requirements, construction impacts related to development of the modified project would be less than significant.

Additionally, as discussed above, the modified project would only consolidate parcels to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR and would not introduce new land uses compare to what was evaluated

in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

Operational Emissions

Operation of future industrial development on-site could result in operational air emissions. The modified project would allow a mix of industrial warehouse types, specifically up to 1,140,000 square feet warehouse, 570,000 square feet manufacturing, and 190,000 square feet high cube cold storage warehouse uses. Long-term air quality impacts typically consist of mobile source emissions generated from project-related traffic (i.e., motor vehicle use by employees, visitors, and delivery trucks), and emissions from area and energy sources. Emissions associated with each of these sources were calculated and are discussed below. Operational emissions generated by the modified project are detailed in Table 1, *Proposed Modified Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*. Refer to Appendix B, *Air Quality/GHG/Energy Data*, for California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) outputs.

**Table 1  
Proposed Modified Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions**

Source	Emissions (pounds/day) <sup>1</sup>					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Summer</b>						
Mobile Source	23.50	20.30	248.00	0.55	52.60	13.60
Area Source	59.30	0.70	82.60	0.00	0.15	0.11
Energy Source	0.76	13.70	11.50	0.08	1.04	1.04
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>83.60</b>	<b>23.84</b>	<b>223.76</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>35.73</b>	<b>9.60</b>
<i>SCAQMD Thresholds</i>	55	55	550	150	150	55
<b><i>Threshold Exceeded?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Winter</b>						
Mobile Source	22.10	22.00	207.00	0.51	52.60	13.60
Area Source	45.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source	0.76	13.70	11.50	0.08	1.04	1.04
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>68.50</b>	<b>35.70</b>	<b>219.00</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>53.70</b>	<b>14.60</b>
<i>SCAQMD Thresholds</i>	55	55	550	150	150	55
<b><i>Threshold Exceeded?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
Notes: VOC = volatile organic compounds; NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxide; CO = carbon monoxide; SO <sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide; PM <sub>10</sub> = coarse particulate matter; PM <sub>2.5</sub> = fine particulate matter						
1. Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, version 2022.1.						
2. The numbers may be slightly off due to rounding.						
Source: Refer to Appendix B for assumptions used in this analysis.						

### *Mobile Source Emissions*

Mobile sources are emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions. Depending upon the pollutant being discussed, the potential air quality impact may be of either regional or local concern. For example, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)/Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), Nitrogen Oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), Sulfur Oxide (SO<sub>x</sub>), Coarse Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) are all pollutants of regional concern (NO<sub>x</sub> and ROG react with sunlight to form Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) [photochemical smog], and wind currents readily transport SO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>). However, CO tends to be a localized pollutant, dispersing rapidly at the source. According to the *Part 150 Project – Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Scoping and Screening Memorandum* (VMT Scoping Memo), prepared by Michael Baker International, dated January 27, 2025, the modified project would generate approximately 5,060 total daily trips.

### *Area Source Emissions*

Area source emissions would be generated from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping. Consumer products are the main contribution of area source emissions for the modified project.

### *Energy Source Emissions*

The primary use of electricity and natural gas by the modified project would be for space heating and cooling, water heating, ventilation, lighting, appliances, landscaping equipment, and electronics.

### *Total Operational Emissions*

As shown in [Table 1](#), criterion air pollutant emissions resulting from the modified project operational activities would not exceed the numerical thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD, with the exception of VOC emissions. Similarly, TOP 2050 SEIR concluded the approved project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact in long-term VOC emissions by exceeding the daily SCAQMD VOC threshold. Furthermore, future projects within the modified project site would be required to comply with 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which includes measures to reduce vehicles idling, increase electric and fuel-efficient vehicles usage, and increase energy efficiency and renewable energy generation, all of which would reduce VOC emissions. In conclusion, although operations of future development under the modified project would result in an exceedance of daily maximum VOC emissions, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

## Air Quality Health Impacts

Adverse health effects induced by criteria pollutant emissions are highly dependent on a multitude of interconnected variables (e.g., cumulative concentrations, local meteorology and atmospheric conditions, and the number and character of exposed individual [e.g., age, gender]). In particular, ozone precursors, VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub>, affect air quality on a regional scale. Health effects related to ozone are therefore the product of emissions generated by numerous sources throughout a region. Existing models have limited sensitivity to small changes in criteria pollutant concentrations, and, as such, translating project-generated criteria pollutants to specific health effects or additional days of nonattainment would produce meaningless results. In other words, the modified project's less than significant increases in regional air pollution from criteria air pollutants would have nominal or negligible impacts on human health.

As noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae by the SCAQMD<sup>8</sup>, the SCAQMD acknowledged it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to quantify health impacts of criteria pollutants for various reasons including modeling limitations as well as where in the atmosphere air pollutants interact and form. Further, as noted in the Brief of Amicus Curiae by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD)<sup>9</sup>, SJVAPCD has acknowledged that currently available modeling tools are not equipped to provide a meaningful analysis of the correlation between an individual development project's air emissions and specific human health impacts.

The SCAQMD acknowledges that health effects quantification from ozone, as an example is correlated with the increases in ambient level of ozone in the air (concentration) that an individual person breathes. SCAQMD's Brief of Amicus Curiae states that it would take a large amount of additional emissions to cause a modeled increase in ambient ozone levels over the entire region. The SCAQMD states that based on their own modeling in the SCAQMD's 2012 Air Quality Management Plan, a reduction of 432 tons (864,000 pounds) per day of NO<sub>x</sub> and a reduction of 187 tons (374,000 pounds) per day of VOCs would reduce ozone levels at highest monitored site by only nine parts per billion. As such, the SCAQMD concludes that it is not currently possible to accurately quantify ozone-related health impacts caused by NO<sub>x</sub> or VOC emissions from relatively small projects (defined as projects with regional scope) due to photochemistry and regional model limitations. As discussed above, operations of future development under the modified project would exceed the SCAQMD maximum daily threshold for operational VOC emissions. Similarly, TOP 2050 SEIR concluded the approved project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact in long-term VOC emissions by exceeding the

---

<sup>8</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Application of the South Coast Air Quality Management District for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae in Support of Neither Party and Brief of Amicus Curiae. In the Supreme Court of California. Sierra Club, Revive the San Joaquin, and League of Women Voters of Fresno v. County of Fresno*, 2014.

<sup>9</sup> San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, *Application for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae Brief of San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District in Support of Defendant and Respondent, County of Fresno and Real Party In Interest and Respondent, Friant Ranch, L.P. In the Supreme Court of California. Sierra Club, Revive the San Joaquin, and League of Women Voters of Fresno v. County of Fresno*, 2014.

daily SCAQMD VOC threshold. Future projects within the modified project site would be required to comply with 2010 TOP EIR 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2 and TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1 to reduce VOC emissions. The emissions are not sufficiently high to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a Basin-wide level and would not provide a reliable indicator of health effects if modeled. While TOP 2050 SEIR did not analyze criteria air pollutant health risks from buildout of TOP 2050, the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

### Localized Significance to Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis.

The nearest sensitive receptors to the modified project site are residences located 160 feet north of the modified project site. To identify impacts to sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD recommends addressing localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for construction and operations impacts (area source and energy source). The modified project is located within Source Receptor Area (SRA) 33, *Southwest San Bernardino Valley*. The CO hotspot analysis following the LST analysis addresses localized mobile source impacts.

### *Construction LST*

As discussed above, there is no specific development proposed. Existing land use and zoning on-site would remain as-is and would accommodate industrial development in accordance with the site's Industrial and Airport designations and IG and ONT zoning. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as well as other mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions, such as 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1. Upon complying with the existing SCAQMD regulations, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1, and applicable building code requirements, LST construction impacts related to development of the modified project would be less than significant. As such, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity

of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

*Operational LST*

According to the SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site (e.g., transfer facilities and warehouse buildings). The modified project proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to accommodate development potential up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. Operation of future industrial development on-site could result in localized impacts to sensitive receptors. As operational emissions can be quantified based on the allowable buildout square footage and daily trips, impacts pertaining to operation LST is analyzed below.

The LST methodology and associated mass rates are not designed to evaluate localized impacts from mobile sources traveling over the roadways. As such, operational localized emissions would only include area source and energy source. As shown in Table 2, Proposed Modified Project Localized Significance of Operational Emissions, localized operational emissions would not exceed the LSTs for SRA 33. Operational LST impacts would be less than significant and would be less than the approved project, which was determined to be significant and unavoidable in TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

**Table 2  
Proposed Modified Project Localized Significance of Operational Emissions**

Source	Emissions (pounds/day) <sup>1</sup>			
	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>Summer</b>				
Area Source	0.70	82.60	0.15	0.11
Energy Source	13.70	11.50	1.04	1.04
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions<sup>2</sup></b>	14.40	94.10	1.19	1.15
<i>LST Thresholds<sup>3</sup></i>	118	863	5	4
<b>Threshold Exceeded?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Winter</b>				
Area Source	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source	13.70	11.50	1.04	1.04
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions<sup>2</sup></b>	13.70	11.50	1.04	1.04
<i>LST Thresholds<sup>3</sup></i>	118	863	5	4
<b>Threshold Exceeded?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
Notes: VOC = volatile organic chemical; NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrous oxide; CO = carbon monoxide; SO <sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide; PM <sub>10</sub> = coarse particulate matter; PM <sub>2.5</sub> = fine particulate matter				
1. Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, version 2022.1.				

Source	Emissions (pounds/day) <sup>1</sup>			
	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2. The numbers may be slightly off due to rounding. 3. Since there is no specific development proposed, the lowest operational Localized Significance Threshold Mass Rate Screening Criteria was used based on Appendix C of the SCAQMD Final Localized Significant Threshold Methodology guidance document for pollutants NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, PM <sub>10</sub> , and PM <sub>2.5</sub> . The one-acre and 25-meter Localized Significance Thresholds in Source Receptor Area 33, Southwest San Bernardino Valley, are used since these are the lowest thresholds provided.				
Source: Refer to <u>Appendix B</u> for assumptions used in this analysis.				

### Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

CO emissions are a function of vehicle idling time, meteorological conditions, and traffic flow. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthful levels (e.g., adversely affecting residents, school children, hospital patients, and the elderly).

The Basin is designated as an attainment/maintenance area for the federal CO standards and an attainment area under State standards. There has been a decline in CO emissions even though vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on U.S. urban and rural roads have increased; estimated anthropogenic CO emissions have decreased 68 percent between 1990 and 2014. In 2014, mobile sources accounted for 82 percent of the nation’s total anthropogenic CO emissions. Three major control programs have contributed to the reduced per-vehicle CO emissions, including exhaust standards, cleaner burning fuels, and motor vehicle inspection/maintenance programs.

According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, a potential CO hotspot may occur at any location where the background CO concentration already exceeds 9.0 parts per million (ppm), which is the 8-hour California ambient air quality standard. As previously discussed, the site is in SRA 33. Communities within SRAs are expected to have similar climatology and ambient air pollutant concentrations. The monitoring station closest to the project site is the Ontario-NW Corner I-10 and Etiwanda Ave Monitoring Station located, which is located approximately 5.9 miles southeast of the site. The CO measurements collected by this monitoring station is representative of the background CO concentration due to its close proximity to the project. The maximum ambient 1-hour CO concentration within the modified project study area is estimated to be 1.464 ppm in 2024 from Ontario-NW Corner I-10 and Etiwanda Ave Monitoring Station.<sup>10</sup> Given that the background CO concentration does not currently exceed 9.0 ppm, a CO hotspot would not occur at the project site.

