

INITIAL STUDY

FOR THE

**BEAR VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BIG BEAR HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL AND
TRACK STADIUM PROJECT**

Prepared for:

Bear Valley Unified School District

Physical Address: 42271 Moonridge Road, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315
Mailing Address: 201 N. E St, San Bernardino, CA 92401

Prepared by:

Tom Dodson & Associates

2150 N. Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, California 92405
(909) 882-3612

December 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	5
Determination	6
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....	7
I. Aesthetics	9
II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	13
III. Air Quality	15
IV. Biological Resources	27
V. Cultural Resources	32
VI. Energy.....	34
VII. Geology and Soils.....	36
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	41
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	45
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	49
XI. Land Use and Planning	54
XII. Mineral Resources	55
XIII. Noise	56
XIV. Population and Housing.....	59
XV. Public Services	60
XVI. Recreation.....	62
XVII. Transportation / Traffic.....	63
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	67
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	68
XX. Wildfire	72
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	75
Summary of Mitigation Measures	76
References.....	82

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	– AQ / GHG Analyses
Appendix 2	– BRA / JD
Appendix 3	– Cultural Report
Appendix 4	– Soils Map
Appendix 5	– Noise Analysis
Appendix 6a	– Trip Generation Assessment
Appendix 6b	– VMT Evaluation

FIGURES

Figure 1	Regional Location
Figure 2	Site Location
Figure 3	Site Plan
Figure 4	Site Location Content
Figure I-1	Photos depicting ground level views of project site
↓	along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane
Figure I-5	
Figure II-1	Farmland Map
Figure II-2	Agricultural Resources
Figure IV-1	Jurisdictional Features (“Waters of the State”)
Figure VII-1	Alquist-Priolo Study Zones / Fault Activity
Figure VII-2	USGS Fault Activity Map of California
Figure VII-3	Liquefaction & Landslides
Figure VII-4	Paleontological Sensitivity – Mountain Region
Figure IX-1	GeoTracker
Figure IX-2	Mountain Area Emergency Routes – Area 2
Figure IX-3	Fire Hazard Severity Zones
Figure X-1	FEMA Map
Figure X-2	Flood Hazards Map
Figure X-3	Dam & Basin Hazards
Figure XII-1	Mineral Resource Zones
Figure XIII-1	Site Boundary – Measurement Locations
Figure XIII-2	Site Boundary – Receiver Locations
Figure XIII-3	Delineated Noise Contours for the Airport

TABLES

Table 1	Existing Land Use and Land Use Zoning Districts	4
Table III-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards	16
Table III-2	Health Effects of Major Criteria Pollutants.....	18
Table III-3	Air Quality Monitoring Summary (2015-2018).....	19
Table III-4	South Coast Air Basin Emissions Forecasts	20
Table III-5	Daily Emissions Thresholds	22
Table III-6	Construction Activity Equipment Fleet.....	23
Table III-7	Construction Activity Emissions Maximum Daily Emissions	23
Table III-8	Proposed Uses Daily Operational Impacts (2020)	25
Table III-9	LST and Project Emissions	26
Table VIII-1	Construction Emissions	43
Table VIII-2	Operational Emissions.....	43
Table XVII-1	Existing Survey Data for Big Bear Middle School	64

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACROYNMS

AAM	American Association of Museums
AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ACM	Asbestos-containing materials
ADA	American Disability Act
APE	Area of Potential Effect
APN	Assessor Parcel Number
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
BBHS	Big Bear High School
BBLDWP	City of Big Bear Lake DWP
bgs	below ground surface
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BRA	Biological Resources Assessment
BVES	Bear Valley Electric Service
BVUSD	Bear Valley Unified School District
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalOSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAR	Climate Action Registry
CDFW	California Department of Fish & Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWP	Countywide Plan
dB	decibel
dba	A-weighted decibel
DOI	Department of Interiors
DTSC	Department of Toxic and Substance Control
DWP	Department of Water and Power
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FGC	Fish & Game Code
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GCC	Global Climate Change
GHG	Greenhouse Gas

GSAs	Groundwater Sustainability Agencies
GSPs	Groundwater Sustainability Plans
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HAS	Hydrologic Sub-Area
HUD	U.S. Housing & Urban Development
IN	Institutional
IS/MND	Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
LSTs	Localized Significance Thresholds
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCLs	maximum contaminant levels
MM	Mitigation Measure
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OS	Open Space
PA	Production/Attraction
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PF	Public Facility
PRMMP	paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan
RL	Rural Living
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SBCTA	San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
SBTAM	San Bernardino Transportation Authority Model
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMBMI	San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
SPOW	spotted owl
SVP	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
TCP	Timberland Conversion Permit
TGA	Trip Generation Assessment
THP	Timber Harvest Plan
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture

USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VdB	velocity in decibels
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WOTUS	Waters of the United States
WTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan

This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**INTRODUCTION**

1. Project Title: Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project
2. Lead Agency Name: Bear Valley Unified School District
Address: *Physical:* 42271 Moonridge Road, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315
Mailing: 201 N E St, San Bernardino, CA 92401
3. Contact Person: Terry Planz, Director of Maintenance & Operations
Phone Number: (909) 866-4179
4. Project Location: The project is located at the northwest corner of the intersection at Maple Lane and Baldwin Lane in the Unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf within San Bernardino County, CA. The project is located within the USGS Topo 7.5-minute map for Big Bear City, CA, and the site is located in Section 13, Township 2 North and Range 1 East. The approximate GPS coordinates of the project site are 34.251683, -116.825905 (34° 15' 6.00" N, 116° 49' 33.36" W). Refer to Figures 1 and 2 for the regional and site location maps.
5. Project Sponsor Name: Bear Valley Unified School District
Address: *Physical:* 42271 Moonridge Road, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315
Mailing: 201 N E St, San Bernardino, CA 92401
6. General Plan Designation: Previous General Plan Designation: Institutional (IN) and Rural Living-10/20/40 acre minimum (RL); NEW: Public Facility (PF)
7. Zoning: Previous Zoning: Bear Valley/Institutional and Bear Valley/Rural Living-20 Acre Minimum; NEW: Institutional (IN)
8. Project Description:

Existing Site Conditions

The proposed project site is located in the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County, just east/southeast of the City of Big Bear Lake. More specifically, the proposed project site is located in the unincorporated community of Sugarloaf in Big Bear, California. Figures 1 and 2 provide a regional and local context, respectively, of the project location.

The proposed project site has been previously engineered, as it contains the previously occupied Chautauqua High School, which is a continuation school serving Bear Valley Unified School District (BVUSD or District) students, the operations for which have since been relocated to Big Bear High School. The site contains five large structures, two deteriorating baseball fields (one dirt, one containing some grass), as well as several areas that have been paved with concrete or asphalt. Vegetation within the site is minimal, though several trees are located along the Baldwin Lane frontage, which continues north along the site frontage at Maple Lane for about 200 feet.

Introduction

The BVUSD serves the community of Bear Valley area, including the City of Big Bear Lake, as well as the surrounding unincorporated communities. The District operates one High School, one Continuation School, one Middle School, three Elementary Schools, and one K-8 school located in nearby Forest Falls. The BVUSD will serve as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. The District desires to repurpose an existing site that recently served as the Chautauqua High School (Continuation School) to provide a new football and track stadium to serve Big Bear High School, as well as the Chautauqua High School, which currently operates at the same site as Big Bear High School. This Initial Study evaluates the potential effects to the environment from implementing the project.

Project Description

The proposed Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project consists of development within a ~7-acre site designated for Institutional use by the County of San Bernardino General Plan on the northwest corner of Maple Lane and Baldwin Lane in the Unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf. The project consists of one parcel with the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN): 0312-311-20. Refer to the site plan, provided as Figure 3.

The project proposes to demolish the existing structures on site, and develop the site as a continuation of the Big Bear High School athletic fields with a new football and track stadium to serve the High School and District athletics.

The football field will be of standard size (100 yards long between the goal lines and 160 feet wide), with additional turf area surrounding the entirety of the field to accommodate the use of the field for soccer games, as well as football games. This is typical of athletic fields throughout the State and County because it allows the field to serve multiple sports within one space. Around the football field, the District plans to install a 400 meter track with 8 1.22-meter wide lanes.

On the western edge of the site, centered with the football and track field, the project proposes to install a home team grandstand with a 750± seating capacity. On the eastern edge of the site, centered with the football and track field, the project proposes to install a visiting team grandstand with a 250 ± seating capacity. The style of grandstands will be bleachers. The project proposes to install field lighting illuminating to 50 footcandles on either side of the home and visiting team grandstands, with lighting directed towards the fields, shielded to the greatest extent possible from the nearby residential community to the south of the project site.

At the southern end of the site toward Baldwin Lane, the project proposes to install a north facing scoreboard that will be approximately 8-feet high by 25-feet wide in size and will be about 23-feet in height. On either side of the scoreboard, two flag poles will be installed.

The proposed project will be accessible via new driveways at Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane, which connect to a parking lot that provides exit at either access point. The parking provided at the site will be limited to handicapped (ADA) parking, and a designated drop-off zone. Approximately 5-7 ADA parking spaces will be installed. At the entryway to the site along Maple Lane, a new concrete sign will be installed for the Big Bear High School Stadium, stating the site address, as well as notating the Bear Valley Unified School District.

At several locations throughout the site, night lighting will be provided through 12' high LED light poles that will be installed as needed for a minimum of 1 footcandle per square-foot (SF). Additionally, concrete walkways and curbing will be installed at various locations throughout the site to provide pedestrian movement and access throughout the site. Several drinking fountains will be installed throughout the site, as shown on the site plan provided as Figure 3. Portable restrooms will be available for use on the site.

Along the outskirts of the project boundary, slope stabilization is required, and rip-rap slope stabilization will be installed to ensure slope stability.

The site boundary will be fenced with an 8' high chain link security fencing and gates pursuant to District Standards. Additionally, the project includes landscaping around the boundary of the site, within the parking lots. The landscape coverage of the site will equal about 15-20% of the total site area.

Electric service is available on Baldwin Lane from Bear Valley Electric Service. Water service is available in Baldwin Lane from the City of Big Bear Lake, Department of Water and Power (DWP). Sewer and Solid Waste service will be provided by the Big Bear City Community Services District (BBCCSD).

Operational Information

The new Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project will require 2 additional employees of the District to operate the project site. The field is anticipated to be utilized in the following ways:

- Practice for various athletic teams during after-school hours 2:30 PM to 5:30 PM for an anticipated 5 days per week with limited use during the summer.
- Use for home games, matches, and meets for the Football, Track, Soccer, athletic teams at the high school. The new Stadium is anticipated to host 16 games per year, typically between the hours of 2:30 PM to 9:30 PM on weekdays, or 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM on weekends.
- Other field uses include middle school promotion, high school graduation, and possibly use by the high school band for practice.

It is anticipated that the stadium could host a maximum of about 1,000 persons, excluding the staff and students participating in the athletic events, of which anywhere from 75 persons to 100 persons would attend each event, depending on the type of event the new stadium would be hosting at a given time. Lighting will only be in use from 4:00 PM to 11:00 PM, with no lighting allowed after 11:00 PM.

Construction Scenario

Construction of the proposed Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project is anticipated to require approximately 6-12 months, with the anticipated start date of construction in May 2022 and the completion date by the January 2023. The project site currently contains 5 existing buildings. It is possible two of the five structures contain asbestos. The site also contains two deteriorating baseball fields (one dirt, one containing some grass), as well as several areas that have been paved with concrete or asphalt. As such, the project will also require demolition and removal of the existing buildings, as well as the existing concrete and pavement within the

site. The project is anticipated to require minimal cut and fill with any cut being reused to balance of the site through grading, which will minimize import/export of material.

