

Memorandum

To: DiTanyon Johnson, Senior Planner, City of Fontana
From: Peter Minegar, Project Manager
Date: June 10, 2020
Subject: Supplemental Errata: I-15 Logistics Final EIR

This Supplemental Errata is being provided for inclusion in the I-15 Logistics Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) in order to address minor typographical errors identified after the completion of the Final EIR. A double underline indicates additions to the text and a ~~strike through~~ indicates deletions to the text. The changes to the Revised Draft EIR do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document. Changes are listed by page and, where appropriate, by paragraph.

None of the minor updates, corrections, or clarifications to the Revised Draft EIR identified in this Supplemental Errata constitutes “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. As a result, a recirculation of the Revised Draft EIR is not required. Any changes referenced to mitigation measures contained in the Revised Draft EIR text also apply to Revised Draft EIR Section 1.0, Executive Summary.

The corrections, additions, and clarifications are as follows:

Revised Draft EIR Section 4.2, Air Quality

PAGE 4.2-16, IMPACT 4.2.2, VIOLATE AIR QUALITY STANDARDS, TABLE 4.2-6

Table 4.2-6: Unmitigated Long-Term Operational Emissions

Source	Pollutant (pounds per day) ¹					
	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO _x)	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)
Area Source	26.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00
Energy Use	0.07 <u>0.05</u>	0.64 <u>0.44</u>	0.05 <u>0.03</u>	0.05 <u>0.03</u>	0.54 <u>0.37</u>	0.00
Mobile Source ²	8.90 <u>8.18</u>	146.82 <u>95.86</u>	41.35 <u>41.59</u>	11.82 <u>12.04</u>	131.28 <u>100.79</u>	0.75 <u>0.61</u>
Total	35.72 <u>34.98</u>	147.46 <u>96.30</u>	41.40 <u>41.62</u>	11.87 <u>12.08</u>	131.98 <u>101.33</u>	0.75 <u>0.61</u>
Potentially Significant Impact Threshold (Daily Emissions)	55	55	150	55	550	150
Exceed Daily Threshold?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No

Source: Michael Baker International 2018-2020; see Appendix B.

Notes:

1. Emissions calculated using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2.
2. Based on the EMFAC 2014 2017 emissions rates in 2022 web database, in 2021, 74% of the diesel trucks on the road will be 2010 models or newer.

PAGE 4.2-17, IMPACT 4.2.2, VIOLATE AIR QUALITY STANDARDS, MITIGATION MEASURES

AQ-4 The Logistics Facility ~~site plan design shall provide~~ include a minimum of ~~two ten~~ on-site Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations available for use by employees and guests.

PAGE 4.2-17, IMPACT 4.2.2, VIOLATE AIR QUALITY STANDARDS, LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

~~Although t~~The operational mitigation measures identified above would serve to reduce operational emissions associated with the Proposed Project, ~~the extent to which such measures would result in reductions is not quantifiable. However, No~~ mitigation measures beyond Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 would reduce project-related impacts to levels that are less than significant. Long-term project operation would generate NO_x emissions that exceed the applicable SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, impacts resulting from the project's long-term operation would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Revised Draft EIR Section 4.3, Biological Resources

PAGE 4.3-23, THIRD PARAGRAPH, SECTION 4.3.2, REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

~~Because the habitat within the NFCP area varies in quality from parcel to parcel, a tiered development mitigation fee program provides the most equitable approach to allocating mitigation responsibilities and may be imposed on new development in the NFCP area based on the quality of the habitat on the development site and a site's potential to support SBKR, CAGN, or other special status species occurring in the vicinity. The mitigation fee is charged for each acre of land proposed for development based on the habitat quality rating.~~

Revised Draft EIR Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions

PAGE 4.7-14, IMPACT 4.7-1, GREENHOUSE GASES

The SCAQMD asserts that CalEEMod underestimates trip lengths for warehouse and industrial use projects because most heavy-duty trucks would be hauling consumer goods from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles and/or to destinations outside of California. The SCAQMD states that for this reason, CalEEMod default trip length would not be representative of Project activities. The SCAQMD recommends the use of a 40-mile one-way trip length for warehouse and industrial projects. Therefore, the Proposed Project would directly result in approximately ~~12,325.81~~ 10,754.48 MTCO₂eq per year of mobile source-generated GHG emissions.

Revised Draft EIR Section 4.13, Transportation

PAGE 4.13-19, FIRST PARAGRAPH, IMPACT 4.13-1, CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE ROADWAY PLANS

According to the City's significance criteria, Sierra Avenue / I-15 Northbound Ramps (Intersection No. 8) would result in a potentially significant impact as a result of the Project. This intersection is within the County and Caltrans' jurisdiction. Therefore, the City cannot require mitigation for the potential impact. Additionally, there are no planned improvements identified at this interchange by Caltrans or the County. The City has no established mechanism whereby the applicant can provide fair share funds to the jurisdiction within which the impact is occurring, such as the County or Caltrans, to help finance the recommended improvements. Also, as the intersection and/or roadway falls outside the jurisdiction of the City, the City does not have the authority to construct or demand the construction of such improvements.

Improvements to Intersection No. 7 would require widening along Sierra Avenue in order to reduce project impacts. However, improvements to Intersection No. 7 would be physically infeasible since Sierra Avenue is currently constrained by the I-15 overpass, which crosses Sierra Avenue immediately south of the Intersection. Any improvement requiring widening of Sierra Avenue would also require re-design of the I-15 overpass, which is physically infeasible, as it would require major improvements to the I-15 freeway to occur.

Therefore, Project-related impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Revised Draft EIR Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations

PAGE 6.0-1 AND 6.0-2, SECTION 6.1.1, CEQA REQUIREMENTS, SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

- Air Quality
 - Impact 4.2-1: The Project would potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (or applicable air quality thresholds);
 - Impact 4.2-2: The Project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; and
 - Impact 4.2-5: The project would potentially create a cumulative air quality impact.
- Cultural Resources
 - Impact 4.4-1: The Project would potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5; and
 - Impact 4.4-5: The Project would potentially result in cumulative impacts to cultural resources.
- ~~Greenhouse Gas Emissions~~
 - ~~Impact 4.7-1: The Project would potentially generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.~~
 - ~~Impact 4.7-2: The Project would potentially conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases; and~~
 - ~~Impact 4.7-3: The Project would potentially result in cumulatively significant greenhouse gases emissions.~~

Revised Draft EIR Appendix B

PAGE 2, FIRST PARAGRAPH, AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Pursuant to SB 330, also known as the Housing Accountability Act Crisis Act of 2019, a local agency is prohibited from disapproving, or conditioning approving in a manner that renders infeasible, a housing development project for very low, low-, or moderate-income households or an emergency shelter unless the local agency makes specified written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. Further, Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A) stipulates that agencies shall not “chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land

use designation, or zoning...to a less intensive use... below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances in effect on January 1, 2018". For purposes of Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A), a "less intensive use" includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, or new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or anything that would lessen the intensity of housing.

Revised Draft EIR Appendix B

PAGE 2, SECOND PARAGRAPH, HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

"SB 330 Compliance" Alternative

Pursuant to SB 330, also known as the Housing ~~Accountability Act~~ Crisis Act of 2019, a local agency is prohibited from disapproving, or conditioning approving in a manner that renders infeasible, a housing development project for very low, low-, or moderate-income households or an emergency shelter unless the local agency makes specified written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. Further, Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A) stipulates that agencies shall not "chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning...to a less intensive use... below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances in effect on January 1, 2018". For purposes of Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A), a "less intensive use" includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, or new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or anything that would lessen the intensity of housing.