Additionally, a detailed CO analysis was conducted in the *Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide* (CO Plan) for the SCAQMD’s 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, which is the most recent AQMP that addresses CO concentrations. The locations selected for microscale modeling in the CO Plan are worst-case intersections in the Basin

<sup>10</sup> California Air Resource Board, *AQMIS Data*, <https://www.arb.ca.gov/aqmis2/display.php?param=CO&year=2024&units=007&report=SITE1YR&statistic=DMAX&site=3820&ptype=aqd>, accessed February 6, 2025.

and would likely experience the highest CO concentrations. Thus, CO analysis within the CO Plan is utilized in a comparison to the proposed project since it represents a worst-case scenario with heavy traffic volumes within the Basin.

Of these locations, the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection in the City of Los Angeles experienced the highest CO concentration (4.6 ppm), which is well below the 35-ppm 1-hr CO federal standard. The Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection is one of the most congested intersections in southern California with an average daily trip (ADT) volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day. The modified project site area currently has traffic volumes ranging from 722 to 55,507 ADT; refer to [Table 7, \*Existing Traffic Noise Levels\*](#), in [Section 3.2.6, \*Noise\*](#). With the addition of the modified project's traffic generation of 5,060 daily trips, the ADT on the nearby roadway segments would range from 5,782 to 60,567, which would not result in traffic volumes exceeding 100,000 vehicles per day. As the CO hotspots were not experienced at the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection, it can be reasonably inferred that CO hotspots would not be experienced at any intersections near the modified project site due to the comparatively low volume of traffic that would occur as a result of modified project implementation. Therefore, CO hotspot impacts would not be experienced in the modified project's vicinity and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard. As such, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

### Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) (also referred to as hazardous air pollutants [HAPs]), are pollutants that result in an increase in mortality, a serious illness, or pose a present or potential hazard to human health. Health effects of TACs may include cancer, birth defects, and immune system and neurological damage.

Project construction may result in temporary increases in emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) associated with the use of off-road diesel equipment. Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily associated with long-term exposure and associated risk of contracting cancer. As such, the calculation of cancer risk associated with exposure to TACs are typically calculated based on a long-term (e.g., 70-year) period of exposure. The use of diesel-powered construction equipment, however, would be temporary and episodic and would occur over a relatively large area. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Future development projects would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as well as other mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions, such as 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1. Upon complying with the existing SCAQMD regulations, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-1, and applicable building code requirements, TAC impacts related to development of the modified project would be less than significant. As such, the modified project would not

result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

The modified project would allow up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial uses, including warehouse, manufacturing, and high cube cold storage warehouse. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is the existing single-family residential use located approximately 160 feet to the north of the site. Future development that would have the potential to generate potentially significant risks associated with the release of TACs are required to undergo an analysis of their potential health risks associated with TACs based upon the specific detail of each individual project. Further, as the modified project would only consolidate parcels under a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, it would be within the scope of TOP 2050. The modified project is not anticipated to result in impacts more than the approved project, which was evaluated as significant and unavoidable impact in TOP 2050 SEIR. As such, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

### Odors

The modified project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources related to the modified project may arise from construction equipment exhaust, the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities, and emissions from mobile exhaust associated with the modified project's long-term operational uses. Future development within the modified project site would be required to comply with standard construction requirements to minimize odor impacts from construction. Furthermore, construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, ceasing upon completion of the respective phase of construction, and dissipate quickly to be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment in use. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

It is expected that the modified project-generated mobile exhaust would comply with required vehicle regulations. Future development would also be required to comply with the 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 3-2, which requires access or linkages to alternative modes of transportation, to help reduce mobile exhaust emissions. Additionally, the modified project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors and other emissions (such as those leading to odors) associated with construction and operational activities of the modified project would be less than significant. The modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

## Conclusion

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that air quality impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be significant and unavoidable despite implementation of applicable mitigation measures. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

### **Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:**

- 3-1 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Ontario for development projects subject to CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) review (i.e., nonexempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts to the City of Ontario Planning Department for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Ontario Building Department shall require feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions. Potential measures shall be incorporated as conditions of approval of for a project and may include:
- Require fugitive dust control measures that exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403, such as:
    - Requiring use of nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion.
    - Applying water every four hours to active soil disturbing activities.
    - Tarping and/or maintaining a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials.
  - Using construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 4 interim or higher exhaust emissions limits.
  - Ensuring construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards.
  - Limiting nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than five consecutive minutes.
  - Using Super-Compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufacturers can be found on the SCAQMD's website at: [http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant\\_AIM.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf).

These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Department.

- 3-2 The City of Ontario shall evaluate new development proposals within the City and require all developments to include access or linkages to alternative modes of transportation, such as transit stops, bike paths, and/or pedestrian paths (e.g., sidewalks).

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:**

AQ-1 Prior to discretionary approval by the City of Ontario for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act review (i.e., nonexempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation-phase-related air quality impacts to the City of Ontario Planning Department for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management (SCAQMD)-adopted thresholds of significance, the City of Ontario Planning Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions could include, but are not limited to the following:

- For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug-in of the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions.
- Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Chapter 10 sec. 2485).
- Provide changing/shower facilities as specified in Section A5.106.4.3 of the California Green Building Standards Code—Part 11, Title 24, California Code of Regulations (CALGreen) (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).

- Provide bicycle parking facilities per Section A4.106.9 if CALGreen (Residential Voluntary Measures).
- Provide preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles per Section A5.106.5.1 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures).
- Provide facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 and Section A5.106.8.2 of CALGreen (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures; Residential Voluntary Measures).
- Applicant-provided appliances shall be Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by the City during plan check.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

### **3.2.2 Biological Resources**

#### **Approved Project Findings**

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, there are no sensitive plant species or wildlife movement corridors within the City. However, TOP 2050 SEIR requires all future development located within special-status wildlife critical habitat in the City, including within jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and conservation plans and areas, to conduct focused species surveys where applicable. Additionally, future projects would be required to consult and coordinate with applicable regulating agencies, including, but not limited to, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and implement necessary mitigation measures pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Following the focused surveys and agency consultation, any resulting mitigation measures should be implemented. Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that less than significant impacts to biological resources would result as the approved project would not grant specific entitlements for development and would not result in development of new, previously undeveloped areas of the City. No mitigation measures were required for the approved project.

#### **Modified Project Analysis**

The *Biological Resources Assessment for the City of Ontario Part 150 Project in the City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California* (Biological Resources Assessment), dated March 4, 2025, was prepared for the modified project by Michael Baker International; refer

to Appendix C, *Biological Resources Assessment*. The Biological Resources Assessment involved a literature review using the CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (IREPC), the USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) web-based environmental review tool, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, and the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory. Additionally, a general biological resources survey and habitat assessment was conducted on January 8, 2025.

### Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities

The Biological Resources Assessment determined that the modified project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, is not located within a designated wildlife corridor or linkage, does not contain any State or federally protected wetlands, and is not located in a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

### Special-Status Species

The literature review identified 82 special-status plant species as occurring in the vicinity of the modified project site; however, none were observed during the site survey and, due to a lack of native habitat present, none are expected to occur on-site. Therefore, no impact would occur to special-status plant species.

No special-status wildlife species were observed during the modified project site survey; however, 61 special-status wildlife species appeared in the literature review as occurring in the vicinity of the modified project site, three of which – Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*), and western yellow bat (*Lasiurus xanthinus*) – have a moderate potential to occur on site. Additionally, it was determined that on-site trees and trees in the surrounding area may provide suitable roosting habitat for individual or small groups of bats, including western yellow bat. As such, per Standard Conditions of Approval (SCAs) BIO-1 and BIO-2, pre-construction nesting bird surveys and bat roosting suitability assessments for any vegetation planned for removal would be required prior to the start of future development activities. If nests are identified, further protective measures outlined in SCAs BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be required.

It should also be noted that selected special-status species were assessed for their potential to occur within the modified project site, including Delhi sands flower-loving fly (*Rhaphiomidas terminates abdominalis*) and burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*); it was determined that neither are expected to occur on-site.

### Nesting Birds

Nesting birds are protected pursuant to the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). While no active or old nests were observed

during the site survey, the survey was conducted outside the nesting bird season. The Biological Resources Assessment concluded that trees present on-site would provide suitable nesting habitat for birds, and some bird species may also nest on the ground surface. As such, bird nesting can be expected on-site. If an active bird nest is destroyed or if project activities result in indirect impacts leading to abandonment of the nest by the adults or otherwise loss of nestlings, it is considered “take” and is potentially punishable by fines. Therefore, nesting bird clearance surveys per SCA BIO-1 would be conducted during the breeding season (generally February 1 to August 31 but as early as January 1 for raptors), prior to future removal of vegetation and other development activities.

Development Code Section 6.05.020, *Tree Preservation Policy and Protection Measures*, includes tree preservation and protection measures for trees qualifying as a “Heritage Tree.” An inventory of trees on-site and their potential status as a Heritage Tree was not completed during the modified project site field survey as the modified project does not propose any tree removal. Most trees on-site are non-native species; however, trees that qualify as Heritage Trees may occur on-site. Prior to future construction activities in accordance with the modified project, the City would determine if such trees occur on-site and if they require removal. If removal is required, future development would be required to comply with the City’s Tree Preservation Policy and Protection Measures. Further, should any “Parkway” trees – trees located between the street right-of-way and curb line – require removal under the proposed modified project, future development would comply with the provisions regarding the preservation, maintenance, and planting of parkway trees in accordance with Municipal Code Title 10, Chapter 2, *Parkway Trees*. Adherence to existing tree preservation regulations would result in less than significant impacts in this regard.

Overall, biological impacts associated with the modified project would be less than significant with implementation of SCAs BIO-1 and BIO-2.

### Conclusion

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that biological resources impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

### **Modified Project Conditions:**

SCA BIO-1 A pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days (72 hours) prior to the start of modified project activities to determine whether active nests are present within or directly

adjacent to the modified project site. Following completion of the survey, a brief memo report shall be prepared to document the location of all nests found (if any), their status (i.e. eggs or hatchlings present), existing biological conditions of the project area, and the bird species detected during the survey. If an active nest is found, recommendations to avoid and minimize impacts to the nest, such as those presented below, shall be included as appropriate.

A no-work (or reduced work) buffer shall be established around any active passerine bird nest and around any active raptor nest. The qualified biologist shall monitor the nest on a weekly basis, and project activities within 300 feet of an active nest of any passerine bird or within 500 feet of an active nest of any raptor, shall be evaluated for potential impacts to the active nest. Monitoring shall occur until the nest is no longer active. The buffers may be adjusted (including increases or reductions to the buffer) by the qualified biologist on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the location, type, duration and timing, and severity of work, distance of nest from project activities, surrounding vegetation and line-of-sight between the nest and work areas, and the species' site-specific level of habituation to the disturbance. If the qualified biologist determines nesting activities may fail as a result of project activities, the biologist shall immediately inform the resident engineer and construction supervisor and all project activities shall cease within the recommended no-disturbance buffer until the biologist determines the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site.

Avoidance buffers around active nests should be delineated on site with bright flagging or other means, for easy identification by project personnel. The resident engineer and construction supervisor will be notified of the nest and the buffer limits to ensure it is maintained.

- SCA BIO-2 No less than 60 days prior to initiating modified project activities, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct a bat roosting habitat suitability assessment of any vegetation that may be removed, altered, or indirectly impacted by the project activities. Any locations identified as having potentially suitable bat roosting habitat by the qualified bat biologist shall be subject to additional nighttime surveys (bat surveys) during the summer months (i.e., June-August) to determine the numbers and bat species using the roost(s). The information collected during these additional bat surveys shall be used by the qualified bat biologist to develop species-specific measures to minimize impacts to roosting bats should bats be detected using the site. The bat surveys shall be conducted by the qualified bat biologist using an appropriate combination of visual inspection, sampling, exit counts, and acoustic surveys. The results of the pre-construction bat surveys shall be submitted to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for review no less than 30 days prior to the initiation of project activities.

If the presence of bats within the project is confirmed, avoidance and minimization measures, including the designation of buffers based upon what bat species are found, and phased removal of trees, shall be developed and submitted to CDFW for review and approval. If the site supports maternity roosts, the Applicant shall avoid disturbing those areas during the breeding season.