Any on-site trees within the cut and fill areas and the roadway will be removed. It is anticipated that a maximum number of 25 employees will be required to support the construction of the project each day. Grading will be by traditional mechanized grading and compaction equipment including, but not limited to the following: front end loader, excavator, loader backhoe, dump truck, forklift, skid steer, mobile crane, bulldozer, grader, roller, water wagon, asphalt compactors, telehandlers, cement trucks, various hand tools traditional to grading operations, etc. For the areas that require paving, such as the new parking area, the asphalt or concrete will be delivered to the site and applied to these areas in a routine manner. It is the intent of the District to attenuate and minimize noise, traffic, and dust during the course of construction.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings)

The San Bernardino County General Plan Land Use is Institutional (IN), while the Zoning classification is Institutional (IN). The land uses bordering the project site are outlined in Table 1 below and a general outline of adjacent uses are depicted on Figure 4:

**Table 1
EXISTING LAND USE AND LAND USE ZONING DISTRICTS**

Location	Existing Uses	Land Use
Project Site	Chautauqua High School (vacant)	Institutional (IN) and Rural Living-10/20/40 acre minimum (RL) NEW: Public Facility (PF)
North	Big Bear High School	Public Facility (PF)
South	A residential neighborhood	Low Density Residential (LDR) 2-5 du/ac max
East	Baldwin Lane Elementary School	Public Facility (PF)
West	Big Bear Skate Park and other Park facilities and vacant land	Public Facility (PF)

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for a NPDES general construction stormwater discharge permit. This permit is granted by submittal of an NOI to the SWRCB, but is enforced through a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that identifies construction best management practices (BMPs) for the site. In the project area, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board enforces the BMP requirements described in the NPDES permit by ensuring construction activities adequately implement a SWPPP. Implementation of the SWPPP is carried out by the construction contractor, with the Regional Board and County providing enforcement oversight.

Additionally, the project must comply with the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Land Use Services-Building and Safety/Code Enforcement, Public Health-Environmental Services, Department of Public Works, and any other responsible agency that may have discretionary authority over all or a portion of the Project.

No other permits or agency requirements have been identified in association with the proposed project.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and cultural affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

No consultation letters were sent to any Tribes, as none have requested consultation from the District under AB 52 to the District's knowledge.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION , including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Tom Dodson & Associates
Prepared by


Lead Agency (signature)

12/28/21
Date

12/28/2021
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

Environmental Setting

The Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium site contains the remaining structures that comprised the Chautauqua High School (Continuation School), which has since been relocated to Big Bear High School. The proposed project site has been previously engineered and contains five large structures, two deteriorating baseball fields (one dirt, one containing some grass), as well as several areas that have been paved with concrete or asphalt. Vegetation within the site is minimal, though several native trees are located along the Baldwin Lane frontage, which continue north along the site frontage at Maple Lane for about 200 feet. Please refer to Figures I-1 through I-5, which depict the ground level views of the project site along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane.

Impact Analysis

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – A scenic vista can generally be defined as a viewpoint from a public vantage point that provides expansive views of a highly-valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. Common examples include undeveloped hillsides, ridgelines, and open space areas that provide a unifying visual backdrop to a developed area. Scenic resources are those landscape patterns and features that are visually or aesthetically pleasing and that contribute affirmatively to the definition of a distinct community or region such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. As stated above, the proposed Football and Track Stadium would be developed within a site containing existing facilities that would be demolished in order to enable the Stadium to be built. None of the features of the proposed project site contain or would impair views of any scenic vistas.

A scenic vista impact can also occur when a scenic vista can be viewed from the project area or immediate vicinity and a proposed development may interfere with the view to a scenic vista. The project is situated in the Mountain Region of the County of San Bernardino. Development at this location would not interfere with mountain views to the North or any surrounding mountain views. The proposed project is located within a site that is at a slightly higher elevation than the surrounding area (the highest point is about 6,979’ in elevation at the southwest corner of the project site, and the lowest is about 6,952’ at the northeast corner of the project site), situated in the area that separates the Big Bear City area from the Sugarloaf community area (refer to Figure 1). Views from residences

to the north of the project would not be impacted by the proposed project development as the hills and tree line prevent views to Big Bear High School. Views from the residences to the south of the project would not be substantially impacted by the proposed development. Based on a review of ground-level views, the existing views to the north consist of trees in the foreground view, school facilities in the middle-ground view, and very limited/highly obstructed background views of the mountains to the north. The proposed project may further obstruct these views to the mountains to the north, but given that the existing setting does not offer pristine nor scenic vistas of the mountains, the development of the project site with a new stadium would not result in a significant impact to a scenic vista. Additionally, the proposed project would develop a sports field that would be consistent with surrounding uses, as the project site currently contains two baseball fields, and is adjacent to the Big Bear High School fields, creating a use consistent with and supportive of the existing High School setting.

The San Bernardino Countywide Plan Program EIR (PEIR) states the following pertaining to impacts to scenic vistas and other aesthetic impacts: *“In many cases, such development would occur in the region’s forested areas, where scenic vistas are already fragmented by trees and topography”* (pg. 5.1-14). Given that the County utilizes the above as rationale for why development in the mountain region would not have an impact on a scenic vista, the same rationale can be applied to the type of development proposed as part of this project. As such, given that the proposed project would both occur adjacent to the regions forested area, and that views in this area are fragmented by trees and topography, it is anticipated that the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas within the project area. Therefore, given that the elevation of the proposed Stadium would be similar or only slightly elevated compared to the surrounding uses, that the proposed project is consistent with the surrounding uses, and that vistas of the mountains to the north and south would not be substantially impacted by development of this project, the project will have a less than significant potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No mitigation is required.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The project site is located on Baldwin Lane, which is not considered by the State or the County to be a scenic highway. The proposed project consists of Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. Impacts on this vegetation type would be considered less than significant since this vegetation type is common throughout the San Bernardino Mountains and other mountain ranges in the region. The County has utilized the following as criteria for designating scenic resources:

Features meeting the following criteria shall be considered for designation as scenic resources: A roadway, vista point, or area that provides a vista of undisturbed natural areas; Includes a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed (the area within the field of view of the observer); and Offers a distant vista that provides relief from less attractive views of nearby features (such as views of mountain backdrops from urban areas). (San Bernardino General Plan EIR, February 2007)

The proposed project site does not meet any of the above criteria that would define the area as containing a scenic resource. A few trees will be removed as part of the proposed project, though only those located internally within the site boundaries; most of the trees along the roadway and are anticipated to remain in place. The number of trees that would be removed in order to develop the site as proposed is anticipated to be no more than 10. There are no regulations that apply to the proposed development as the School District does not require development permits or any applications with San Bernardino County Development Code. As such, the removal of a minimal number trees in order to develop the project site with the proposed Stadium would not constitute substantially damaging scenic resources including trees, particularly given that many of the trees located internally are intended for landscape purposes, and the proposed project will include landscape features that would effectively replace the loss of landscape trees on site. Therefore, given

that no significant scenic resources exist on site, development of the proposed Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium project would have a less than significant potential to substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would be installed in an area defined as an “urban cluster” under the Census,^{1,2} and as such is considered to be in an urban area. The proposed project occurs in a suburban portion of the Community of Sugarloaf, within the County of San Bernardino. The proposed facilities would be constructed within existing school facilities, and would develop new school facilities that are commensurate with some of the existing uses on site, and also with the adjacent use. Additionally, the proposed project does not require any entitlements to proceed once funded. According to the San Bernardino County General Plan, the proposed project is not located in a delineated scenic area. The proposed project is currently zoned Institutional (IN) in order to be compatible with the Land Use Category of Public Facility (PF) within the recently approved (October 27, 2020) Countywide Plan (CWP). The IN zoning district provides sites for public and quasi-public uses facilities, and similar and compatible uses, such as the proposed public use sports complex. The proposed project would comply with the applicable zoning development standards governing scenic quality pertaining to the Institutional Zoning District. The San Bernardino General Plan Policy NR-4.1 Preservation of Scenic Resources states that “*We consider the location and scale of development to preserve regionally significant scenic vistas and natural features, including prominent hillsides, ridgelines, dominant landforms, and reservoirs.*” As discussed under issues I(a) and I(b), above, the proposed project would not disrupt or otherwise impact regionally significant vistas or other natural features. The proposed project would install a Stadium that would serve the Community, adjacent to existing developed school facilities, thus blending with the surrounding environment. Given the discussion above, and under issues I(a) and I(b), the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality
- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Implementation of the proposed project will create new sources of light during the construction and operational phases of the project. Light and glare from the proposed stadium includes field lighting, which will be controlled to focus the light on the fields and minimize light spillage into the surrounding area, and safety and security lighting within the parking lot. The San Bernardino County Development Code requires new projects to adhere to the provisions of the Chapter 83.07.040 Glare and Outdoor Lighting – Mountain and Desert Region. While the proposed project will generate a new source of lighting, the majority of the lighting will be directed east, west, and north, avoiding the sensitive receptors (residences) to the south. The project proposes to install field lighting illuminating to 50 footcandles on either side of the home and visiting team grandstands, with lighting directed towards the fields, shielded to the greatest extent possible from the nearby residential community to the south of the project site. Compliance with the provisions outlined in San Bernardino County Development Code 83.07.040 Glare and Outdoor Lighting – Mountain and Desert Regions is a mandatory requirement for all new construction with which a project must comply. However, because the proposed project is located within the Mountain Region, which generally is more sparsely populated and contains substantial areas providing “dark skies” with minimal ambient nighttime illumination (County General Plan page 5.1-24), a facilities lighting plan shall be prepared to ensure that nearby residences are not substantially impacted by the introduction of new light sources and potential glare from the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project. Therefore, to protect nearby sensitive uses from direct light and glare from new lighting and to protect vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

AES-1 *A facilities lighting plan shall be prepared and shall demonstrate that glare from the proposed sports complex lighting and facility design that may create light and glare affecting adjacent occupied property are sufficiently shielded to prevent light and glare from spilling into occupied structures. This plan*

¹ <https://sitecheck.opr.ca.gov/>

² <https://databasin.org/datasets/2e85241791144ded9bba064b7d196f7b/>

shall specifically indicate that the lighting doesn't exceed the standards set forth in Section 83.07.040 of the County's Development Code pertaining to lighting requirements. This plan shall be reviewed and implemented by the District to minimize light or glare intrusion onto adjacent properties.

AES-2 *Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting of the project that may impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be prepared and approved by the District. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to orientation and/or shielding of lighting, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the District shall modify the lighting orientation, use non-glare reflective materials or shall implement other design solutions to eliminate any identified potentially significant glare impacts.*

With implementation of these mitigation measures, potential light and glare impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *No Impact* – The proposed project site has been previously engineered and contains five large structures, two deteriorating baseball fields (one dirt, one containing some grass), as well as several areas that have been paved with concrete or asphalt. Vegetation within the site is minimal, though several trees are located along the Baldwin Lane frontage, which continue north along the site frontage at Maple Lane for about 200 feet. No agricultural uses exist within the project site. Neither the project footprint nor the surrounding area are designated for agricultural use; no agricultural activities exist in the project area; and there is no potential for impact to any agricultural uses or values as a result of project implementation. According to the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, and to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan Agricultural Resources Map, no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of state importance exists within the vicinity of the proposed project (Figures II-1 and II-2).