If the site supports a maternity roost(s) or special-status species, the Applicant shall contact CDFW and conduct an impact assessment prior to commencing project activities to assist in the development of minimization and mitigation measures. Applicant shall compensate for impacts and losses to maternity roosts and/or special-status bat habitat through a mitigation strategy approved by CDFW.

### **3.2.3 Cultural Resources**

#### **Approved Project Findings**

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, implementation of TOP 2050 could impact historic resources. TOP 2050 would result in an increase in land use intensity but would not result in development in areas of the City that were not planned for development under TOP 2010. Nonetheless, historical resources categorized under the City's Development Code as Tier III could still be potentially impacted with implementation of new land uses under TOP 2050. 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1 would require historic or potentially historic resources to be evaluated for historic significance through the City's Development Code tier system. Major modification or demolition of Tier III resources may be appropriate under certain circumstances. If demolition occurs, the City requires historic resources to be documented and historic features to be salvaged and requires a demolition mitigation fee. Provided that major modification or demolition of Tier III resources may still occur upon implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-1, the measure would not provide a high level of protection for Tier III historic resources under CEQA. Therefore, impacts to historic resources were determined to remain significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of TOP 2050 could impact archaeological resources as future development that would be accommodated by TOP 2050 could potentially unearth previously unrecorded resources. 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 would require preservation and curation of archeological resources if uncovered during development. Implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2 would reduce potential impacts to archeological resources to a less than significant level.

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, grading activities would not adversely impact human remains, if accidentally uncovered, because procedures are required under the Public Resources Code and California Health and Safety code. Although soil-disturbing activities associated with development in accordance with TOP 2050 could result in the discovery

of human remains, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that significant impacts to human remains would not occur.

### **Modified Project Analysis**

The *Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Ontario Part 150 Project, City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California* (Cultural/Paleo Resources Report), prepared by Michael Baker International, and dated February 27, 2025, included a records search at the South-Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File search, literature and historical map review, archaeological field survey, and archaeological sensitivity analysis; refer to Appendix A.

The records search results indicated that 11 previous cultural resources studies have been conducted within 0.5-mile of the modified project site, including three that intersect the site. As a result of those studies, no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within the modified project site. The NAHC Sacred Lands File search results indicated that no tribal cultural resources have been identified within the vicinity of the project area.

An intensive pedestrian survey was conducted by Michael Baker International on January 7, 2025, within the defined Area of Potential Effects (APE). The survey documented extensive modern refuse and structural debris scattered across the APE, including plastic, metal, concrete, asphalt fragments, flooring tiles, roof tiles, and sparse domestic homewares. No precontact or historic period archaeological deposits or artifacts were identified, and no built environment resources older than 50 years were identified. It was determined that the four existing structures, located in the northeast portion of the modified project site, do not meet the 50-year age criteria for historic resources and, therefore, were not assessed for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.

The project area consists of Tujunga loamy sand, an excessively drained alluvial soil. This soil type suggests that organic materials are unlikely to be preserved due to rapid decomposition. Stone tools, ceramic artifacts, and other durable cultural materials could be present in buried contexts but no historical or archaeological resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5(a) were found within the project area. Given the negative findings from the survey, records search, and NAHC search, the Cultural/Paleo Resources Report determined that there is no indication that the project would result in direct or indirect impacts on historic resources as defined by CEQA Section 15064.5(a), tribal cultural resources (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21074), or a significant archaeological resource (PRC §5024.1).

While the modified project site is considered to have low to moderate archeological sensitivity, given the alluvial sediments that underlie the area, the potential for encountering previously unrecorded, buried archaeological resources during future ground-disturbing activities cannot be entirely ruled out. While this risk appears low, inadvertent discoveries remain a possibility. As such 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure

5-2 is applicable to the modified project and would require preservation and curation of archeological resources if uncovered during future site development. As such, upon implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2, modified project-related impacts to archeological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Similar to buildout of TOP 2050, while soil-disturbing activities associated with development of the modified project could result in the discovery of human remains, compliance with existing law, including procedures are required under the Public Resources Code and California Health and Safety code, would ensure that significant impacts to human remains would not occur. No impacts would occur in this regard.

Overall, cultural impacts associated with the modified project would be less than significant with implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 5-2.

### Conclusion

Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that cultural resources impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be significant and unavoidable despite implementation of applicable mitigation measures. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

### **Applicable Certified 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures:**

- 5-2            In areas of documented or inferred from evident archaeological and/or paleontological resource presence, City staff shall require applicants for development permits to provide studies to document the presence/absence of such resources. On properties where resources are identified, such studies shall provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified cultural preservation expert. The mitigation plan shall include the following requirements:
- a) Archaeologists and/or paleontologist shall be retained for the modified project and will be on call during grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities.
  - b) Should any cultural resources be discovered, no further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Planning Director or designee is satisfied that adequate provisions are in place to protect these resources.
  - c) Unanticipated discoveries shall be evaluated for significance by a San Bernardino County Certified Professional Archaeologist/Paleontologist. If significance criteria are met, then the modified project shall be required to perform data recovery, professional identification, radiocarbon dates, and other special studies; submit materials to a museum for permanent

curation; and provide a comprehensive final report including a catalog with museum numbers.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

### 3.2.4 Energy

#### Approved Project Findings

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, regulatory compliance (e.g., Building Energy Efficiency Standards [commonly known as Title 24], California Green Building Standards Code—Part 11, Title 24, California Code of Regulations [CALGreen], California Renewables Portfolio Standard [RPS], and Corporate Average Fuel Economy [CAFE] standards) would increase building energy efficiency and vehicle fuel efficiency and reduce building energy demand and transportation-related fuel usage. Additionally, TOP 2050 includes policies related to land use and transportation planning and design, energy efficiency, public and active transit, and renewable energy generation that would contribute to minimizing building and transportation-related energy demands overall and demands on nonrenewable sources of energy. Implementation of proposed policies under TOP 2050 and the *City of Ontario 2022 Community Climate Action Plan (2022 CCAP)*, in conjunction with regulatory requirements would ensure that energy demand associated with growth under TOP 2050 would not be inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. Therefore, TOP 2050 would not result in new or a substantial increase in magnitude of impacts. Furthermore, TOP 2050 includes Environmental Resources Element and Safety Element policies that would support the Statewide goal of transitioning the electricity grid to renewable sources and employ best practices regarding energy-saving standards. Implementation of TOP 2050 would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of California's RPS program. TOP 2050 SEIR determined that energy-related impacts would be less than significant.

#### Modified Project Analysis

##### Construction

The analysis of impacts related to energy use considers construction and operations of a project. Fossil fuels would be used for construction vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment during construction of potentially 1.9 million square feet of warehouse uses that the modified project would facilitate. Construction of future industrial development in accordance with the Industrial and Airport land use designations and IG and ONT zoning district would result in on-road (automotive) fuel consumption associated with construction vehicle trips and off-road fuel consumption associated with construction equipment usage. Typically, construction equipment fuel consumption is estimated from the modified project's construction equipment, timing/phasing, and hours of duration for construction equipment as modeled in CalEEMod. Nonetheless, the modified project proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to

accommodate development potential of up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. Construction fuel consumptions depend on multiple factors, including but not limited to, start and duration of construction phases, types and numbers of construction equipment to be used, soil import and export volumes, hauling trips distance, etc., all of which cannot be determined at this stage of the planning process. As such, because implementation of the modified project does not propose any specific development and construction details are unknown, construction-related fuel consumption that may occur at any one time in any scale are speculative and cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, and therefore the associated construction fuel consumption impact was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR.

Future industrial development in accordance with the modified project would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Typically, fuel consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant demand on energy resources. In addition, some incidental energy conservation would occur during construction through compliance with State requirements that equipment not in use for more than five minutes be turned off. Construction equipment would also be required to comply with the latest U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CARB engine emissions standards. These emissions standards require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption. Due to increasing transportation costs and fuel prices, contractors and owners have a strong financial incentive to avoid wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction. There is growing recognition among developers and retailers that sustainable construction is not prohibitively expensive, and that there is a significant cost-savings potential in green building practices and materials. Further, the modified project-related incremental increase in the use of energy bound in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes and manufactured or processed materials (e.g., lumber and gas), would not substantially increase demand for energy compared to overall local and regional demand for construction materials.

Construction fuel use is temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. There are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or State. Additionally, construction contractors would be required to comply with the provisions of California Code of Regulations Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and off-road diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes and would minimize unnecessary fuel consumption. Construction equipment would be subject to the EPA Construction Equipment Fuel Efficiency Standard, which would also minimize inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary fuel consumption. Furthermore, per applicable regulatory requirements, such as the current CALGreen, future industrial development in accordance with the

modified project would comply with construction waste management practices to divert a minimum of 65 percent of construction debris.

As detailed above, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that energy-related impacts of the approved project would be less than significant. Similarly, for the modified project, construction fuel consumption would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than other similar development projects. As such, consistent with the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR, impacts would be less than significant, and the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect.

### Operation

This analysis focuses on three sources of energy that are relevant to the modified project: electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel for vehicle trips associated with modified project operations. The analysis of operational energy usage is based on the CalEEMod modeling results for the modified project; refer to Appendix B. The model assumed a mix of industrial warehouse types, specifically up to 1,140,000 square feet warehouse, 570,000 square feet manufacturing, and 190,000 square feet high cube cold storage warehouse uses. The modified project's estimated electricity and natural gas consumption is based primarily on CalEEMod's default settings for San Bernardino County and consumption factors provided by Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), the electricity and natural gas providers for the City and the modified project site, respectively. The amount of operational fuel consumption was estimated using the modified project's annual VMT as modeled in CalEEMod, and CARB Emissions Factor 2021 (EMFAC2021) website platform, which provides typical fuel efficiency for the County. The year of 2025 was used as the buildout (operational) year of the modified project as this is the year this Addendum was prepared, and it would be the most conservative based on EMFAC2021's modeling assumptions. The modified project's estimated operational energy consumption is summarized in Table 3, Proposed Modified Project Energy Consumption.

As shown in Table 3, the modified project's annual electricity and natural gas usage would result in a 0.0894 percent over the County's typical annual electricity usage and a 0.0909 percent over the County's typical annual natural usage, respectively. Furthermore, the modified project's increase of operational vehicle fuel consumption would increase the County's consumption by 0.1504 percent. Overall, the modified project would result in a nominal energy consumption increase over the County's current consumption.

**Table 3  
Proposed Modified Project Energy Consumption**

Energy Type	Modified Project Annual Energy Consumption	San Bernadino County Annual Energy Consumption	Percentage Increase Countywide
<b>Electricity Consumption<sup>1</sup> (Megawatt Hour)</b>	14,862	16,629,614	0.0894%
<b>Natural Gas Consumption<sup>1</sup> (therms)</b>	511,227	562,123,065	0.0909%
<b>Operational Automotive (on-road) Fuel Consumption<sup>2</sup> (Gallon)<sup>2</sup></b>	1,669,559	1,110,012,646	0.1504%
Notes:			
1. Modified project electricity and natural gas consumptions as modeled in CalEEMod computer model provided in <a href="#">Appendix B</a> . Fuel consumption calculated based on CalEEMod results.			
2. The percentage increases in on-road fuel consumption are compared with the projected Countywide on-road fuel consumption in 2025 (the assumed first year of operation based on CalEEMod). Countywide on-road fuel consumption are from CARB EMFAC2021.			
Source: Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B</a> .			

*Transportation Energy Demands*

Annual vehicular trips and related VMT generated by the modified project operations would result in approximately 27,058,386 annual VMT and a fuel demand of approximately 1,669,559 gallons per year during operations; refer to [Table 3](#).

Fuel would be provided by current and future commercial vendors. Trip generation and VMT generated by the modified project are consistent with other industrial uses of similar scale and configuration previously contemplated in TOP 2050. As such, operations of future industrial development in accordance with the modified project would not result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, nor excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption compared to other industrial uses.