No adverse impact to any agricultural resources would occur from implementing the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

- b. *No Impact* – There are no agricultural uses currently within the boundaries of the project site or adjacent to the project site. The San Bernardino County General Plan Land Use designation is Public Facility (PF), while the Zoning classification is Institutional (IN). Therefore, no potential exists for a conflict between the proposed project and agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts within the project area. No mitigation is required.
- c. *No Impact* – Please refer to issues II(a) and II(b) above. The project site is located within the Unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf, within the County of San Bernardino. The San Bernardino County General Plan Land Use designation is Public Facility (PF), while the Zoning classification is Institutional (IN). This land use designation would not support forest land or timberland uses or designations. The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). CAL FIRE stipulates that when a project will convert timberland to a use other than growing timber a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) is required [PRC 4621(a)]. Also, when projects are converting timberland to another use, the operations are considered commercial timber operations even if the logs are not being sold [PRC 4527(a)(1) and (2)]. While trees are found in abundance in the project area, no timberland resources would be disturbed as a result of project implementation because the project site contains the former Chautauqua High School, and as such, the project site is not considered forest land. The site is already disturbed and the use of the site as the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium would have a less than significant potential to conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).
- d. *No Impact* – The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The proposed project would develop a project site that is zoned for Institutional (IN) uses and the land use designation is Public Facility (PF), no timberland designations exist at the project site. No forest resources occur within the area of potential effects (APE). Thus, no impacts to forest resources are anticipated to be associated with the implementation of the proposed project.
- e. *No Impact* – Because the project site and surrounding area do not support either agricultural or forestry uses and, furthermore, because the project site and environs are not designated for such uses, implementation of the proposed project would not cause or result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to alternative use. No adverse impact would occur. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study “Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-191, Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, Big Bear (San Bernardino County), California” prepared by Giroux & Associates dated October 19, 2021, and provided as Appendix 1 to this document.

Background

Climate

The project area is in the San Bernardino Mountains. The area is characterized by an alpine climate, with substantial winter precipitation in the form of winter snow because of its high elevation. Snowfall, as measured at lake level, averages 61.8 inches each year (although upwards of 100 inches can accumulate on the forested ridges bordering the lake, above 8,000 feet). Snow has fallen in every month except July and August. There are normally 16.5 days each year with measurable snow (0.1 inch or more).

On average, the Bear Valley area receives approximately 24 inches of precipitation per year, with a sharp transition between the western edge of the Valley at the dam and the eastern edge at Baldwin Lake. Historical precipitation consists of both rainfall and snowfall. Within the Big Bear watershed, the precipitation varies with location. At the dam, Big Bear Lake receives about 36 inches of precipitation per year, and about 14 inches at the east end of the Valley.

Daily minimum temperatures in the summer are from 60°F to 70°F. Temperatures in the winter average approximately 35 °F to 40 °F. According to the National Weather Service, the warmest month at Big Bear is July, when the average high is 80.7 °F and the average low is 47.1 °F. The coolest month is January, with an average high of 47.1 °F and an average low of 20.7 °F.

Air Quality Standards

Existing air quality is measured at established Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) air quality monitoring stations. Monitored air quality is evaluated and in the context of ambient air quality standards. These standards are the levels of air quality that are considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) currently in effect are shown in Table III-1. Because the State of California had established Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) several years before the federal action and because of unique air quality problems introduced by the restrictive dispersion

meteorology, there is considerable difference between state and national clean air standards. Those standards currently in effect in California are shown in Table III-1. Sources and health effects of various pollutants are shown in Table III-2.

**Table III-1
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

Pollutant	Average Time	California Standards ¹		National Standards ²		
		Concentration ³	Method ⁴	Primary ^{3,5}	Secondary ^{3,6}	Method ⁷
Ozone (O ₃) ⁸	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Photometry	–	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) ⁹	24 Hour	50 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³		–		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5}) ⁹	24 Hour	–	–	35 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12.0 µg/m ³	15.0 µg/m ³	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	–	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	8 Hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)		9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	–	
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m ³)		–	–	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) ¹⁰	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m ³)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	100 ppb (188 µg/m ³)	–	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m ³)		0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂) ¹¹	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	75 ppb (196 µg/m ³)	–	Ultraviolet Fluorescence; Spectrophotometry (Paraosanine Method)
	3 Hour	–		–	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³)	
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³)		0.14 ppm (for certain areas) ¹¹	–	
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	–		0.030 ppm (for certain areas) ¹¹	–	
Lead ^{8,12,13}	30-Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	Atomic Absorption	–	–	–
	Calendar Quarter	–		1.5 µg/m ³ (for certain areas) ¹²	Same as Primary Standard	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Rolling 3-Month Avg	–		0.15 µg/m ³		
Visibility Reducing Particles ¹⁴	8 Hour	See footnote 14	Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape	No Federal Standards		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m ³	Ion Chromatography			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride ¹²	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)	Gas Chromatography			

Source: California Air Resources Board 5/4/16

Footnotes:

- 1 California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, suspended particulate matter – PM10, PM2.5, and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 2 National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest eight-hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year, with a 24-hour average concentration above $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over 3 years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact U.S. EPA for further clarification and current federal policies.
- 3 Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
- 4 Any equivalent procedure which can be shown to the satisfaction of the ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.
- 5 National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.
- 6 National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
- 7 Reference method as described by the EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by the EPA.
- 8 On October 1, 2015, the national 8-hour ozone primary and secondary standards were lowered from 0.075 to 0.070 ppm.
- 9 On December 14, 2012, the national PM2.5 primary standard was lowered from $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $12.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The existing national 24-hour PM2.5 standards (primary and secondary) were retained at $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, as was the annual secondary standard of $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The existing 24-hour PM10 standards (primary and secondary) of $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ also were retained. The form of the annual primary and secondary standards is the annual mean, averaged over 3 years.
- 10 To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 100 ppb. Note that the national 1-hour standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national 1-hour standard to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 100 ppb is identical to 0.100 ppm.
- 11 On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO2 standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 75 ppb. The 1971 SO2 national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved.

Note that the 1-hour national standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the 1-hour national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.
- 12 The ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.
- 13 The national standard for lead was revised on October 15, 2008 to a rolling 3-month average. The 1978 lead standard ($1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ as a quarterly average) remains in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978 standard, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.
- 14 In 1989, the ARB converted both the general statewide 10-mile visibility standard and the Lake Tahoe 30-mile visibility standard to instrumental equivalents, which are "extinction of 0.23 per kilometer" and "extinction of 0.07 per kilometer" for the statewide and Lake Tahoe Air Basin standards, respectively.

**Table III-2
HEALTH EFFECTS OF MAJOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS**

Pollutants	Sources	Primary Effects
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete combustion of fuels and other carbon-containing substances, such as motor exhaust. Natural events, such as decomposition of organic matter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced tolerance for exercise. Impairment of mental function. Impairment of fetal development. Death at high levels of exposure. Aggravation of some heart diseases (angina).
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motor vehicle exhaust. High temperature stationary combustion. Atmospheric reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory illness. Reduced visibility. Reduced plant growth. Formation of acid rain.
Ozone (O ₃)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atmospheric reaction of organic gases with nitrogen oxides in sunlight. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Irritation of eyes. Impairment of cardiopulmonary function. Plant leaf injury.
Lead (Pb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contaminated soil. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impairment of blood function and nerve construction. Behavioral and hearing problems in children.
Fine Particulate Matter (PM-10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stationary combustion of solid fuels. Construction activities. Industrial processes. Atmospheric chemical reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced lung function. Aggravation of the effects of gaseous pollutants. Aggravation of respiratory and cardio respiratory diseases. Increased cough and chest discomfort. Soiling. Reduced visibility.
Fine Particulate Matter (PM-2.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fuel combustion in motor vehicles, equipment, and industrial sources. Residential and agricultural burning. Industrial processes. Also, formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NO_x, sulfur oxides, and organics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases respiratory disease. Lung damage. Cancer and premature death. Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combustion of sulfur-containing fossil fuels. Smelting of sulfur-bearing metal ores. Industrial processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory diseases (asthma, emphysema). Reduced lung function. Irritation of eyes. Reduced visibility. Plant injury. Deterioration of metals, textiles, leather, finishes, coatings, etc.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2002

Baseline Air Quality

Existing and probable future levels of air quality in the project area can be best inferred from ambient air quality measurements conducted by the SCAQMD. The data resource in closest proximity to the project site is the Big Bear City Monitoring Station. However, this station only monitors small particulates (PM-2.5). The closest available data for ozone and large particulates (PM-10) is the Crestline Monitoring Station. Data for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide were obtained from the San Bernardino 4th Street Monitoring Station. Summary data compiled from these resources is provided in Table 3. Findings are summarized below:

Photochemical smog (ozone) levels frequently exceed standards at Crestline. The 8-hour state ozone standard has been exceeded an average of 30 percent of all days in the past four years near the project

site while the 1-hour state standard has been violated an average of 17 percent of all days. While ozone levels are still high, they are much lower than 10 to 20 years ago.

Measurements of carbon monoxide have shown very low baseline levels in comparison to the most stringent one- and eight-hour standards.

Respirable dust (PM-10) levels very rarely exceed the state or federal standard PM-10 standard. There have only been four violations in the last four years of measurement days for state PM-10 and no violations of the federal standard.

A substantial fraction of PM-10 is comprised of small diameter particulates capable of being inhaled into deep lung tissue (PM-2.5). However, PM-2.5 readings rarely exceed the federal 24-hour PM-2.5 ambient standard and there have had no violations within the previous four years.

Although complete attainment of every clean air standard is not yet imminent, extrapolation of the steady improvement trend suggests that such attainment could occur within the reasonably near future.

Table III-3
AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY (2015-2018)
(Number of Days Standards Were Exceeded and Maximum Levels During Such Violations) *

Pollutant/Standard	2017	2018	2019	2020
Ozone				
1-Hour > 0.09 ppm (S)	76	57	53	69
8-Hour > 0.07 ppm (S)	110	113	99	118
8- Hour > 0.075 ppm (F)	90	91	79	97
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.146	0.142	0.129	0.159
Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.121	0.125	0.112	0.139
Carbon Monoxide				
8- Hour > 9. ppm (S,F)	0	0	0	0
Max 8-hour Conc. (ppm)	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.4
Nitrogen Dioxide				
1-Hour > 0.18 ppm (S)	0	0	0	0
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.063	0.055	0.056	0.054
Respirable Particulates (PM-10)				
24-Hour > 50 µg/m ³ (S)	2/55	1/59	0/54	1/40
24-Hour > 150 µg/m ³ (F)	0/55	0/59	0/54	0/40
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. (µg/m ³)	56.	78.	38.	51.
Fine Particulates (PM-2.5)				
24-Hour > 35 µg/m ³ (F)	0/49	0/54	0/46	0/58
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. (µg/m ³)	23.5	17.3	31.0	24.3

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District;
Crestline Monitoring Station for Ozone and PM-10 (5181)
San Bernardino 4th Street Monitoring Station for CO and NO₂ (5203)
Big Bear City Monitoring Station for PM-2.5 (5818)
data: www.arb.ca.gov/adam/

Air Quality Planning

The U.S. EPA is responsible for setting and enforcing the NAAQS for O₃, CO, NO_x, SO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and lead. The U.S. EPA has jurisdiction over emissions sources that are under the authority of the federal government including aircraft, locomotives, and emissions sources outside state waters (Outer Continental Shelf). The U.S. EPA also establishes emission standards for vehicles sold in states other than California. Automobiles sold in California must meet the stricter emission requirements of the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) was first enacted in 1955, and has been amended numerous times in subsequent years (1963, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1977, and 1990). The CAA establishes the federal air quality standards, the NAAQS, and specifies future dates for achieving compliance. The CAA also mandates that states submit and implement State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for local areas not meeting these standards. These plans must include pollution control measures that demonstrate how the standards will be met. Substantial reductions in emissions of ROG, NO_x and CO are forecast to continue throughout the next several decades. Unless new particulate control programs are implemented, PM-10 and PM-2.5 are forecast to slightly increase.

The Air Quality Management District (AQMD) adopted an updated clean air “blueprint” in August 2003. The 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was approved by the EPA in 2004. The AQMP outlined the air pollution measures needed to meet federal health-based standards for ozone by 2010 and for particulates (PM-10) by 2006. The 2003 AQMP was based upon the federal one-hour ozone standard which was revoked late in 2005 and replaced by an 8-hour federal standard. Because of the revocation of the hourly standard, a new air quality planning cycle was initiated.

With re-designation of the air basin as non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, a new attainment plan was developed. This plan shifted most of the one-hour ozone standard attainment strategies to the 8-hour standard. As previously noted, the attainment date was to “slip” from 2010 to 2021. The updated attainment plan also includes strategies for ultimately meeting the federal PM-2.5 standard.

Because projected attainment by 2021 required control technologies that did not exist yet, the SCAQMD requested a voluntary “bump-up” from a “severe non-attainment” area to an “extreme non-attainment” designation for ozone. The extreme designation was to allow a longer time period for these technologies to develop. If attainment cannot be demonstrated within the specified deadline without relying on “black-box” measures, EPA would have been required to impose sanctions on the region had the bump-up request not been approved. In April 2010, the EPA approved the change in the non-attainment designation from “severe-17” to “extreme.” This reclassification set a later attainment deadline (2024), but also required the air basin to adopt even more stringent emissions controls.

**Table III-4
SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN EMISSIONS FORECASTS (EMISSIONS IN TONS/DAY)**

Pollutant	2015 ^a	2020 ^a	2025 ^a	2030 ^a
NO _x	357	289	266	257
VOC	400	393	393	391
PM-10	161	165	170	172
PM-2.5	67	68	70	71

^a2015 Base Year.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2013 Almanac of Air Quality

AQMPs are required to be updated every three years. The 2012 AQMP was adopted in early 2013. An updated AQMP was required for completion in 2016. The 2016 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Board in March, 2017, and has been submitted the California Air Resources Board for forwarding to the EPA. The

2016 AQMP acknowledges that motor vehicle emissions have been effectively controlled and that reductions in NO_x, the continuing ozone problem pollutant, may need to come from major stationary sources (power plants, refineries, landfill flares, etc.). The current attainment deadlines for all federal non-attainment pollutants are now as follows:

8-hour ozone (70 ppb)	2032
Annual PM-2.5 (12 µg/m ³)	2025
8-hour ozone (75 ppb)	2024 (former standard)
1-hour ozone (120 ppb)	2023 (rescinded standard)
24-hour PM-2.5 (35 µg/m ³)	2019

The key challenge is that NO_x emission levels, as a critical ozone precursor pollutant, are forecast to continue to exceed the levels that would allow the above deadlines to be met. Unless additional stringent NO_x control measures are adopted and implemented, ozone attainment goals may not be met.

The proposed project does not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing school related athletic facility development projects. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less-than-significant just because the proposed development is consistent with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis.

Appendix G of the California CEQA Guidelines offers the following four tests of air quality impact significance. A project would have a potentially significant impact if it:

- a. Conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- b. Results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).
- c. Exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- d. Results in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people

Primary Pollutants

Air quality impacts generally occur on two scales of motion. Near an individual source of emissions or a collection of sources such as a crowded intersection or parking lot, levels of those pollutants that are emitted in their already unhealthy form will be highest. Carbon monoxide (CO) is an example of such a pollutant. Primary pollutant impacts can generally be evaluated directly in comparison to appropriate clean air standards. Violations of these standards where they are currently met, or a measurable worsening of an existing or future violation, would be considered a significant impact. Many particulates, especially fugitive dust emissions, are also primary pollutants. Because of the non-attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) for PM-10, an aggressive dust control program is required to control fugitive dust during project construction.

Secondary Pollutants

Many pollutants, however, require time to transform from a more benign form to a more unhealthy contaminant. Their impact occurs regionally far from the source. Their incremental regional impact is minute on an individual basis and cannot be quantified except through complex photochemical computer models. Analysis of significance of such emissions is based upon a specified amount of emissions (pounds, tons, etc.) even though there is no way to translate those emissions directly into a corresponding ambient air quality impact.

Because of the chemical complexity of primary versus secondary pollutants, the SCAQMD has designated significant emissions levels as surrogates for evaluating regional air quality impact significance independent of chemical transformation processes. Projects with daily emissions that exceed any emission thresholds in Table III-5 are recommended by the SCAQMD to be considered significant under CEQA guidelines.

**Table III-5
DAILY EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS**

Pollutant	Construction	Operations
ROG	75	55
NOx	100	55
CO	550	550
PM-10	150	150
PM-2.5	55	55
SOx	150	150
Lead	3	3

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November, 1993 Rev.

Additional Indicators

Some of the structures to be demolished have been surveyed and are assumed to contain asbestos. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook identifies various secondary significance criteria related to toxic, hazardous or odorous air contaminants. Such pollutants may be associated with demolition of existing structures if they contain asbestos, lead-based paint, or other hazardous building materials. Prior to demolition detailed surveys will be conducted to ascertain the possible presence of asbestos, lead-based paint, etc. If any such materials are present, they will be remediated using mandatory procedures specified by Rule 1403-Asbestos Emissions from Demolition and Renovation Activities SCAQMD and state air toxics agencies.

Impact Analysis

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Projects such as the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project do not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing general development. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less-than-significant just because the proposed development is consistent with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis. The project will be consistent with the County's General Plan and Zoning Code within which the project is located. The proposed project is forecast to be consistent with regional planning forecasts maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional plans. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has been analyzed on a project-specific basis. As the analysis of project-related emissions provided below indicates, the proposed project will not cause or be exposed to significant air pollution if implemented, and is, therefore, consistent with the applicable air quality plan.
- b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Air pollution emissions associated with the proposed project would occur over both a short and long-term time period. Short-term emissions include fugitive dust from construction activities (i.e., site prep, demolition, grading, and exhaust emission) at the project site. Long-term emissions generated by future operation of the proposed project primarily include energy consumption and trips generated by the proposed stadium.

Construction Emissions

The approximately 7-acre site contains the previously occupied Chautauqua High School and contains five large structures. The project proposes to demolish the existing structures and develop the site as a continuation of the Big Bear High School athletic fields with a new football and track fields and stadiums to serve District athletics. Construction was modeled in CalEEMod2020.4.0 using the following construction equipment and schedule for a project of this size as shown in Table III-6.

**Table III-6
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EQUIPMENT FLEET**

Phase Name and Duration	Equipment
Demolition (20 days)	1 Concrete Saw
	3 Excavators
	2 Dozers
Site Prep (10 days)	3 Dozers
	4 Tractors
	4 Loader/Backhoes
Grading (20 days)	1 Grader
	1 Excavator
	1 Dozer
	3 Loader/Backhoes
Construction (130 days)	3 Forklifts
	1 Crane
	3 Loader/Backhoes
	1 Welder
	1 Generator Set
Paving (20 days)	2 Pavers
	2 Paving Equipment
	2 Rollers

Utilizing this indicated equipment fleet and durations shown in Table III-6 the following worst-case daily construction emissions are calculated by CalEEMod and are listed in Table III-7.

**Table III-7
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EMISSIONS MAXIMUM DAILY EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)**

Maximal Construction Emissions	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
2022	4.7	51.2	27.8	0.1	10.8	6.2
2023	2.1	16.4	21.8	0.0	2.4	1.1
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55

*assumes SCAQMD Rule 403 Fugitive Dust applied.

SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 (prohibition of nuisances, watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.), are applicable to the project and were applied in CalEEMod to minimize fugitive dust emissions. With this measure, peak daily construction activity emissions are estimated be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds without the need for added mitigation. Nevertheless, emissions minimization through enhanced dust control measures is recommended for use because of the non-

attainment status of the air basin. As such, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize air quality emissions impacts:

- AQ-1 Fugitive Dust Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:**
- **Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.**
 - **Water exposed surfaces to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (at least 2-3 times/day).**
 - **Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day and as needed during the construction day.**
 - **Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials.**
 - **Require the contractor to minimize in-out traffic from construction zone to the extent feasible, and enforce a speed limit of 15 MPH on site to avoid dust migration from the site.**
 - **Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.**
 - **Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.**

Similarly, ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NOx) are calculated to be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. However, because of the regional non-attainment for photochemical smog, the use of reasonably available control measures for diesel exhaust is recommended. Combustion emissions control options include:

- AQ-2 Exhaust Emissions Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:**
- **Utilize off-road construction equipment that has met or exceeded the maker's recommendations for vehicle/equipment maintenance schedule.**
 - **Contactors shall utilize Tier 4 or better heavy equipment.**
 - **Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.**

With the above mitigation measures, any impacts related to construction emissions are considered less than significant. No further mitigation is required.

Operational Emissions

The new Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project will require 2 additional employees to operate the project site. Practice for various athletic teams during after-school hours will occur 2:30 PM to 5:30 PM for an anticipated 5 days per week with limited use during the summer.

The new stadium is anticipated to host 16 games per year. Other field uses include middle school promotion, high school graduation, and possibly use by the high school band for practice. The existing football games were found to generate an average of 460 trips per day.

It is anticipated that the stadium could host a maximum of about 1,000 persons. For this analysis, it is assumed that a worst-case day would include 1,000 persons attending an event such as a graduation with a conservative estimate of 2 persons per vehicle. Therefore, there would be 1000 in and out trips on that day.

In addition to vehicular trips, the athletic facility requires water for irrigation, generates a small amount of solid waste from bathrooms and requires a small amount of electricity for lighting. Operational emissions were calculated using CalEEMod2020.4.0 for an assumed operational year of 2023. The operational impacts are shown in Table III-8. The assumptions modeled were that every weekday could generate 460 trips and every weekend could generate 1,000 trips although this would not occur

with such regularity. As shown, operational emissions will not exceed applicable the SCAQMD operational CEQA thresholds of significance.

**Table III-8
PROPOSED USES DAILY OPERATIONAL IMPACTS (2020)**

Source	Operational Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Area	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Energy	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Mobile	0.6	4.3	7.4	<0.1	2.1	0.6
Total	0.7	4.3	7.4	<0.1	2.1	0.6
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Output in Appendix

As shown in the table above, operational emissions will not exceed applicable SCAQMD operational emissions CEQA thresholds of significance. No mitigation is required to minimize operational air quality emissions.

Conclusion

With the incorporation of mitigation measures (MMs) **AQ-1** through **AQ-2**, the development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would have a less than significant potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

- c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The SCAQMD has developed analysis parameters to evaluate ambient air quality on a local level in addition to the more regional emissions-based thresholds of significance. These analysis elements are called Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). LSTs were developed in response to Governing Board's Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative 1-4 and the LST methodology was provisionally adopted in October 2003 and formally approved by SCAQMD's Mobile Source Committee in February 2005.