It should be noted that the State’s strategy for the transportation sector for medium- and heavy-duty trucks is focused on making trucks more efficient and expediting truck turnover rather than reducing VMT. This contrasts with the passenger vehicle component of the transportation sector where both per-capita VMT reductions and an increase in vehicle efficiency are forecasted to be needed to achieve the overall State emissions reductions goals.

Heavy-duty trucks involved in goods movements are generally controlled on the technology side and through fleet turnover of older trucks and engines to newer and cleaner trucks and engines. The first battery-electric heavy-duty trucks are being tested in 2025 and SCAQMD is looking to integrate this new technology into large-scale truck operations. Enhanced fuel economies realized pursuant to federal and State regulatory

actions, and related transition of vehicles to alternative energy sources (e.g., electricity, natural gas, biofuels, hydrogen cells) would likely decrease future gasoline and diesel fuel demands per VMT. The close proximity of the modified project to regional and local roadway systems tends to reduce VMT within the region, acting to reduce regional vehicle energy demands. Therefore, fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the modified project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary in comparison to other similar developments in the region. Further, as indicated in Table 3, the modified project's operational automotive transportation is estimated to consume approximately 1,669,559 gallons of fuel per year. This increase would account for 0.1504 percent of the County's forecasted annual consumption of fuel for the buildout year of 2025. As such, the modified project would account for a nominal percentage of the forecasted annual operational automotive fuel consumption for the County and, thus, would have a nominal effect on the local and regional energy supplies. The modified project does not propose any unusual features that would result in excessive long-term operational fuel consumption.

### *Building Energy Demand*

The California Energy Commission (CEC) developed 2024 to 2040 forecasts for energy consumption and peak demand in support of the *2023 Integrated Energy Policy Report* (2023 IEPR) for each of the major electricity and natural gas planning areas and the State based on the economic and demographic growth projections. CEC forecasted baseline electricity consumption grows at a rate of about 1.7 percent annually through 2040.<sup>11</sup> The natural gas consumption grows at a rate of about 0.2 percent annually through 2035.<sup>12</sup>

As shown in Table 3, the modified project's operational energy consumption at full buildout would result in an annual electricity and natural gas consumption of 14,862 megawatt hour (MWh) and 511,227 therms, respectively. Table 3 also shows the increase of operational energy consumption would result in an approximately 0.0894 percent increase in electricity consumption and approximately 0.0909 percent increase in natural gas consumption over the current Countywide usage. As such, energy consumption would be significantly below the CEC's forecasts and the current Countywide usage. Overall, the modified project would be consistent with the CEC's energy consumption forecasts and would not require additional energy capacity or supplies. The modified project would also consume energy during the same time periods as other surrounding industrial developments. As a result, the modified project would not result in unique or more intensive peak or base period energy demand.

Future industrial development in accordance with the modified project would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Any future industrial development would also be required to

---

<sup>11</sup> California Energy Commission, *2023 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, page 130, July 14, 2024.

<sup>12</sup> Based on the *2023 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, the gas forecast is updated every two years, in odd years. As such, the natural gas consumption shown here is based on the California Energy Commission, *Final 2022 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update*, page 140, May 10, 2023.

comply with the most current and applicable version of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards (commonly known as Title 24), which provides minimum efficiency standards related to various building features such as appliances, water and space heating and cooling equipment, building insulation and roofing, and lighting. The modified project would also comply with CALGreen pertaining to the installation of EV charging stations. Compliance with the most current and applicable Title 24 standards significantly reduces energy usage. Furthermore, SCE is subject to California's RPS which requires investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 60 percent of total procurement by 2030 and 100 percent of total procurement by 2045. Renewable energy is generally defined as energy that comes from resources which are naturally replenished within a human timescale such as sunlight, wind, tides, waves, and geothermal heat. The increase in reliance of such energy resources further ensures that new development projects will not result in the waste of the finite energy resources. Overall, the modified project would ensure energy consumption to be kept to a minimum through these components.

Based on the analysis above, the modified project would not cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of building energy during modified project operation or preempt future energy development or future energy conservation. As such, impacts resulting from the modified project would be less than significant. Overall, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

#### Consistency with State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency

As discussed above, the State's electricity grid is transitioning to renewable energy under California's RPS Program. Renewable sources of electricity include wind, small hydropower, solar, geothermal, biomass, and biogas. In general, California has RPS requirements of 33 percent renewable energy by 2020 (SB X1-2), 40 percent by 2024 (SB 350), 50 percent by 2026 (SB 100), 60 percent by 2030 (SB 100), and 100 percent by 2045 (SB 100). SB 100 also establishes RPS requirements for publicly owned utilities that consist of 44 percent renewable energy by 2024, 52 percent by 2027, and 60 percent by 2030. The Statewide RPS requirements do not directly apply to individual development projects, but to utilities and energy providers such as SCE, whose compliance with RPS requirements would contribute to the State of California objective of transitioning to renewable energy.

The industrial land uses accommodated under the modified project would comply with the current and future iterations of the Title 24 and CALGreen. Furthermore, the modified project would be subject to TOP 2050 Environmental Resources Element Policies ER-3.1, ER-3.2, ER-3.3, ER-3.4, ER-3.5, and ER-3.6 and Safety Element Policies S-9.1, S-9.2, and S-9.3, which would support the Statewide goal of transitioning the electricity grid to renewable sources and employ best practices regarding energy-saving standards. Therefore, implementation of the modified project would not conflict with or obstruct

implementation of California's RPS program, or any other State or local energy plans. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

### Conclusion

Overall, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that energy impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

## **3.2.5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

### **Approved Project Findings**

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, with implementation of the 2022 CCAP, TOP 2050 would achieve the State's GHG emissions efficiency target without implementation of additional local GHG reduction measures. Goals and policies in TOP 2050 and actions in the 2022 CCAP would minimize GHG emissions generated by the residential and nonresidential land uses in the City. Implementation of TOP 2050 would not obstruct implementation of the CARB Scoping Plan or interfere with SCAG ability to implement the regional strategies in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Overall, TOP 2050 would not result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to GHG emissions with implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions of approval, as well as the 2022 CCAP. Less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

### **Modified Project Analysis**

#### GHG Emissions

Future construction-related activities associated with development of the modified project could result in emissions of GHGs. Construction GHG emissions depend on multiple factors, including but not limited to, start and duration of construction phases, types and numbers of construction equipment to be used, soil import and export volumes, hauling trips distance, etc., all of which cannot be determined at this stage of the planning process. As such, because implementation of the modified project does not propose any specific development and construction details are unknown, construction-related GHG emissions that may occur at any one time in any scale are speculative and cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, and

therefore the associated construction GHG emissions impact was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts.

Operation of future industrial development on-site could result in direct and indirect GHG emissions. The modified project would allow up to 1,140,000-square foot warehouse, 570,000-square foot manufacturing, and 190,000-square foot high cube cold storage warehouse. These operational emissions can be quantified based on the allowable buildout square footage and daily trips. Direct GHG emissions would include emissions from area sources, mobile sources, and refrigerants, while indirect emissions would include emissions from energy consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. The most recent version of the CalEEMod, version 2022.1 was used to calculate project related GHG emissions. CalEEMod outputs are contained within [Appendix B](#).

[Table 4, Proposed Modified Project Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions](#), presents the estimated GHG emissions of the modified project. As shown in [Table 4](#), the total amount of modified project-related GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined would total approximately 18,072.00 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>) per year.

**Table 4  
Proposed Modified Project Estimated Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Emission Source	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Refrigerants	CO <sub>2e</sub>
	Metric Tons/year <sup>1</sup>				
<b>Direct Emissions</b>					
Mobile Source	8,771.00	0.43	0.39	16.10	8,913.00
Area Source	38.50	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	38.70
Refrigerants	0.00	0.00	0.00	863.00	863.00
<i>Total Direct Emissions<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>8,809.50</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>0.39</i>	<i>879.10</i>	<i>9,814.70</i>
<b>Indirect Emissions</b>					
Energy	6,299.00	0.46	0.03	0.00	6,320.00
Water	865.00	14.30	0.35	0.00	1,326.00
Waste	175.00	1.75	0.00	0.00	611.00
<i>Total Indirect Emissions<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>7339.00</i>	<i>16.51</i>	<i>0.38</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>8,257.00</i>
<b>Total CO<sub>2e</sub> (All Sources)</b>	<b>18,072.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year</b>				
Notes: CO <sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide; CH <sub>4</sub> = methane; N <sub>2</sub> O = nitrous oxide; CO <sub>2e</sub> = carbon dioxide equivalent					
1. Emissions calculated using 2022.1 CalEEMod computer model.					
2. Totals may be slightly off due to rounding.					
Source: Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B</a> for assumptions used in this analysis.					

*Direct Project-Related Source of Greenhouse Gases*

**Mobile Source.** According to the VMT Scoping Memo, the modified project would generate approximately 5,060 total daily trips, which equates to approximately 8,913.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year of mobile source GHG emissions; refer to [Table 4](#) as well as [Appendix E](#).

**Area Source.** Area source emissions were calculated using CalEEMod and project-specific land use data. Project-related area sources may include exhaust emissions from typical landscape maintenance equipment such as lawnmowers, shredders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chain saws, and hedge trimmers. As noted in Table 4, the modified project would result in 38.70 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year of area source GHG emissions.

**Refrigerants.** Refrigerants are substances used in equipment for air conditioning and refrigeration. Most of the refrigerants used today are hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) or blends thereof, which can have high global warming potential (GWP) values. All equipment that uses refrigerants has a charge size (i.e., quantity of refrigerant the equipment contains), and an operational refrigerant leak rate, and each refrigerant has a GWP that is specific to that refrigerant. CalEEMod quantifies refrigerant emissions from leaks during regular operation and routine servicing over the equipment lifetime and then derives average annual emissions from the lifetime estimate. Implementation of the modified project would allow for future refrigerated warehouses to be developed on-site. As such, emissions of refrigerants are primarily from air conditioning and refrigeration on-site. The modified project would directly result in approximately 863.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year from refrigerants; refer to Table 4.

#### *Indirect Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases*

**Energy.** Energy consumption emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model and project-specific land use data. Electricity and natural gas would be provided to the project site via SCE and SoCal Gas. The modified project would indirectly result in 6,320.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year of GHG emissions due to energy consumption; refer to Table 4.

**Water.** The modified project's operations would result in a demand of approximately 442 million gallons of water per year, refer to Appendix B. Emissions from indirect energy impacts due to water supply would result in 1,326.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year; refer to Table 4.

**Waste.** Solid waste associated with operations of the modified project would result in 611.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year; refer to Table 4.

#### *Conclusion*

As shown in Table 4, the total amount of modified project-related GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined would total approximately 18,072.00 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. As the modified project would only consolidate parcels under a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, , the modified project would not generate emissions more than the approved project, which was evaluated as a significant and unavoidable impact in TOP 2050 SEIR. Consistency with Applicable GHG Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The GHG plan consistency analysis for the modified project is based on its alignment with the 2022 Scoping Plan, the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, and the 2022 CCAP (included as part of TOP 2050). Statewide, the 2022 Scoping Plan provides measures to achieve SB 32 targets. Regionally, the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS includes measures to achieve VMT reductions required under SB 375. Locally, the 2022 CCAP contains measures to enhance the City’s ability to further reduce GHG emissions.

*Consistency With the 2022 Scoping Plan*

The 2022 Scoping Plan identifies reduction measures necessary to achieve the goal of carbon neutrality by 2045 or earlier. Actions that reduce GHG emissions are identified for each AB 32 inventory sector. Provided in Table 5, *Consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan: AB 32 GHG Inventory Sectors*, is an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category to determine how the modified project would be consistent with or exceed reduction actions/strategies outlined in the 2022 Scoping Plan.