Use of an LST analysis for a project is optional. For the proposed project, the primary source of possible LST impact would be during construction. LSTs are applicable for a sensitive receptor where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours such as a residence, hospital or convalescent facility.

LSTs are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5). LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

LST screening tables are available for 25, 50, 100, 200- and 500-meter source-receptor distances. For this project, there are adjacent academic uses such that the most conservative 25-meter distance was modeled.

The SCAQMD has issued guidance on applying CalEEMod to LSTs. LST pollutant screening level concentration data is currently published for 1, 2- and 5-acre sites for varying distances. According to guidelines provided by SCAQMD, based on grading equipment, data for a 3.5-acre site was used (derived via interpolating between a 2-acre and 5-acre site).

The following thresholds and emissions in Table III-9 are therefore determined (pounds per day):

**Table III-9
LST AND PROJECT EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)**

3.5 acre/25 meters East San Bernardino Mountains	CO	NOx	PM-10	PM-2.5
LST	1,625	220	11	7
Max On-Site Emissions				
2022	28	51	11	6
2023	22	16	2	1

CalEEMod Output in Appendix

LSTs were compared to the maximum daily construction activities. As seen in Table III-9, with active dust suppression, mitigated emissions meet the LSTs for construction. As such, with implementation of MMs **AQ-1** and **AQ-2**, LSTs would be less than significant.

Construction equipment exhaust contains carcinogenic compounds within the diesel exhaust particulates. The toxicity of diesel exhaust is evaluated relative to a 24-hour per day, 365 days per year, 70-year lifetime exposure. The SCAQMD does not generally require the analysis of construction-related diesel emissions relative to health risk due to the short period for which the majority of diesel exhaust would occur. Health risk analyses are typically assessed over a 9-, 30-, or 70-year timeframe and not over a relatively brief construction period due to the lack of health risk associated with such a brief exposure.

As such, with implementation of MMs **AQ-1** and **AQ-2**, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Heavy-duty equipment in the proposed project area during construction will emit odors; however, the construction activity would cease to occur after a short period of time. Land uses generally associated with odor complaints include:
- Agricultural uses (livestock and farming)
 - Wastewater treatment plants
 - Food processing plants
 - Chemical plants
 - Composting operations
 - Refineries
 - Landfills
 - Dairies
 - Fiberglass molding facilities

The project does not propose any such uses or activities that would result in potentially significant operational-source odor impacts. Potential sources of operational odors generated by the project would include disposal of refuse. All project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with solid waste regulations, thereby precluding substantial generation of odors due to temporary holding of refuse on-site. Moreover, SCAQMD Rule 402 acts to prevent occurrences of odor nuisances. No other sources of objectionable odors or other emissions have been identified for the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information is provided based on a Biological Resources Assessment and Jurisdictional Delineation of the project site. The assessment was conducted by Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. dated December 2021, and is titled “Bear Valley Unified School District Big Bear High School Sports Field Project Biological Resources Assessment and Jurisdictional Delineation Report.” The following information is abstracted from the Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) provided as Appendix 2.

General Site Conditions

The project area is within the Sugarloaf area of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which is east/southeast of Big Bear Lake and situated near the eastern end of Big Bear Valley in the San Bernardino Mountains.

The project site is situated within a flat to gently sloped, mostly graded area. The elevation of the project site is approximately 6,965 feet above mean sea level (amsl).

Hydrologically, the project area is situated within the Baldwin Hydrologic Sub-Area (HSA 801.73). The Baldwin HSA comprises a 22,789-acre drainage area, within the larger Santa Ana Watershed (HUC 18070203). The Santa Ana River is the major hydrogeomorphic feature within the Santa Ana Watershed.

One of several tributaries to the Santa Ana River is Bear Creek, which outflows from Big Bear Lake from the Bear Valley Dam located at the westernmost (downstream) end of Big Bear Lake. Big Bear Lake is one of the head waters of the Santa Ana River Watershed.

Soils within the project area are comprised mostly (>90%) of Garloaf-Urban land complex, 4 to 9 percent slopes, with some Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes along the undisturbed western edge of the project site. Garloaf family soils consist of very cobbly loam to very cobbly clay loam that is comprised of alluvium derived from granitoid. This soil type is well drained and does not have a hydric soil rating. Cariboucreek family soils consist of clay loam that is comprised of mixed alluvium. This soil type is well drained and does not have a hydric soil rating.

Vegetation within most of the site is minimal, though several trees are located along the Baldwin Lane frontage, which continue north along the site frontage at Maple Lane for about 200 feet. Additionally, there is an approximately 1-acre area (70 feet wide by 570 feet long) of undeveloped, forested land along the western edge of the project site. The site is bordered by BBHS on the north, Baldwin Lane on the south, Maple Lane on the east, and vacant (forested) land on the west. Existing land use surrounding the project area consists of BBHS to the north, residential neighborhood to the south, Big Bear Skate Park, other park facilities and vacant land to the east, and Baldwin Lane Elementary School and vacant land to the west.

Habitat within the project site is sparse, as the entirety of the site has been developed. Habitat adjacent to the project site, within the undeveloped westernmost edge of the project site consists of mixed *Juniperus grandis* Woodland Alliance (mountain juniper woodland), *Pinus jeffreyi* Forest and Woodland Alliance (Jeffrey pine forest and woodland), and *Artemisia tridentata* Shrubland Alliance (big sagebrush) plant communities. Other trees/large shrub species conspicuous within the undeveloped portion of the project area include curl leaved mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus ledifolius* var. *intermontanus*) and California fremontia (*Fremontodendron californicum*). The shrub layer on site is dominated by big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) and rubber rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*).

The project area is within and adjacent a high school and residential community, and due to the historic and existing disturbances on site and adjacent, only those wildlife species at least partially adapted to urban environments are expected to occur. The only wildlife species observed or otherwise detected within the project area during the reconnaissance-level field survey were California scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), Steller's jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), mountain chickadee (*Poecile gambeli*), and pygmy nuthatch (*Sitta pygmaea*). Additionally, evidence of domestic dogs was observed in the project area. No focused faunal surveys were conducted, and no small mammal trapping was performed.

Of the 20 state and/or federally listed species documented within the Big Bear Lake, Big Bear City, Fawnskin and Moonridge USGS quadrangles, the following 13 state and/or federally listed species have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles):

- ash-gray paintbrush (*Castilleja cinerea*)
- southern rubber boa (*Charina umbratica*)
- Big Bear Valley sandwort (*Eremogone ursina*)
- southern mountain buckwheat (*Eriogonum kennedyi* var. *austromontanum*)
- Cushenbury buckwheat (*Eriogonum ovalifolium* var. *vineum*)
- unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*)
- bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)
- San Bernardino Mountains bladderpod (*Physaria kingii* ssp. *bernardina*)
- San Bernardino blue grass (*Poa atropurpurea*)
- southern mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*)
- bird-foot checkerbloom (*Sidalcea pedata*)
- California dandelion (*Taraxacum californicum*)
- slender-petaled thelypodium (*Thelypodium stenopetalum*)

Conclusion

Sensitive Biological Resources

A BRA survey was conducted by Jacobs in October 2021 to identify potential habitat for special status wildlife within the project area. No special status wildlife species, including state and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species, were observed within the project area during the reconnaissance-level assessment survey and none are expected to occur. Due to the environmental conditions on site and the adjacent disturbances, the project area is likely not suitable to support any of the special status wildlife species that have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles), including the state listed as threatened southern rubber boa, the federally delisted and state listed as endangered bald eagle, and the California species of special concern (SSC) San Bernardino flying squirrel and California spotted owl.

The project area does not contain any sensitive habitats, including any USFWS designated Critical Habitat for any federally listed species, and the project will not result in any loss or adverse modification of Critical Habitat.

Nesting Birds

There is vegetation throughout the project area that is suitable to support nesting birds, including possible habitat for California spotted owl (SPOW). Most native bird species are protected from unlawful take by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). In December 2017, the Department of the Interior (DOI) issued a memorandum concluding that the MBTA's prohibitions on take apply "[...] only to affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nests, or their eggs" (DOI 2017). Then in April 2018, the USFWS issued a guidance memorandum that further clarified that the take of migratory birds or their active nests (i.e., with eggs or young) that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, an otherwise lawful activity does not constitute a violation of the MBTA. However, the State of California provides additional protection for native bird species and their nests in the California Fish and Game Code (FGC).

In general, impacts to all bird species (common and special status) can be avoided by conducting work outside of the nesting season, which is generally February 1st through September 1st. However, if all work cannot be conducted outside of nesting season, mitigation is recommended.

Lighting Impacts

To avoid potential impacts to nocturnal species including SPOW, and other nocturnal species due to light pollution, project related night lighting (both temporary and permanent) should be directed away from adjacent undeveloped areas to protect nocturnal species from direct night lighting. Shielding should be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in adjacent habitat is not increased.

Jurisdictional Waters

In addition to the BRA and focused botanical field survey, Jacobs also assessed the project area for the presence of any state and/or federal jurisdictional waters. The result of the jurisdictional waters assessment is that there are no wetland or non-wetland waters of the United States (WOTUS) or waters of the State potentially subject to regulation by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under Section 401 of the CWA and/or Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code (FGC), respectively. Therefore, the project will not impact and jurisdictional waters and no state or federal jurisdictional waters permitting will be required.

Impact Analysis

- a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to have a potential for an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The project area lies within

the range of several sensitive species including several that have been documented in the project vicinity (approximately 3 miles), namely: ash-gray paintbrush (*Castilleja cinerea*), southern rubber boa (*Charina umbratica*), Big Bear Valley sandwort (*Eremogone ursina*), southern mountain buckwheat (*Eriogonum kennedyi* var. *austromontanum*), Cushenbury buckwheat (*Eriogonum ovalifolium* var. *vineum*), unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), San Bernardino Mountains bladderpod (*Physaria kingii* ssp. *bernardina*), San Bernardino blue grass (*Poa atropurpurea*), southern mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*), bird-foot checkerbloom (*Sidalcea pedata*), California dandelion (*Taraxacum californicum*), and slender-petaled thelypodium (*Thelypodium stenopetalum*). As stated above, due to the environmental conditions on site from past use as the Chautauqua High School and the adjacent disturbances, the project area is likely not suitable to support any of the special status wildlife species that have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles), including the state listed as threatened southern rubber boa, the federally delisted and state listed as endangered bald eagle, and the California SSC San Bernardino flying squirrel and California spotted owl. This is specifically due to the past disturbance within the project site, as the entirety of the site has been developed with the Chautauqua High School. However, as noted in the BRA and Background provided above, the proposed project would create a new source of lighting in the project area with a potential to impact nocturnal species in the area. As such, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

BIO-1 *To avoid potential impacts to nocturnal species including SPOW, and other nocturnal species due to light pollution, project related night lighting (both temporary and permanent) shall be directed away from adjacent undeveloped areas to protect nocturnal species from direct night lighting. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in adjacent habitat on the project's western boundary specifically, is not increased.*

Therefore, with the implementation of MM **BIO-1** above, and based on the data contained in the BRA, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project area does not contain any sensitive habitats, including any USFWS designated Critical Habitat for any federally listed species, and the project will not result in any loss or adverse modification of Critical Habitat. Furthermore, the result of the jurisdictional waters assessment is that there are no wetland or non-wetland WOTUS or waters of the State potentially subject to regulation by the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA, the RWQCB under Section 401 of the CWA and/or Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, or the CDFW under Section 1602 of the FGC, respectively. Therefore, the project will not impact any jurisdictional waters and no state or federal jurisdictional waters permitting will be required. Given that no other riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities have been identified within the project area, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- c. *No Impact* – According to the data gathered by Jacobs in Appendix 2, no federally protected wetlands occur within the project footprint. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will have no potential to impact state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No mitigation is required.
- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Based on the field survey of the project site, the project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory species or with established native or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native nursery sites.