**Table 5  
Consistency with the 2022 Scoping Plan: AB 32 Inventory Sectors**

Actions and Strategies	Project Consistency Analysis
<b>Smart Growth / Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT)</b>	
Reduce VMT per capita to 25% below 2019 levels by 2030, and 30% below 2019 levels by 2045	<b>Consistent.</b> As discussed in <u>Section 3.2.7</u> , the modified project is presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impacts and is not required to conducted additional VMT assessments. Future development within the modified project site would be required to comply with all applicable Title 24 and CalGreen Code measures, such as providing bicycle parking and electric vehicle charging stations that would reduce VMT.
<b>Construction Equipment</b>	
Achieve 25% of energy demand electrified by 2030 and 75% electrified by 2045.	<b>Consistent.</b> The City of Ontario has not adopted an ordinance or program requiring the use of electrified construction equipment. However, if adopted in the future, developments within the modified project would be required to comply with the applicable policies requiring the use of electrified construction equipment.
<b>New Residential and Commercial Buildings</b>	
All electric appliances beginning 2026 (residential) and 2029 (commercial), contributing to 6 million heat pumps installed Statewide by 2030	<b>Not Applicable.</b> The modified project would allow up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space and does not include residential or commercial uses.
<b>Non-combustion Methane Emissions</b>	
Divert 75% of organic waste from landfills by 2025	<b>Consistent.</b> SB 1383 establishes targets to achieve a 50 percent reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 2020 and a 75 percent reduction by 2025. The law establishes an additional target that not less than 20 percent of currently disposed edible food is recovered for human consumption by 2025. The modified project would comply with local and regional regulations and recycle or compost 75 percent of waste by 2025 pursuant to SB 1383.
Source: California Air Resources Board, <i>2022 Scoping Plan</i> , November 16, 2022.	

### *Consistency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS*

Connect SoCal 2024 was adopted on April 4, 2024. However, CARB concluded that the technical methodology SCAG used to quantify the GHG emission reductions for the Connect SoCal 2024 does not operate accurately.<sup>13</sup> SCAG resubmitted the SCS Submittal Package for CARB's review in June 2024. At the time of preparation of this Addendum, CARB has not made its determination on the validity of Connect SoCal 2024. Review by CARB is limited to acceptance or rejection of SCAG's determination that its SCS would, if implemented, achieve the region's GHG emissions reduction target. If CARB rejects SCAG's determination of meeting the GHG emission target, SCAG would need to revise the SCS or adopt an alternative planning strategy demonstrating the ability to achieve the target. As such, until CARB makes the decision, Connect SoCal 2024 is not a fully adopted document and is potentially subject to further updates, especially from the GHG reduction perspective of the methods and assumptions of the calculation of Auto Operating Costs (AOC)<sup>14</sup>, induced travel, electric vehicle incentives, job center parking and parking deregulation, off-model strategy assumptions, and emissions factors.

As CARB has not made the decision at the time of preparation of this document, the consistency analysis only relies upon the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, refer to Table 6, Consistency with 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS includes performance goals that were adopted to help focus future investments on the best-performing projects and different strategies to preserve, maintain, and optimize the performance of the existing transportation system. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS is forecasted to help California reach its GHG reduction goals by reducing GHG emissions from passenger cars by 8 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, and by 19 percent by 2035 in accordance with the most recent CARB targets adopted in March 2018. Five key SCS strategies are included in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS to help the region meet its regional VMT and GHG reduction goals. Table 6 evaluates the modified project's consistency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS strategies. As detailed, the modified project would be consistent with the GHG emission reduction strategies contained in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

---

<sup>13</sup> California Air Resources Board, *RE: CARB Review of Southern California Association of Governments' 2024 SCS Senate Bill 375 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Draft Technical Methodology*, March 29, 2024. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-04/SCAG%20memo%20final.pdf>, accessed February 13, 2025.

<sup>14</sup> AOC is used as key variable across several major model components of the travel demand model, such as vehicle ownership, destination choice, and mode choice. This parameter represents the expenses associated with the usage of vehicles, expressed in cents per mile or dollar per mile. AOC plays a pivotal role as a fundamental parameter within the travel demand model.

**Table 6  
Consistency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS**

Reduction Strategy	Applicable Land Use Tools	Description of Project Measure(S) / Documentation of Compliance / Explanation of Non-Compliance	Project Consistency
<b>Focus Growth Near Destinations and Mobility Options</b>			
<p>A) Emphasize land use patterns that facilitate multimodal access to work, educational and other destinations</p> <p>B) Focus on a regional jobs/housing balance to reduce commute times and distances and expand job opportunities near transit and along center-focused main streets</p> <p>C) Plan for growth near transit investments and support implementation of first/last mile strategies</p> <p>D) Promote the redevelopment of underperforming retail developments and other outmoded nonresidential uses</p> <p>E) Prioritize infill and redevelopment of underutilized land to accommodate new growth, increase amenities and connectivity in existing neighborhoods</p> <p>F) Encourage design and transportation options that reduce the reliance on and number of solo car trips (this could include mixed uses or locating and orienting close to existing destinations)</p> <p>G) Identify ways to “right size” parking requirements and promote alternative</p>	<p><b>Center Focused Placemaking, Priority Growth Areas (PGA), Job Centers, High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), Transit Priority Areas (TPA), Neighborhood Mobility Areas (NMAs), Livable Corridors, Spheres of Influence (SOIs), Green Region, Urban Greening.</b></p>	<p>A) The modified project site is in a highly developed and urbanized environment, bounded by the Union Pacific Railroad (Alhambra Subdivision Line) to the north, Grove Avenue to the east, Ontario Boulevard and Metrolink Railroad/Union Pacific Railroad (Los Angeles Subdivision Line) to the south, and Bon View Avenue to the west. The Ontario International Airport is located further to the east, across Grove Avenue. Additionally, the site is in close proximity to public transportation (the nearest existing bus stops provided by OmniTrans are located 600 feet north of the modified project boundary). As such, users of future industrial development associated with the modified project would be offered a variety of multimodal access.</p> <p>B) The modified project would connect to the existing roadways and be located within 0.2-mile of the residential communities, which would provide jobs to the surrounding communities.</p> <p>C) As detailed above, the modified project site is in a highly developed and urbanized environment. Additionally, the site is near public transportation (the nearest existing bus stops provided by OmniTrans are located 600 feet north of modified project boundary). As such, the modified project plans for growth (industrial development) near transit investments and support implementation of first/last mile strategies.</p> <p>D) The project site is a mostly vacant, disturbed site. Existing development on-site includes industrial uses in the northeastern</p>	<p><b>The modified project would be consistent with the strategy.</b></p>

Reduction Strategy	Applicable Land Use Tools	Description of Project Measure(S) / Documentation of Compliance / Explanation of Non-Compliance	Project Consistency
parking strategies (e.g. shared parking or smart parking)		<p>portion of the site and the former Ontario Access Center in the southwestern corner of the site. The modified project would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized site to create new economic opportunities within an urbanized area of Ontario.</p> <p>E) The modified project would allow the redevelopment of an underutilized site to create new economic opportunities within an urbanized area of Ontario. Additional future improvements would include new on-site local roadways, connecting the modified project site with surrounding off-site roadways.</p> <p>F) As detailed above, the modified project site is in a highly developed and urbanized environment with a variety of multimodal transportation access options. Future industrial development on-site would also be required to comply with the latest Title 24 Standards and CalGreen Code and provide bike and electric vehicle parking options to reduce the reliance on and number of solo car trips.</p> <p>G) As no specific development is proposed at this time, it would be too speculative to determine ways to “right size” parking requirements or promote specific alternative parking strategies. Nonetheless, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts.</p>	
<b>Promote Diverse Housing Choices</b>			
<p>A) Preserve and rehabilitate affordable housing and prevent displacement</p> <p>B) Identify funding</p>	<p><b>PGA, Job Centers, HQTAs, NMA, TPAs, Livable Corridors,</b></p>	<p>The modified project proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to accommodate development potential up to 1.9 million square feet of</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable.</b></p>

Reduction Strategy	Applicable Land Use Tools	Description of Project Measure(S) / Documentation of Compliance / Explanation of Non-Compliance	Project Consistency
<p>opportunities for new workforce and affordable housing development</p> <p>C) Create incentives and reduce regulatory barriers for building context sensitive accessory dwelling units to increase housing supply</p> <p>D) Provide support to local jurisdictions to streamline and lessen barriers to housing development that supports reduction of greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p><b>Green Region, Urban Greening.</b></p>	<p>industrial warehouse space. Existing land use designations and zoning on-site would remain as-is and would accommodate industrial development in accordance with the site's Industrial and Airport designations and IG and ONT zoning districts. As no housing development is proposed, this reduction strategy would not be applicable to the modified project.</p>	
<b>Leverage Technology Innovations</b>			
<p>A) Promote low emission technologies such as neighborhood electric vehicles, shared rides hailing, car sharing, bike sharing and scooters by providing supportive and safe infrastructure such as dedicated lanes, charging and parking/drop-off space</p> <p>B) Improve access to services through technology—such as telework and telemedicine as well as other incentives such as a “mobility wallet,” an app-based system for storing transit and other multi-modal payments</p> <p>C) Identify ways to incorporate “micro-power grids” in communities, for example solar energy, hydrogen fuel cell power storage, and power generation</p>	<p><b>HQTA, TPAs, NMA, Livable Corridors.</b></p>	<p>A) Future development within the modified project would comply with sustainable practices included in the latest Title 24 Standards and CalGreen Code, which would require developments to provide bike parking and electric vehicle parking to promote low emissions technologies.</p> <p>B) This reduction strategy does not apply as the modified project does not include specific development that could improve access to services through technology.</p> <p>C) Future development within the modified project would comply with sustainable practices included in the latest Title 24 Standards and CalGreen Code, which would require future development to install solar photovoltaic systems or meet certain energy efficiency standards.</p>	<p><b>The modified project would be consistent with this reduction strategy.</b></p>
<b>Support Implementation of Sustainability Policies</b>			
A) Pursue funding	<b>Center</b>	A) Future development within the	<b>The modified</b>

Reduction Strategy	Applicable Land Use Tools	Description of Project Measure(S) / Documentation of Compliance / Explanation of Non-Compliance	Project Consistency
<p>opportunities to support local sustainable development implementation projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>B) Support statewide legislation that reduces barriers to new construction and that incentivizes development near transit corridors and stations</p> <p>C) Support local jurisdictions in the establishment of Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs), Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities (CRIAs), or other tax increment or value capture tools to finance sustainable infrastructure and development projects, including parks and open space</p> <p>D) Work with local jurisdictions/communities to identify opportunities and assess barriers to implement sustainability strategies</p> <p>E) Enhance partnerships with other planning organizations to promote resources and best practices in the SCAG region</p> <p>F) Continue to support long range planning efforts by local jurisdictions</p> <p>G) Provide educational opportunities to local</p>	<p><b>Focused Placemaking, Priority Growth Areas (PGA), Job Centers, High Quality Transit Areas (HQTAs), Transit Priority Areas (TPA), Neighborhood Mobility Areas (NMAs), Livable Corridors, Spheres of Influence (SOIs), Green Region, Urban Greening.</b></p>	<p>modified project would comply with sustainable practices included in the CALGreen Code and Title 24 standards.</p> <p>B) As detailed above, the modified project is located within an urbanized area near transit corridors.</p> <p>C) This reduction strategy does not apply as the modified project does not involve infrastructure or park development.</p> <p>D) Future development within the modified project would be in an urbanized area near transit corridors and be required to comply with sustainable practices included in the CALGreen Code and Title 24 standards.</p> <p>E) This strategy is associated with regional-wide efforts to promote resources and best practices in the SCAG region and is not applicable to the modified project which proposes the consolidation of multiple parcels to accommodate the development of up to 1.9 million square feet of warehouse use as proposed and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR.</p> <p>F) The modified project supports the long-range planning efforts presented in TOP 2050.</p> <p>G) This strategy is associated with City-wide efforts to provide educational opportunities and is not applicable to the modified project which proposes the consolidation of multiple parcels to accommodate the development of up to 1.9 million square feet of warehouse use as proposed and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR.</p>	<p><b>project would be consistent with this reduction strategy.</b></p>

Reduction Strategy	Applicable Land Use Tools	Description of Project Measure(S) / Documentation of Compliance / Explanation of Non-Compliance	Project Consistency
decisions makers and staff on new tools, best practices and policies related to implementing the Sustainable Communities Strategy			
<b>Promote a Green Region</b>			
<p>A) Support development of local climate adaptation and hazard mitigation plans, as well as project implementation that improves community resiliency to climate change and natural hazards</p> <p>B) Support local policies for renewable energy production, reduction of urban heat islands and carbon sequestration</p> <p>C) Integrate local food production into the regional landscape</p> <p>D) Promote more resource efficient development focused on conservation, recycling and reclamation</p> <p>E) Preserve, enhance and restore regional wildlife connectivity</p> <p>F) Reduce consumption of resource areas, including agricultural land</p> <p>G) Identify ways to improve access to public park space</p>	<p><b>Green Region, Urban Greening, Greenbelts and Community Separators.</b></p>	<p>A) As demonstrated throughout this section, the modified project would be consistent with applicable local plans pertaining to climate adaptation.</p> <p>B) The modified project would be consistent with applicable local plans pertaining to climate adaptation. Additionally, future development within the modified project site would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code and Title 24 standards and implement design features that support renewable energy production and reduction of urban heat islands. Future development would also be subject to individual CEQA review that may warrant carbon sequestration.</p> <p>C) The modified project does not propose any use related to food production.</p> <p>D) The modified project would comply with local and regional regulations and recycle or compost 75 percent of waste by 2025 pursuant to SB 1383.</p> <p>E) The modified project would not impact wildlife connectivity in the project area; refer to <u>Section 3.2.2, Biological Resources</u>.</p> <p>F) The modified project does not propose any use related to agricultural production.</p> <p>G) The modified project proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to accommodate development potential up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. No public parks are located adjacent to the site.</p>	<p><b>The modified project would be consistent with this reduction strategy.</b></p>
<p>Source: Southern California Association of Governments, <i>2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy – Connect SoCal</i>, September 3, 2020.</p>			

### *Consistency with the City of Ontario 2022 Community Climate Action Plan*

The purpose of the 2022 CCAP is to provide guidance on how to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of modified development projects within the City. Because the 2022 CCAP addresses GHG emissions reductions and is consistent with the requirements of AB 32, SB 32, and international efforts to reduce GHG emissions, compliance with the 2022 CCAP fulfills the description of mitigation found in the State CEQA Guidelines. As discussed above, the modified project would be consistent with the 2022 Scoping Plan and the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Future development within the modified project would be required to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance on a case-by-case basis to ensure that development is consistent with applicable GHG reduction plans, including the 2022 CCAP. As such, the modified project would be consistent with the 2022 CCAP.

### Conclusion

In summary, the plan consistency analysis provided above demonstrates that the modified project complies with or exceeds the plans, policies, regulations and GHG reduction actions/strategies outlined in the 2022 Scoping Plan, the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, and the 2022 CCAP. Impacts on GHG would be less than significant, consistent with the conclusions reached in TOP 2050 SEIR.

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that GHG emissions impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

### **3.2.6 Noise**

#### **Approved Project Findings**

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, construction activities associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would result in temporary noise increases at sensitive receptors during construction activities and could create groundborne vibration during construction activities in excess of established standards. 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-4 would reduce potential impacts associated with construction from individual development projects to the extent feasible, and 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-2 would reduce potential impacts associated with construction vibration from individual development projects to the extent feasible. However, due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive

uses, the number of construction projects occurring simultaneously, and the potential duration of construction activities, TOP 2050 could still result in a temporary substantial increase in noise levels above ambient conditions and exceedance of the 80 A-weighted decibel (dBA) equivalent sound level ( $L_{eq}$ ) threshold and generate excessive vibration levels at sensitive receptor locations. Therefore, TOP 2050 SEIR concluded that construction noise and vibration impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Buildout associated with TOP 2050 would not result in new types of stationary noise sources. Furthermore, TOP 2050 includes Safety Element Policy S-4.1, *Noise Mitigation*, which utilizes the City's Noise Ordinance, building codes, and subdivision and development code regulations to reduce noise from future development projects. As such, stationary noise impacts would be less than significant. Regarding transportation noise, TOP 2050 traffic noise levels would increase along studied roadway segments in the City but would not result in the exceedance of the significance threshold when other noise sources such as rail have been taken into considerations. Additionally, TOP 2050 includes Safety Element Policies S-4.2, *Coordination with Transportation Authorities*, S-4.4, *Truck Traffic*, and S-4.5, *Roadway Design*, that would minimize traffic noise impacts. As such, transportation noise impacts would be less than significant. Moreover, according to TOP 2050 SEIR, TOP 2050's commercial and industrial operations would not generate significant vibration impacts, and vibration from industrial and commercial operations would be less than significant.

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, implementation of TOP 2050 could expose noise sensitive uses to excessive noise levels from the Ontario International Airport. With the implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-1, impacts to future sensitive receptors from excessive airport-related noise would be reduced to interior noise levels of 45 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or less. While interior noise levels are required to achieve the interior noise limits of Title 24 and Title 25, exterior noise levels may continue to exceed the noise compatibility criteria for the City. Consequently, TOP 2050 SEIR concluded that airport noise compatibility impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

## **Modified Project Analysis**

### Existing Conditions

#### *Sensitive Receptors*

Human response to noise varies widely depending on the type of noise, time of day, and sensitivity of the receptor. Sensitive populations are more susceptible to the effects of noise than are the general population. Land uses considered sensitive by the State of California include schools, playgrounds, athletic facilities, hospitals, rest homes, rehabilitation centers, long-term care and mental care facilities. Generally, a sensitive receptor is identified as a location where human populations (especially children, senior citizens, and sick persons) are present. Land uses less sensitive to noise are business, commercial, and professional developments. Noise receptors categorized as being least

sensitive to noise include industrial, manufacturing, utilities, agriculture, natural open space, undeveloped land, parking lots, warehousing, and transit terminals. These types of land uses often generate high noise levels. Moderately sensitive land uses typically include multi-family dwellings, hotels, motels, dormitories, and outpatient clinics.

The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is the existing single-family residential use located approximately 160 feet to the north (210 South Bon View Avenue).

### *Stationary Sources*

The project site is surrounded by vacant lands on all sides with remote residential uses further north, warehousing uses further south and west, and recreational (park) and airport uses to the west. Given the distance to these land uses, noise from stationary sources are minimal at the project site.

Nonetheless, stationary noise sources in the project vicinity include mechanical equipment, airport-related activities, and stationary noise sources from the industrial uses within the project vicinity. The noise associated with these stationary sources may represent a single-event noise occurrence, short-term, or long-term/continuous noise.

### *Mobile Sources*

Most of the existing noise in the project area is generated from vehicle sources along Bon View Street, South Grove Avenue, Ontario Boulevard, and East State Street. To assess the potential for mobile source noise impacts from these project area and nearby roadways, it is necessary to determine the noise currently generated by vehicles traveling through the project area. Existing roadway noise levels in the vicinity of the project site were projected utilizing noise models in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration's Highway (FHWA) Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108) together with several roadway and site parameters. These parameters determine the projected impact of vehicular traffic noise and include the roadway cross-section (such as the number of lanes), roadway width, ADT, vehicle travel speed, percentages of auto and truck traffic, roadway grade, angle-of-view, and site conditions ("hard" or "soft"). The model does not account for ambient noise levels (i.e., noise from adjacent land uses) or topographical differences between the roadway and adjacent land uses. As shown in Table 7, the noise levels along the roadways range from 47.4 dBA to 66.8 dBA.

**Table 7  
Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions				
	Average Daily Trip (ADT) <sup>1</sup>	dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline	Distance from Roadway Centerline: (Feet)		
			70 CNEL Noise Contour	65 CNEL Noise Contour	60 CNEL Noise Contour
Bon View Avenue, South of Holt Boulevard	722	47.4	-	-	-
State Street, East of Bon View Avenue	21,320	63.7	-	81	176
Grove Avenue, South of Holt Boulevard	55,507	66.8	-	131	283
Grove Avenue, South of Airport Drive	4,748	56.9	-	-	62
Ontario Boulevard, East of Campus Avenue	3,204	53.9	-	-	39

Notes:  
1. The average daily trip is from the *Ontario Plan 2050 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Appendix H, Noise Monitoring and Modeling*.

**Existing Ambient Noise Levels**

To quantify existing ambient noise levels in the project area, Michael Baker International conducted four short-term noise measurements in the project vicinity on February 5, 2025. The 10-minute measurements were taken between 10:30 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. Refer to Exhibit 4, *Noise Measurement Locations*, of Appendix D, Noise Data, for measurement locations. Short-term ( $L_{eq}$ ) measurements at these locations are considered representative of the noise levels in the project area throughout the day. The noise measurements were taken during “off-peak” (9:00 a.m. through 3:00 p.m.) traffic noise hours as this provides a more conservative baseline. During rush hour traffic, vehicle speeds and heavy truck volumes are often low; as such, free-flowing traffic conditions before or after rush hour often yield higher noise levels due to higher vehicle speeds.<sup>15</sup> The ambient noise levels measured are identified in Table 8, Noise Measurements.

**Table 8  
Noise Measurements**

Site No.	Location	$L_{eq}$ (dBA)	$L_{min}$ (dBA)	$L_{max}$ (dBA)	Start Time
NM-1	In front of 201 South Bon View Avenue	65.7	44.5	84.4	10:42 a.m.
NM-2	Along the back of 1120 East Holt Boulevard that borders East Emporia Street	67.0	54.9	85.3	11:05 a.m.
NM-3	In front of 764 East Ontario Boulevard	68.3	46.8	82.7	11:26 a.m.
NM-4	In front of 1004 East California Street	70.0	63.3	84.4	11:43 a.m.

Source: Refer to Appendix D, Noise Data, for the results of the field measurements; refer to Exhibit 4, *Noise Measurement Locations*, for measurement locations.

<sup>15</sup> California Department of Transportation, *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*, September 2013.

Meteorological conditions were sunny, cold temperatures (55 degrees Fahrenheit [°F]), and wind speeds of approximately 4 mile per hour. Measured noise levels during the daytime measurements ranged from 65.7 to 70.0 dBA  $L_{eq}$ . The sources of peak noise include traffic along the roadways and overhead airplane noise. Noise monitoring equipment used for the ambient noise survey consisted of a Brüel & Kjær Hand-held Analyzer Type 2250 equipped with a Type 4189 pre-polarized microphone. The monitoring equipment complies with applicable requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Type I (precision) sound level meters. Refer to [Appendix D](#), for the results of the field measurement.

### Construction Noise

The modified project proposes to consolidate multiple parcels on an approximately 81-acre site to accommodate development potential up to 1.9 million square feet of industrial warehouse space. There is no construction or development proposed within the modified project site at this time. Construction noise levels depend on multiple factors, including but not limited to, duration of construction phases, types and numbers of construction equipment to be used, soil import and export volumes, etc., all of which cannot be determined at this stage of the planning process. As such, construction-related noise levels that may occur at any one time in any scale are speculative and cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, and therefore the associated construction noise impact was previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Furthermore, the modified project would be subject to TOP 2050 Safety Element Policy S-4.1, *Noise Mitigation*, which would help minimize the construction noise impacts through enforcement of the City's Noise Ordinance. Municipal Code Section 5-29.09, *Construction activity noise regulations* (City's Noise Ordinance), limits construction, remodeling, digging, grading, demolition, or any other related building activity to between the hours of 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, Monday through Friday, and 9:00 am to 6:00 pm on weekends. Further, the modified project would be subject to 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-4. 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-4 would ensure that best management practices would be incorporated into construction plans and implemented during construction associated with new development near sensitive receptors. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts.