The proposed project is currently fenced, and thus prevents any migration from adjacent forested areas at present, and would continue to do so once developed as the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project. However, the State does protect all migratory and nesting native birds. Several bird species were identified as potentially occurring in the project area, and given that the proposed project contains some trees and is located adjacent to forestland to the west of the project site, the project area may include locations that function as nesting locations for native birds nesting birds exists within and adjacent to the site. To avoid impacting nesting birds as required by the MBTA and California FGC, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

BIO-2 Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities. Preconstruction surveys shall focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified avian biologist will make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If active nests are found during the preconstruction nesting bird surveys, a Nesting Bird Plan (NBP) shall be prepared and implemented by the qualified avian biologist. At a minimum, the NBP shall include guidelines for addressing active nests, establishing buffers, ongoing monitoring, establishment of avoidance and minimization measures, and reporting. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be based on the nesting species, individual/pair's behavior, nesting stage, nest location, its sensitivity to disturbance, and intensity and duration of the disturbance activity. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, any grubbing or vegetation removal should occur outside peak breeding season (typically February 1 through September 1).

- **Preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall include a nighttime component to address the potential for presence of nocturnal species in which a qualified avian biologist will conduct 3 consecutive nights of survey.**

Thus, with implementation of the above measure, any effects on wildlife movement or the use of wildlife nursery sites can be reduced to a less than significant impact.

- e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Development of the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts to biological resources have been addressed above under issues IV(a-d). Therefore, the potential for the project to conflict with local policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources would be considered less than significant.
- f. *No Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under response IV(a) above. The project has not been identified as being located within an area within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and implementation of the project will therefore not result in a significant impact to any such plans. No further mitigation is necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: The information utilized in this section of the Initial Study was obtained from the following technical study: "Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, 525 Maple Lane, Sugarloaf Area, San Bernardino County, California" prepared by CRM TECH dated December 15, 2021 (Appendix 3).

Summary of the Finding

The purpose of the study is to provide the BVUSD with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes to any "historical resources," as defined by CEQA, that may exist in or around the project area. In order to identify such resources, CRM TECH initiated a historical/archaeological resources records search and a Native American Sacred Lands File search, pursued historical background research, and carried out a systematic field survey.

Throughout these research procedures, no "historical resources" were encountered within or adjacent to the project area. However, the Sacred Lands File indicates the presence of unspecified Native American cultural resource(s) in the general vicinity of the project area. The State of California Native American Heritage Commission referred further inquiries on such resource(s) to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and other local tribes. During ensuing correspondence, the San Manuel Band identified cultural resources near but not in the immediate vicinity of the project area.

Based on these findings, CRM TECH recommends to the BVUSD a preliminary determination of No Impact regarding cultural resources, pending the completion of further consultations with local Native American groups by the district. No other cultural resources investigations will be necessary for the project unless construction plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study. However, if buried cultural materials are discovered during earth-moving operations associated with the project, all work at that location should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.

Impact Analysis

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – CEQA establishes that "a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (PRC §21084.1). "Substantial adverse change," according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired."

Per the above discussion and definition, as well as the information contained in Appendix 3, no historical or archaeological sites or isolates were located within the project boundaries during the field review of the project area. Thus, none of them requires further consideration during this study. In

light of this information and pursuant to PRC §21084.1, the following conclusions have been reached for the project:

- No historical resources within or adjacent to the project area have any potential to be disturbed as they are not within the proposed area in which the facilities will be constructed and developed, and thus, the project as currently proposed will not cause a substantial adverse change to any known historical resources.
- No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed project unless construction plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.

However, if any earth moving activities are required, the following mitigation measure will ensure that impacts to any buried cultural materials that may be discovered during earth moving activities is carried are less than significant:

CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these sewer facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with BVUSD. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Additionally, the following measure will ensure that the treatment of any discovered cultural materials follows the appropriate protocol to minimize impacts to such resources:

CUL-2 If significant cultural resources, as defined by CEQA, are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to District for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of ground disturbing activities and shall implement the Plan accordingly.

With the incorporation of the above mitigation measures, potential for impact to cultural resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

- c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – As noted in the discussion above, no available information suggests that human remains may occur within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the potential for such an occurrence is considered very low. Human remains discovered during the project will need to be treated in accordance with the provisions of HSC §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98, which is mandatory. State law (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code) as well as local laws requires that the Police Department, County Sheriff and Coroner's Office receive notification if human remains are encountered. Compliance with these laws is considered adequate mitigation for potential impacts, however, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented in relation to discovery and treatment of human remains:

CUL-3 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.

With the incorporation of the above mitigation measure, potential for impact to discovery and treatment of human remains will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
VI. ENERGY: Would the project:				
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – During construction, the proposed project will utilize construction equipment that is CARB approved, minimizing emissions generated and electricity required to the extent feasible (as outlined under Section III, Air Quality, above). As stated in Section III, Air Quality, the construction of the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would require mitigation measures to minimize emissions impacts from construction equipment use (refer to MM AIR-2). These mitigation measures also apply to energy resources as they require equipment not in use for 5 minutes to be turned off, and for electrical construction equipment to be used where available. These measures would prevent a significant impact during construction due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and would also conform to the CARB regulations regarding energy efficiency.

The proposed project consists of a Football and Track Stadium that would include a field and a track that would accommodate sports such as soccer, football, and track, and would include a small amount of vehicle parking with night lighting as well as stadium lighting. The Stadium would not require substantial energy to operate, as the only energy required will be in support of the Stadium when in use and lighting is required in the evening hours.

Energy consumption encompasses many different activities. For example, construction can include the following activities: delivery of equipment and material to a site from some location (note it also requires energy to manufacture the equipment and material, such as harvesting, cutting and delivering wood from its source); employee trips to work, possibly offsite for lunch (or a visit by a catering truck), travel home, and occasionally leaving a site for an appointment or checking another job; use of equipment onsite (electric or fuel); and sometimes demolition and disposal of construction waste. To minimize energy costs of construction debris management, mitigation has been established to require diversion of all material capable of being recycled. Energy consumption by equipment will be reduced by requiring shutdowns when equipment is not in use after five minutes and ensuring equipment is being operated within proper operating parameters (tune-ups) to minimize emissions and fuel consumption. These requirements are consistent with State and regional rules and regulations. Under the construction scenario outlined above, the proposed project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption during construction.

The proposed project is currently, and will continue to be supplied power by Bear Valley Electric Service (BVES) (a division of Golden State Water Company) through the power distribution system located at the site. BVES will be able to supply sufficient electricity, as the proposed use would likely utilize less energy than did the Continuation High School when it was in use as generally, the energy required to operate indoor structures, is much greater than that which would be required to light Stadium fields on an as needed basis. The project site will not require natural gas to operate. Park lighting must be constructed in conformance with a variety of existing energy efficiency regulatory requirements or guidelines including:

- Compliance California Green Building Standards Code, AKA the CALGreen Code (Title 24, Part 11), which became effective on January 1, 2017. The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of building through the use of building concepts encouraging sustainable construction practices.
- Compliance with diversion of construction and demolition materials from landfills.
- Compliance with AQMD Mandatory use of low-pollutant emitting finish materials.
- Compliance with AQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2 to reduce the release of undesirable emissions.
- Compliance with diesel exhaust emissions from diesel vehicles and off-road diesel vehicle/equipment operations.

Compliance with these regulatory requirements for operational energy use and construction energy use would not be wasteful or unnecessary use of energy. Under both the operational and construction scenarios for the proposed project, with implementation of MM **AQ-2**, the proposed project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption that could result in a significant adverse impact to energy issues based on compliance with the referenced laws, regulations and guidelines.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

a. i. Ground Rupture

Less Than Significant Impact – The project site is located within the Community of Sugarloaf within the Mountain Region of the County of San Bernardino to the southeast of Big Bear Lake. California as a whole is a seismically active state, though the proposed project site is not located on a fault or within a fault zone. According to the recently updated Fault Activity Map of California prepared for the County’s updated General Plan (Figure VII-1), the proposed project is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo fault zone or other active fault zone. The project site is located in close proximity to several fault zones, as delineated on Figure VII-2, which depicts the Fault Activity Map of California prepared by the California geologic Survey; however, the proposed project is located outside of the boundaries of the delineated fault zones, and as such is not anticipated to be within a site that would experience ground rupture as a result of seismic activity. Furthermore, based on the

project site's location outside of a delineated fault zone, the risk for ground rupture at the site location is low; therefore, it is not likely that future visitors of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project will be subject to seismic hazards from rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant; no mitigation is required.

ii. Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

Less Than Significant Impact – As stated in the discussion above, several faults run through the area surrounding the proposed project, and as with much of southern California, the proposed sports complex will be subject to strong seismic ground shaking impacts should any major earthquakes occur in the future, though the proposed project is not in close proximity to an Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Due to the proximity of the active faults located in the vicinity of the project site, the project site and area can be exposed to significant ground shaking during major earthquakes on nearby regional faults. Much of the project operations scenario will occur in outdoor spaces, which presents minimal hazards from strong seismic ground shaking to humans working at or visiting the site. Like all other development projects in the County and throughout the Southern California Region, the proposed project will be required to comply with all applicable seismic design standards contained in 2019 California Building Code (CBC), including Section 1613 Earthquake Loads. Compliance with the CBC will ensure that structural integrity will be maintained in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, impacts associated with strong ground shaking will be less than significant without mitigation.

iii. Seismic-Related Ground Failure Including Liquefaction

Less Than Significant Impact – According to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan Liquefaction and Landslides map provided as Figure VII-3, the project site consists of land that has been not identified as containing land with liquefaction susceptibility. Therefore, given that the proposed project does not propose any habitable structures, and that no indoor structures would be developed to serve visitors of the new Stadium, and because the majority of the proposed project activities would be conducted outdoors in support of the Stadium activities, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less than significant potential to be susceptible to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides

Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project site is currently developed with structures and associated facilities of the former Chautauqua High School campus. The site is relatively flat, sloping slightly from south to north. According to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan Liquefaction and Landslides map provided as Figure VII-3, the project site consists of land that has been not identified as being susceptible to landslides. The proposed project would be graded and compacted to enable development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project, and with no proposed habitable structures, no potential events have been identified that would result in adverse effects from landslides or that would cause landslides that could expose people or structures to such an event as a result of project implementation. Therefore, no significant impacts under this issue are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

- b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The potential for soil erosion, loss of topsoil, and/or developing the site on unstable soils is anticipated to be marginally possible at the site during ground disturbance associated with construction. The project site is vacant with a modest amount of vegetation coverage. County grading standards, best management practices and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) are required to control the potential significant erosion hazards. The topography of the site slopes gently from north to south. During project construction when soils are exposed, temporary soil erosion may occur, which could be exacerbated by rainfall. Project demolition and grading would be managed through the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, and will be required to implement best management practices to achieve concurrent water quality controls after construction is completed

and the recreation uses are in operation. The following mitigation measures or equivalent best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to address these issues:

GEO-1 *Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. Where covering is not possible, measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the project site for future cleanup such that erosion does not occur.*

GEO-2 *All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the project is being constructed.*

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site has been previously developed with structures, concrete, pavement, and baseball fields that made up the Chautauqua High School campus. The proposed development will include demolition of existing facilities, and will include mass grading the site to provide level surfaces upon which to develop the proposed athletic facilities. As discussed under issue VII(a[iii]) above, landslide and liquefaction potential have been determined to be less than significant within the project site. According to the County’s General Plan, land subsidence in the Mountain Region is known to occur in basins containing aquifer systems that at least in part consist of fine-grained sediments and that have undergone extensive groundwater development. Generally, subsidence is not considered a significant geologic hazard in the Mountain Region as it is underlain predominantly by bedrock, which is not subject to subsidence due to the lack of fine-grained sediments. Furthermore, according to the County’s General Plan, collapsible soils are less likely in the Mountain Region, which typically receives more precipitation than other areas of the County. However, the California Geological Survey has detected small amounts of land deformation (uplift and subsidence) in the area near Big Bear Lake and Sugarloaf. The proposed project is located just within the Community of Sugarloaf, and according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey (Appendix 4), the proposed project is located on Garloaf-Urban land complex and Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex soils. These alluvial sediments are not considered prone to collapse or subsidence. Thus, the project will have a less than significant potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within the Unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf, and according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on Garloaf-Urban land complex and Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex soils. These are alluvial sediments that are not considered to contain expansive properties, as these soils are not fine loamy soils, and do not contain a high percentage of clay. The type of project proposed—an outdoor Stadium—is such that expansive soils would not cause substantial risks to life or property, and that the proposed project will be mass graded and compacted to form the proposed field and Stadium, thereby further minimizing risks related to expansive soils. Based on the above, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e. *No Impact* – The proposed project will utilize portable restrooms on site, with no municipal sewer connections or septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems required. Therefore, determining if the project site soils are capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater does not apply. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.

- f. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The San Bernardino Countywide Plan indicates that the proposed project area is located in a low-to-high sensitivity area for paleontological resources. Previously unknown and unrecorded paleontological resources may be unearthed during excavation and grading activities of the proposed project. If previously unknown potentially unique paleontological resources are uncovered during excavation or construction, significant impacts could occur. According to the 2019 San Bernardino County General Plan EIR, the County requires that projects located within areas that have been delineated as low-to-high sensitivity for paleontological resources by the Countywide Plan (Figure VII-4) meet the requirements of mitigation measure (MM) **CUL-5**, which states:

All projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped with low-to-high paleontological sensitivity will only require monitoring if construction activity will exceed the depth of the low sensitivity surficial sediments. The underlying sediments may have high paleontological sensitivity, and therefore work in those units might require paleontological monitoring, as designated by the Qualified Paleontologist in the PRMMP. When determining the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, the Qualified Paleontologist should take into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available.

The proposed project shall implement the following measure to meet the County's requirements pertaining to paleontological resources:

GEO-3 *The District shall retain the services of a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the standards of SVP (2010). The Qualified Paleontologist shall determine that the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, by taking into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available. Should the project require excavation that will exceed the depth of low sensitivity surficial sediments as determined by a Qualified Paleontologist, a project-specific paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan (PRMMP) shall be developed and adhered to for the duration of ground disturbance activities during construction or as otherwise determined by the Qualified Paleontologist. This plan will address specifics of monitoring and mitigation for the development project, and will take into account updated geologic mapping, geotechnical data, updated paleontological records searches, and any changes to the regulatory framework. This PRMMP shall meet the standards of the SVP (2010).*

The MM **CUL-6** (sourced from the 2019 San Bernardino County General Plan EIR), which addresses the potential for discovery of fossils, shall also be required as part of this project as follows:

In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work will halt within a 50-ft. radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a Qualified Paleontologist. Significant fossils will be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the SVP (2010) and BLM (2009). A repository will be identified and a curatorial arrangement will be signed prior to collection of the fossils. Although the San Bernardino County Museum is specified as the repository for fossils found in the county in the current General Plan (San Bernardino County, 2007), the museum may not always be available as a repository. Therefore, any accredited institution may serve as a repository.

The proposed project shall implement the following measure to meet the County's requirements pertaining to paleontological resources:

GEO-4 In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work will halt within a 50-ft. radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a Qualified Paleontologist. Significant fossils will be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the SVP (2010) and BLM (2009). A repository will be identified and a curatorial arrangement will be signed prior to collection of the fossils. Although the San Bernardino County Museum is specified as the repository for fossils found in the county in the current General Plan (San Bernardino County, 2007), the museum may not always be available as a repository. Therefore, any accredited institution may serve as a repository.

With incorporation of the above project specific and County developed mitigation measures, the potential for impact to paleontological resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study “Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-191, Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, Big Bear (San Bernardino County), California” prepared by Giroux & Associates dated October 19, 2021, and provided as Appendix 1 to this document.

Background

Global Climate Change (GCC) is defined as the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, precipitation, and storms. Many scientists believe that the climate shift taking place since the industrial revolution (1900) is occurring at a quicker rate and magnitude than in the past. Scientific evidence suggests that GCC is the result of increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the earth’s atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Many scientists believe that this increased rate of climate change is the result of greenhouse gases resulting from human activity and industrialization over the past 200 years.

An individual project like the project evaluated in Appendix 1 cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental (cumulative) contribution of greenhouse gasses combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC.

AB 32 is one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation that California has adopted. Among other things, it is designed to maintain California’s reputation as a “national and international leader on energy conservation and environmental stewardship.” It will have wide-ranging effects on California businesses and lifestyles as well as far reaching effects on other states and countries. A unique aspect of AB 32, beyond its broad and wide-ranging mandatory provisions and dramatic GHG reductions are the short time frames within which it must be implemented. Major components of the AB 32 include:

- Require the monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions beginning with sources or categories of sources that contribute the most to statewide emissions.
- Requires immediate “early action” control programs on the most readily controlled GHG sources.
- Mandates that by 2020, California’s GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels.
- Forces an overall reduction of GHG gases in California by 25-40%, from business as usual, to be achieved by 2020.
- Must complement efforts to achieve and maintain federal and state ambient air quality standards and to reduce toxic air contaminants.

Statewide, the framework for developing the implementing regulations for AB 32 is under way. Maximum GHG reductions are expected to derive from increased vehicle fuel efficiency, from greater use of renewable energy and from increased structural energy efficiency. Additionally, through the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR now called the Climate Action Reserve), general and industry-specific protocols for assessing and reporting GHG emissions have been developed. GHG sources are categorized

into direct sources (i.e., company owned) and indirect sources (i.e., not company owned). Direct sources include combustion emissions from on-and off-road mobile sources, and fugitive emissions. Indirect sources include off-site electricity generation and non-company owned mobile sources.

Thresholds of Significance

In response to the requirements of SB97, the State Resources Agency developed guidelines for the treatment of GHG emissions under CEQA. These new guidelines became state laws as part of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations in March, 2010. The CEQA Appendix G guidelines were modified to include GHG as a required analysis element. A project would have a potentially significant impact if it:

- Generates GHG emissions, directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or
- Conflicts with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions.

Section 15064.4 of the Code specifies how significance of GHG emissions is to be evaluated. The process is broken down into quantification of project-related GHG emissions, making a determination of significance, and specification of any appropriate mitigation if impacts are found to be potentially significant. At each of these steps, the new GHG guidelines afford the lead agency with substantial flexibility.

Emissions identification may be quantitative, qualitative, or based on performance standards. CEQA guidelines allow the lead agency to “select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate.” The most common practice for transportation/combustion GHG emissions quantification is to use a computer model such as CalEEMod, as was used in the ensuing analysis.

The significance of those emissions then must be evaluated; the selection of a threshold of significance must take into consideration what level of GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The guidelines are clear that they do not support a zero net emissions threshold. If the lead agency does not have sufficient expertise in evaluating GHG impacts, it may rely on thresholds adopted by an agency with greater expertise.

On December 5, 2008 the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted an Interim quantitative GHG Significance Threshold for industrial projects where the SCAQMD is the lead agency (e.g., stationary source permit projects, rules, plans, etc.) of 10,000 Metric Tons (MT) CO₂ equivalent/year. In September 2010, the SCAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds GHG Working Group released revisions which recommended a threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e for all land use projects. This 3,000 MT/year recommendation has been used as a guideline for this analysis. In the absence of an adopted numerical threshold of significance, project related GHG emissions in excess of the guideline level are presumed to trigger a requirement for enhanced GHG reduction at the project level.

a. *Less Than Significant Impact –*

Construction Activity GHG Emissions

The project is assumed to require less than one year for construction. During project construction, the CalEEMod2020.4.0 computer model predicts that the construction activities will generate the annual CO₂e emissions identified in Table VIII-1.

SCAQMD GHG emissions policy from construction activities is to amortize emissions over a 30-year lifetime. The amortized level is also provided. GHG impacts from construction are considered individually less than significant.

**Table VIII-1
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS**

	Metric Tons CO₂e
Year 2022	367.2
Year 2023	32.3
Total	399.5
Amortized	13.3

CalEEMod Output provided in appendix

Operational GHG Emissions

During project operation, the CalEEMod2020.4.0 computer model predicts that the operational activities will generate the annual CO₂e emissions identified in Table VIII-2. The project GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

**Table VIII-2
OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS CO₂e)**

Consumption Source	CO₂e
Area Sources	<0.1
Energy Utilization	<0.1
Mobile Source	446.2
Solid Waste Generation	0.3
Water Consumption	16.5
Construction	13.3
Total	476.0
Guideline Threshold	3,000
Exceeds Threshold	No

b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated –*

Consistency with GHG Plans, Programs and Policies

In March 2014, the San Bernardino Associated Governments and Participating San Bernardino County Cities Partnership (Partnership) created a final draft of the San Bernardino County Regional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (Reduction Plan) for each of the 25 jurisdictional Partner Cities in the County. The plan was recently updated in March of 2021. The Reduction Plan was created in accordance with AB 32, which established a greenhouse gas limit for the state of California. The Reduction Plan seeks to create an inventory of GHG gases and develop jurisdiction specific GHG reduction measures and baseline information that could be used by the Partnership Cities of San Bernardino County, including the County itself.

Projects that demonstrate consistency with the strategies, actions, and emission reduction targets contained in the Reduction Plan would have a less than significant impact on climate change. The project operations will generate little GHG emissions as shown in Table VIII-2. The only reduction measures applicable to this project are presented below. As such the proposed project shall implement the following mitigation measure to ensure consistency with applicable GHG plans, programs, and policies.

GHG-1 *The Project shall be required to adhere to the following GHG reduction measures:*

- *The District shall implement water-efficient landscaping practices.*
- *The District shall utilize recycled water for landscaping purposes if recycled water connections become available at the project site in the future. The District shall establish a goal that at least 50% of the water used for non-potable sources be recycled wastewater, where such sources are available for use at the site.*
- *The District shall work to exceed the waste diversion goal recommended by Assembly Bill 939 and CalGreen.*
- *The District shall retain a landscaping contractor(s) that uses electric landscaping equipment, if contractors with electric equipment readily available are feasible to retain within the immediate project area, or shall otherwise mandate that future landscaping at the site shall utilize electric equipment where feasible and reduce gasoline-powered landscaping equipment use and reduce the number and operating time of such equipment.*
- *The District shall install water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings in accordance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.*

With the implementation of MM **GHG-1**, the proposed project would be consistent with the Reduction Plan would result in a less than significant impact with respect to GHG emissions.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project should not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; but it may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction. The proposed project would develop a new sports stadium at the former Chautauqua High School to serve BBHS within the Community of Sugarloaf. During construction there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to people and the environment. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project and implementation of this measure can reduce this potential hazard to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1: All accidental spills or discharge of hazardous material during construction activities shall be reported to the Certified Unified Program Agency and shall be remediated in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste shall be collected and disposed of at a licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure shall be incorporated into the Stormwater

Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared on each future facility developed under the CBP. Prior to accepting the site as remediated, the area contaminated shall be tested to verify that any residual concentrations meet the standard for future residential or public use of the site.