Due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses, the number of construction projects that may occur simultaneously, and the potential duration of construction activities, construction noise impacts could still result in a temporary substantial increase in noise levels above ambient conditions and exceedance of the 80 dBA  $L_{eq}$  threshold used in TOP 2050 SEIR. However, as the modified project would only consolidate parcels under a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050 and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height

restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, future development would be within the scope of TOP 2050 and would not generate noise levels beyond what was analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. TOP 2050 SEIR concluded that short-term construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as is the case with the modified project. Overall, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

#### *Construction Vibration*

Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. It is expected that ground-borne vibration from modified project construction activities would cause only intermittent, localized intrusion. Ground-borne vibration levels resulting from typical construction activities occurring within the modified project site were estimated by data published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Caltrans. However, while vehicular traffic is rarely perceptible, construction has the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary ground vibration, depending on the specific construction activities and equipment used. Based on the representative vibration levels presented for various construction equipment types, it is possible to estimate the potential construction vibration levels using vibration assessment methods defined by Caltrans.

There is no specific construction or development proposed within the modified project site at this time. Construction vibration levels depend on multiple factors, including but not limited to, duration of construction phases, types and numbers of construction equipment to be used, etc., all of which cannot be determined at this stage of the planning process. As such, construction-related vibration impacts that may occur at any one time in any scale are speculative and cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, and therefore the associated construction vibration impact was previously contemplated and analyzed in the TOP 2050 SEIR. Furthermore, the modified project would be subject to TOP 2050 Safety Element Policy S-4.1, *Noise Mitigation*, which would help minimize the construction vibration impacts through enforcement of the City's Noise Ordinance. Further, the modified project would be subject to 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-2. Implementation of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-2 would reduce potential impacts associated with construction vibration from individual development projects to the extent feasible. Furthermore, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts.

Due to the potential for proximity of construction activities to sensitive uses, the number of construction projects that may occur simultaneously, and the potential duration of construction activities, construction vibration impacts could still result in elevated vibration level in exceedance of the FTA criterion for vibration annoyance (72 vibration decibel [VdB]). However, as the modified project would only consolidate parcels under a Tentative Parcel Map to accommodate industrial development previously contemplated in TOP 2050

and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, and the modified project is consistent with the land use designation, zoning, FAR intensity, and height restrictions for the project site identified in TOP 2050, future development would be within the scope of TOP 2050 and would not generate vibration levels beyond what was analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR. Therefore, similar to the approved project, short-term construction vibration impacts from the modified project would remain significant and unavoidable. Overall, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

### Operational Noise

Operation of future industrial development on-site could result in operational noise impacts. These operational noise levels could be quantified at this time as the nearest sensitive receptors could be determined based on the parcels included in the modified project and daily trips on major roadways adjacent to these identified closest sensitive receptors.

### *Off-Site Mobile Noise*

Future development within the modified project area would result in additional traffic on adjacent roadways, thereby potentially increasing vehicular noise in the vicinity of existing and proposed land uses. The most prominent source of mobile traffic noise in the project vicinity is along East Ontario Boulevard, South Bon View Avenue, and East Airport Drive. According to VMT Scoping Memo prepared for the project, the proposed warehouse would generate approximately 5,060 total daily trips. The nearest sensitive receptors (201 South Bon View Avenue) are located along South Bon View Avenue.

To assess the off-site traffic CNEL noise level impacts associated with development of the modified project, noise level contours were developed based on modified project-specific traffic impact analysis. Noise level contour boundaries represent the equal levels of noise exposure and are measured in CNEL from the center of the roadway. Noise contours were used to assess the modified project's incremental 24-hour dBA CNEL traffic-related noise impacts at land uses adjacent to roadways conveying modified project-related traffic. The noise contours represent the distance to noise levels of a constant value and are measured from the center of the roadway for the 70, 65, and 60 dBA CNEL noise levels. The noise contours do not consider the effect of any existing noise barriers or topography that may attenuate ambient noise levels. In addition, because the noise contours reflect modeling of vehicular noise on area roadways, they appropriately do not reflect noise contributions from the surrounding stationary noise sources within the study area.

As shown in Table 7, the existing condition would generate noise levels ranging from 47.4 dBA to 66.8 dBA at 100 feet from the roadway centerline. With the modified project, noise levels would range from 59.4 dBA to 69.8 dBA at 100 feet from the roadway centerline; refer to Table 9, *Traffic Noise Levels With and Without Modified Project Comparison*.

Even with the increase, the noise levels due to the modified project along Bon View Avenue and Ontario Boulevard would not exceed the 60 dBA CNEL normally acceptable noise standard for Residential – Low Density, Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes (refer to the *State Office of Planning and Research Noise Element Guidance*). There are no residential uses and only industrial uses located along Grove Avenue. With the implementation of the modified project, the noise levels along Grove Avenue South of Airport Drive would be 69.8 dBA, which would not exceed the 75 dBA CNEL normally acceptable noise standard for industrial land uses. Furthermore, the remaining roadway segments (State Street and Grove Avenue South of Holt Boulevard) would not experience a noise level increase of 3.0 dBA or more due to the implementation of the modified project. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

Overall, the mobile noise levels associated with the modified project would not exceed the land use compatibility standards at all nearby receiver locations and would not result in significant increases. As such, operational noise impacts resulting from mobile noise sources would be less than significant. The modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR, which was identified to be a less than significant impact.

**Table 9  
Traffic Noise Levels With and Without Modified Project Comparison**

Roadway Segment	Existing		Modified Project					Difference in dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway
	ADT <sup>1</sup>	dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT <sup>2</sup>	dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline	Distance from Roadway Centerline: (Feet)			
					70 CNEL Noise Contour	65 CNEL Noise Contour	60 CNEL Noise Contour	
Bon View Avenue, South of Holt Boulevard	722	47.4	5,782	59.4	-	-	91	11.9
State Street, East of Bon View Avenue	21,320	63.7	26,380	65.9	-	116	249	2.3
Grove Avenue, South of Holt Boulevard	55,507	66.8	60,567	69.8	97	210	452	3.0
Grove Avenue, South of	4,748	56.9	9,808	60.3	-	-	104	3.3

Roadway Segment	Existing		Modified Project					Difference in dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway
	ADT <sup>1</sup>	dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT <sup>2</sup>	dBA @ 100 Feet from Roadway Centerline	Distance from Roadway Centerline: (Feet)			
					70 CNEL Noise Contour	65 CNEL Noise Contour	60 CNEL Noise Contour	
Airport Drive								
Ontario Boulevard, East of Campus Avenue	3,204	53.9	8,264	59.4	-	-	92	5.5
Notes:								
1. The approved project's ADT are from the <i>Ontario Plan 2050 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Appendix H, Noise Monitoring and Modeling</i> .								
2. The average daily trip for modified project is the existing ADT (refer to <a href="#">Table 7</a> ) plus the modified project ADT (5,060 trips).								
Source: Refer to <a href="#">Appendix D</a> .								

### Stationary Operational Noise

The modified project would allow for up to 1.9 million square feet of future industrial development. The main stationary noise source typical for warehousing facilities would be mechanical equipment and slow-moving trucks.

### Mechanical Equipment

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units would be installed on the roof of future warehouse buildings. Typically, mechanical equipment, such as HVAC units, generates noise levels of 60 dBA at 20 feet from the source. Noise generated by stationary sources typically attenuates at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling distance from the source. The nearest sensitive receptor to the modified project site is the existing single-family residential use, located approximately 160 feet to the north. At this distance, noise levels from HVAC units would be approximately 42 dBA. However, future warehouses would not be built on the project boundary. Therefore, the operation of the HVAC units would be lower than 42 dBA and not exceed the City's exterior (65 dBA during daytime and 45 dBA during nighttime, refer to Municipal Code Section 5-29.04, *Exterior Noise Standard*) noise standards at the nearest sensitive receptor. Furthermore, the noise level would not exceed the ambient noise level (65.7 dBA, refer to [Table 8](#) above) at the nearest sensitive receptors. As such, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

### Slow-Moving Trucks

The predominant noise source during on-site warehouse operations would be on-site truck movements and idling. Typically, slow movements from these trucks can generate

a maximum noise level of approximately 79 dBA at 50 feet. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is the existing single-family residential use, located approximately 160 feet to the north. At this distance, noise levels from slow-moving trucks would be approximately 69 dBA. However, the loading docks would not be located on the project boundary. As such, the noise level would be much lower than 69 dBA. Although the noise level cannot be quantified at this time, future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to ensure that development would be consistent with the City's noise standards. As such, impacts would be considered less than significant.

### *Conclusion*

As shown above, projected stationary and mobile noise impacts associated with the modified project would be less than significant. Further, all future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Therefore, long-term operational noise impacts related to implementation of the modified project would be less than significant, consistent with TOP 2050 SEIR.

Overall, the modified project would result in less than significant traffic noise impacts during operation. The modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

### Operational Vibration

Industrial operations would generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration, depending on the operational procedures and equipment. Similar to the 2010 TOP EIR and TOP 2050 SEIR findings, the majority of industrial uses proposed under the modified project would not be immediately adjacent to vibration-sensitive uses, the use of heavy equipment associated with industrial activities would occur indoors, and no significant vibration impacts would occur from vibration generated by industrial uses. All future developments within the project site would be subject to project-specific and site-specific discretionary approvals (including separate CEQA review) on a case-by-case basis to evaluate and mitigate, as needed, any project-specific environmental impacts. Further, the modified project would be consistent with the site's existing land use designations and zoning. As such, impacts would be less than significant, consistent with TOP 2050 SEIR. The modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

## Airport Noise

According to the City's *Official Zoning Map*, the site is zoned IG and ONT. The modified project site is located within the ONT Airport Influence Area according to Policy Map 2-1 of the ONT ALUCP.<sup>16</sup> Since the modified project site is located within the ONT Airport Influence Area, the modified project is subject to the Noise Criteria established in the ONT ALUCP. As shown in ONT ALUCP Exhibit 1-9, *Compatibility Factors: Noise*, the modified project site is located within the 70 to 75 dBA CNEL airport noise level contours.<sup>17</sup> According to the ONT ALUCP Table 2-3, *Noise Criteria*, indoor storage (wholesale sales, warehouses, mini/other indoor storage, barns, greenhouses) within the 70 to 75 dBA CNEL is considered a normally compatible land use.<sup>18</sup> As such, airport noise impacts would be less than significant. It should be acknowledged that as the modified project is not located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour, 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measure 12-1 is not applicable to the modified project. Overall, the modified project would not result in a new significant environmental effect or substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant environmental effect as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR.

## Conclusion

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that noise impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be significant and unavoidable despite implementation of applicable mitigation measures. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

## **Applicable Certified 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures:**

- 12-2 Prior to issuance of a building permit, Individual projects that involve vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers occurring near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. For construction within 135 feet of fragile structures, such as historical resources, within 100 feet of nonengineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); or a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate

---

<sup>16</sup> Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Map 2-1, Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ONT-AIA-policy-map-2-1.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

<sup>17</sup> Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Exhibit 1-9, Compatibility Factors: Noise*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ONT-compatibility-Exhibit-1-9-July-2018-Amendment.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

<sup>18</sup> Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Table 2-3, Noise Criteria*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ALUCP-Chap-2-Table-2-3-Noise-Criteria-Amendment-July-2018-Final-Doc.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

potential noise and vibration impacts related to these activities. This noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed Federal Transit Administration (FTA) architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 inches per second [in/sec] peak particle velocity [PPV] for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for nonengineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed this threshold, alternative uses shall be used, such as drilling piles as opposed to pile driving and static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

### 3.2.7 Transportation

#### Approved Project Findings

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that the approved project would result in less than significant impacts related to the circulation system, hazardous traffic conditions due to geometric design, and adequate emergency access. However, TOP 2050 SEIR found that due to the approved project's anticipated population increase, an increase in VMT would occur, which would result in potentially significant impacts. As such, TOP 2050 SEIR included Mitigation Measure T-1, which would require that prior to approval of discretionary projects under TOP 2050 and subject to VMT reduction analysis, applicants shall demonstrate compliance with the City's VMT Guidelines for CEQA assessment of VMT impacts. For projects with VMT per Service Population exceeding the County's significance threshold, a mitigation plan shall be developed and implemented. Mitigation should consist of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures analyzed under a VMT-reduction methodology consistent with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's (CAPCOA) *Final Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity*, and approved by the City (if applicable). However, given the uncertainty of the effectiveness of implementing TDM measures at a Citywide level and of their effectiveness at reducing Citywide VMT, VMT impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

#### Modified Project Analysis

The *Part 150 Project – Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Scoping and Screening Memorandum*, prepared by Michael Baker International and dated January 27, 2025, provided the basis for this analysis; refer to [Appendix E, VMT Analysis](#). Per the City's VMT Guidelines for CEQA assessment of VMT impacts, land use projects that meet one or more VMT screening thresholds can be presumed to result in a less than significant

transportation impact. These criteria include location, trip-making potential, proximity to transit, or project type.

Under the Low VMT Area screening (i.e., the location VMT screening threshold), a project located within a low VMT-generating model traffic analysis zone (TAZ) may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. Utilizing the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) VMT Screening Tool threshold of “Below County Baseline (15%),” the VMT Scoping Memo prepared for the modified project determined that all parcels within the modified project site are located within a Low VMT-generating TAZ; refer to [Appendix E](#). As the modified project would be consistent with the site’s IG and ONT zones, it is anticipated that the modified project would generate VMT consistent with the location. Therefore, the modified project would meet this VMT screening threshold and would not require a detailed project-specific VMT analysis. Future buildout of the site with approximately 1.9 million square feet of warehouse use following implementation of the modified project would result in a less than significant impact regarding VMT.

While the modified project does not propose new bicycle facilities or new transit infrastructure, the modified project would not alter existing access to existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, including stops and connections for Metrolink. As described in [Section 2.3, \*Modified Project Description\*](#), future industrial development on-site would be required to provide new on-site local roadways connecting the modified project site with surrounding off-site roadways, as well as street frontage improvements including sidewalk, curb, gutter, street paving, streetlights, and landscaping to meet City requirements. All circulation improvements would be designed to City standards and would enhance connectivity through and around the modified project site. Further, no roadway improvements are proposed that would create geometric design hazards or impact emergency access in the modified project area.

### Conclusion

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that transportation impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be significant and unavoidable despite implementation of applicable mitigation measures. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2010 EIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:** None.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

### 3.2.8 Tribal Cultural Resources

#### Approved Project Findings

According to TOP 2050 SEIR, future development as a result of TOP 2050 implementation could occur in portions of the City with sensitivity to tribal cultural resources. Grading and construction activities in undeveloped areas or redevelopment that requires deeper soil excavation than in the past could potentially disturb tribal cultural resources. However, TOP 2050 SEIR determined that 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures 5-3 (tribal consultation and preparation of a cultural resources assessment) and 5-4 (construction-related tribal resources mitigation) as well as TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures TCR-1 (tribal cultural resources monitoring plan) and TCR-2 (treatment and disposition of cultural resources) would reduce potential impacts associated with tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels. Therefore, TOP 2050 SEIR concluded that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### Modified Project Analysis

With respect to tribal consultation for the modified project, AB 52 states that prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report for a project, a lead agency shall begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area and the tribe requests consultation. As this environmental document (i.e., an Addendum) is not a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report, AB 52 consultation would not apply to the modified project. Nevertheless, tribal consultation under AB 52 and California Senate Bill (SB) 18 was conducted as part of TOP 2050 SEIR, which resulted in the inclusion of 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures 5-3 (tribal consultation and preparation of a cultural resources assessment) and 5-4 (construction-related tribal resources mitigation) as well as TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures TCR-1 (tribal cultural resources monitoring plan) and TCR-2 (treatment and disposition of cultural resources) to reduce potential impacts associated with tribal cultural resources to less than significant levels.

Future development of the project site with up to 1.9 million square feet of warehouse use would involve ground-disturbing activities during construction and thus, would be required to implement 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures 5-3 and 5-4 as well as TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2.

#### Conclusion

TOP 2050 SEIR determined that tribal cultural resources impacts associated with buildout of TOP 2050 would be less than significant upon implementation of applicable mitigation measures. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would

implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project.

**Applicable Certified 2010 TOP EIR Mitigation Measures:**

- 5-3            Upon receipt of an application for a proposed project subject to CEQA and within the City’s jurisdiction, the City’s representative shall consult with the relevant tribe(s)’ representative(s) to determine if the proposed project is within a culturally sensitive area to the tribe. If sufficient evidence is provided to reasonably ascertain that the site is within a tribal culturally sensitive area, an archaeologist shall prepare a cultural resources assessment. The findings of the cultural resources assessment shall be incorporated into the CEQA documentation. A copy of the report shall be forwarded to the tribe(s). If mitigation is recommended in the CEQA document, the procedure described in Mitigation Measure 5-4 shall be followed.
- 5-4            Prior to the issuance of grading permits for proposed project for which the CEQA document defines cultural resource mitigation for potential tribal resources, the project applicant shall contact the designated tribe(s) to notify them of the grading, excavation, and monitoring program. The applicant shall coordinate with the City of Ontario and the tribal representative(s) to develop mitigation measures that address the designation, responsibilities, and participation of tribal monitors during grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities; scheduling; terms of compensation; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site. The City of Ontario shall be the final arbiter of the conditions for projects within the City’s jurisdiction.

**Applicable Certified TOP 2050 SEIR Mitigation Measures:**

- TCR-1        Tribal Cultural Resources Monitoring. The project archaeologist, in consultation with interested tribes, the developer, and the City of Ontario, shall develop an archaeological monitoring plan (AMP) to address the details, timing, and responsibility of archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. Details in the AMP shall include:
1. Project-related ground disturbance (including, but not limited to, brush clearing, grading, trenching, etc.) and development scheduling;
  2. The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the developer and the project archeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site: including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native

American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all project archaeologists (if the tribes cannot come to an agreement on the rotating or simultaneous schedule of tribal monitoring, the Native American Heritage Commission shall designate the schedule for the onsite Native American Tribal Monitor for the proposed project);

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

At least 30 days prior to application for a grading permit and before any brush clearance, grading, excavation, and/or ground disturbing activities on the site, the developer shall retain a tribal cultural monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources.

Pursuant to the AMP, a tribal monitor from the consulting tribe shall be present during the initial grading activities. If tribal resources are found during grubbing activities, the tribal monitoring shall be present during site grading activities.

TCR-2

Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources. In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of any ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to brush clearance, grading, trenching, etc., for the proposed project, the following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

1. Temporary Curation and Storage: During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location on-site or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process;
2. Treatment and Final Disposition: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and nonhuman remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Ontario with evidence of same:
  - a. Accommodate the process for on-site reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area

from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloging, basic analysis, other analyses as recommended by the project archaeologist and approved by consulting tribes, and basic recordation have been completed; all documentation should be at a level of standard professional practice to allow the writing of a report of professional quality;

- b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository in San Bernardino County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79, and therefore the resource would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility in San Bernardino County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;
- c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, materials shall be curated at the San Bernardino County Museum by default;
- d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City, County Museum, and consulting tribes.

**Modified Project Conditions:** None.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **4.0 DETERMINATION/ADDENDUM CONCLUSION**

As detailed in the analysis presented above, this Addendum supports the conclusion that the modified project constitutes minor or technical changes and do not result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects as compared to the conclusions of TOP 2050 SEIR. No new information has become available and no substantial changes to the circumstances under which the approved project was being undertaken since the certification of TOP 2050 SEIR have occurred. As identified in TOP 2050 SEIR, the approved project would result in significant environmental impacts with regard to air quality, cultural resources, noise, and transportation. As the modified project is proposing a Tentative Parcel Map that would implement industrial warehouse development previously contemplated and analyzed in TOP 2050 SEIR, the modified project would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the approved project. As such, there are no new or different mitigation measures or alternatives that need to be considered in order to reduce significant impacts.

This page intentionally left blank.

## 5.0 REFERENCES

California Air Resources Board, *2022 Scoping Plan*, November 16, 2022.

California Air Resource Board, *AQMIS Data*, <https://www.arb.ca.gov/aqmis2/display.php?param=CO&year=2024&units=007&report=SITE1YR&statistic=DMAX&site=3820&ptype=aqd>, accessed February 6, 2025.

California Air Resources Board, *RE: CARB Review of Southern California Association of Governments' 2024 SCS Senate Bill 375 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Draft Technical Methodology*, March 29, 2024. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2024-04/SCAG%20memo%20final.pdf>, accessed February 13, 2025.

California Department of Conservation, *California Important Farmland Finder*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

California Department of Conservation, *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

California Department of Conservation, *Fault Activity Map of California*, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

California Department of Forestry and Fire, *Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area*, effective April 1, 2024, <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008>, accessed January 19, 2025.

California Department of Transportation, *California State Scenic Highway System Map*, <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>, accessed January 19, 2025.

California Department of Transportation, *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*, September 2013.

California Energy Commission, *2023 Integrated Energy Policy Report*, page 130, July 14, 2024.

California Energy Commission, *Final 2022 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update*, page 140, May 10, 2023.

California Environmental Protection Agency, *Cortese List Data Resources*, <http://calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/>, accessed January 19, 2025.

City of Ontario Housing Services Department, *Continuum of Care*, <https://www.ontarioca.gov/ContinuumCare>, accessed December 31, 2024.

City of Ontario, *Official Zoning Map*, approved December 1, 2015, effective January 1, 2016.

City of Ontario, *Ontario Development Code*, revised November 5, 2024.

City of Ontario, *Ontario Municipal Code*, current through Ordinance 3293, passed December 17, 2024.

City of Ontario, *The Ontario Plan*, approved January 27, 2010, amended August 16, 2022.

City of Ontario, *The Ontario Plan 2050 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse No. 2021070364, prepared by PlaceWorks, August 2022.

Michael Baker International, *Biological Resources Assessment for the City of Ontario Part 150 Project in the City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California*, March 4, 2025.

Michael Baker International *Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the City of Ontario Part 150 Project in the City of Ontario, San Bernardino County, California*, February 27, 2025.

Michael Baker International, *Part 150 Project – Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Scoping and Screening Memorandum*, January 27, 2025.

Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Exhibit 1-9, Compatibility Factors: Noise*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ONT-compatibility-Exhibit-1-9-July-2018-Amendment.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Map 2-1, Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ONT-AIA-policy-map-2-1.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

Ontario International Airport, *Land Use Compatibility Plan, July 2018 Amendment, Table 2-3, Noise Criteria*, <https://www.ont-iac.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ALUCP-Chap-2-Table-2-3-Noise-Criteria-Amendment-July-2018-Final-Doc.pdf>, accessed January 7, 2025.

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, *Application for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae Brief of San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District in Support of Defendant and Respondent, County of Fresno and Real Party In Interest and Respondent, Friant Ranch, L.P. In the Supreme Court of California. Sierra Club, Revive the San Joaquin, and League of Women Voters of Fresno v. County of Fresno*, 2014.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Application of the South Coast Air Quality Management District for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae in Support of Neither Party and Brief of Amicus Curiae. In the Supreme Court of California. Sierra Club, Revive the San Joaquin, and League of Women Voters of Fresno v. County of Fresno*, 2014.

Southern California Association of Governments, *2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy – Connect SoCal*, September 3, 2020.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **APPENDICES**