Since the proposed project involves the demolition of the existing structures on site, some of which may contain asbestos or lead based paint, appropriate abatement of identified asbestos is necessary prior to demolition, federal and State regulations govern the demolition of structures where materials containing lead and asbestos are present. Asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) are regulated both as a hazardous air pollutant under the Clean Air Act and as a potential worker safety hazard under the authority of Cal/OSHA. These requirements include SCAQMD Rules and Regulations pertaining to asbestos abatement (including Rule 1403); Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to asbestos) and 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from CCR Title 8; CFR Title 40, Part 61, Subpart M (pertaining to asbestos); and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Asbestos and lead abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certifications from the California Department of Health Services.

In addition, Cal/OSHA has regulations concerning the use of hazardous materials, including requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, hazardous materials exposure warnings, and emergency action and fire prevention plan preparation. Cal/OSHA enforces the hazard communication program regulations, which include provisions for identifying and labeling hazardous materials, describing the hazards of chemicals, and documenting employee-training programs. All demolition that could result in the release of lead and/or asbestos would be conducted according to Cal/OSHA standards. Adherence to existing regulations would ensure that potential impacts related to ACMs and LBPs would be less than significant.

The use of hazardous materials and substances during construction would be subject to the federal, State, and local health and safety requirements for the handling, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials, summarized in the Regulatory Setting. During operation, no storage or use of hazardous materials is anticipated, other than the use of common household and commercial cleaning products. With compliance with mandatory regulations, and preparation and implementation of MM HAZ-1, identified above, hazardous material impacts related to construction activities would be less than significant.

- c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site is located within one-quarter mile of two public schools. The proposed project would be developed within a site adjacent to Big Bear High School, and within 0.1 mile of Baldwin Lane Elementary School. The project is adjacent to fields, which are similar to that which is proposed by this project. Additionally, a sports complex was recently approved to be developed about 0.2 mile northwest of the proposed project site. The proposed project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emissions as discussed under issue IX(a&b), above, as it is a project that would develop a sports complex with no potential for use of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Based on this information, implementation of the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.
- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site has been previously developed with structures, concrete, pavement, and baseball fields that made up the Chautauqua High School campus. The proposed development will include demolition of existing facilities, and will include mass grading the site to provide level surfaces upon which to develop the proposed Stadium. The project will not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites that are currently under remediation. According to the California State Water Board's GeoTracker website (consistent with Government Code Section 65962.5), which provides information regarding Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) and Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) cleanup sites, there are no open LUST, DTSC, or other clean-up sites within 2,500 feet of the project site (Figure IX-1).

Therefore, there is no potential for the project to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 thereby creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Project construction and operation of the site as the Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project will have a less than significant potential to create a significant hazard to the population or to the environment from its implementation. No mitigation is required.

- e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site is located less than a mile southeast of the Big Bear Airport. According to the Big Bear City Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan³, the project is located within the AR3 overlay, which requires an aviation easement as this project is located beneath the flight path for the airport. Airport staff has indicated that they are comfortable with the proposed project so long as they maintain access to a beacon that can only be accessed from the proposed project site. Given that the proposed project would comply with the Airport’s aviation easement requirement, and that the proposed project does not contain residences and would not facilitate long term visitation of the project site, the potential for the project to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, or otherwise utilizing the proposed project site is less than significant. Therefore, through compliance with the aviation easement requirement, construction and operation of the project at this location would result in less than significant potential safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of proximity to a public airport or private airstrip. No mitigation is required.
- f. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. The proposed project will be constructed entirely within the boundaries of the project site, with minimal improvements to the site frontage and entrances to the site along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane. The project would involve ingress and egress of traffic onto Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane from the existing and proposed access driveways that will provide entry to the site. As such, the proposed project will not experience substantial conflicts with surrounding traffic. However, because the proposed project will require construct an internal driveway and access road of sorts in the project parking lot, and minimal improvements that may affect the flow of traffic along Baldwin Lane or Maple Lane, a limited potential to interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan will occur during construction. Mitigation to address traffic disruption and emergency access issues are included in the Transportation Section (XVII). Therefore, with the implementation of MMs **TRAN-1** and **TRAN-2** identified in the Transportation Section of this document, there is a less than significant potential for the development of the project to physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plans, or evacuation plans.
- g. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The proposed project area is an area susceptible to wildland fires, and is located within a delineated within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA); the majority of the area surrounding Big Bear Lake and Baldwin Lake are located within a VHFHSZ, as shown on Figure IX-3, the Countywide Plan Policy Map of Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The project is also located within the County Fire Safety Overlay. The proposed project is required to, and will incorporate the most current fire protection designs, including an adequate water supply for fire flow and fighting purposes. Regardless of the benefits, the proposed development on the project site will expose future visitors of the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project to a potential for damage during a major wildland fire. However, the potential for loss of life is considered to be low for the following reasons: there are emergency routes that lead away from the project area—State Highway 18 (west and north) and State Highway 38 (east and south)—and, the project would install setbacks from adjacent

³ <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

forestland that could support a wildfire, thus minimizing wildfire risk at the site. Based on past experience with wildfires in the area, the Mountain Region can be successfully evacuated and life preserved, even if structures or property is damaged. Given the type of project proposed—an outdoor stadium—exposure to wildfire would have a limited potential to substantially damage the site. As a result, and due to the availability of and access to emergency routes, the potential for loss of life and structures is considered to be a less than significant impact without mitigation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?; or,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

Impact Analysis

- a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is located within the planning area of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project site contains features similar to much of the Big Bear area including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The project would be supplied with water by the City of Big Bear Lake, Department of Water and Power (DWP). Water is supplied to customers by pumping groundwater from local aquifers to meet customer demand. No sewer connections are required as the project will provide restroom services through portable facilities.

For a developed area, the only three sources of potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are from generation of municipal wastewater, stormwater runoff, and potential discharges of pollutants, such as accidental spills. The project will not generate municipal wastewater. Portable restrooms will be serviced by the portable restroom service provider, which will comply with regulations pertaining to wastewater disposal.

The County implements National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for surface discharge for all qualified projects. The project site is greater than one acre in size, therefore, it is required to obtain coverage under an NPDES permit. To address stormwater and accidental spills within this environment, any new project must ensure that site development implements a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control potential sources of water pollution that could violate any standards or discharge requirements during construction. Also, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) must be prepared and implemented to ensure that project-related surface runoff meets discharge requirements over the long term. The SWPPP would specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are controlled, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property as stormwater runoff. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the NPDES and the SWPPP is mandatory and is judged adequate mitigation by the regulatory agencies for potential impacts to stormwater during construction activities. Implementation of the following mitigation measure is also considered adequate to reduce potential impacts to stormwater runoff to a less than significant level.

HYD-1 *The District shall require that the construction contractor prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite into receiving waters. The SWPPP shall include a Spill Prevention and Cleanup Plan that identifies the methods of containing, cleanup, transport and proper disposal of hazardous chemicals or materials released during construction activities that are compatible with applicable laws and regulations. BMPs to be implemented in the SWPPP may include but not be limited to:*

- *The use of silt fences;*
- *The use of temporary stormwater desilting or retention basins;*
- *The use of water bars to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff;*
- *The use of wheel washers on construction equipment leaving the site;*
- *The washing of silt from public roads at the access point to the site to prevent the tracking of silt and other pollutants from the site onto public roads;*
- *The storage of excavated material shall be kept to the minimum necessary to efficiently perform the construction activities required. Excavated or stockpiled material shall not be stored in water courses or other areas subject to the flow of surface water; and*
- *Where feasible, stockpiled material shall be covered with waterproof material during rain events to control erosion of soil from the stockpiles.*

With implementation of these mandatory Plans and their BMPs, as well as MMs **HAZ-1** and **HYD-1** above, the development of the proposed project will not cause a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project does not propose the installation of any water wells that would directly extract groundwater and the change in pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces will be minimal because the site itself will consist of a large amount of pervious surfaces. The project is located within Bear Valley, which lies in the northeastern portion of the Santa Ana River Watershed, and the underlying groundwater basin is the Bear Valley groundwater basin. According to the Big Bear Lake Department of Water and Power (BBLDWP) 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the total demand for water was 2,332 acre-feet per year (AFY) in 2020⁴. BBLDWP anticipates that the total demand for water within its service area will grow to 2,283 AFY by 2045 AFY. The proposed project would require use of water to support site landscaping and to support drinking fountains within the project site, as well as to serve the fire hydrants developed on site for

⁴ <https://www.bldwp.com/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/249>

fire flow in instances where such flow is needed. As such, the District estimates that the proposed project would require nominal water (less than 1 AFY) to operate, as the proposed field will be developed with synthetic turf, which does not require water. BBLDWP receives about 3,100 AFY of groundwater from the Bear Valley groundwater basin as a base supply within its service area. Therefore, though the proposed project might require water supply from BBLDWP, the increase of an anticipated 1 AFY is well within the planned demand for water for in 2025 (2,147) and in 2040 (2,283 AFY), given the surplus of supply (anticipated at 3,100 AFY for every year between 2025 and 2045). The anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP's retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Thus, based on the availability of water within the area—the maximum perennial yield for the Bear Valley groundwater basin has been estimated at 4,800 AFY, with approximately 3,100 AFY of that volume being available to the BBLDWP—the development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project within the approximately 7-acre site is not forecast to cause a significant demand for new groundwater supplies. The potential impact under this proposed project is considered less than significant; no mitigation measures are required.

c. i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or offsite?

Less Than Significant Impact – The project site has been generally developed as it contains the former Chautauqua High School, with the western boundary of the site, as well as small portions of the southern and eastern site frontages supporting Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly change the volume of flows downstream of the project site, and would not be anticipated to change the amount of surface water in any water body in an amount that could initiate a new cycle of erosion or sedimentation downstream of the project site. The proposed project will be developed to be relatively flat in support of the field and stadium installation. The proposed improvements include parking, landscaping, fields, and bleachers. The proposed project will include drainage structures to convey the runoff to natural flowlines, or to flow dissipation structures. Furthermore, a basin is proposed at the entrance near Baldwin Lane and the sports fields will have subsurface storm drains that outlet to the natural flowline for that drainage area. The proposed project would develop a sports field, which would provide allow for some infiltration; when compared to the existing site conditions, the proposed project would not alter impervious surface area significantly, as the site is currently developed with similar impervious areas to that which is proposed by this project. Regardless, given that the proposed development would include drainage improvements to accommodate the facilities proposed as part of the proposed project, on site flows within the new development will be collected and conveyed in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site. This system will be designed to capture the peak 100-year flow runoff from the project site or otherwise be detained on site and discharged in conformance with County requirements. The downstream drainage system will not be altered and given the control of future surface runoff from the project site, the potential for downstream erosion or sedimentation will be controlled to a less than significant impact level.

c. ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite?

Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project will alter the existing drainage courses or patterns onsite but will maintain the existing offsite downstream drainage system through control of future discharges from the site. The onsite drainage system will capture any incremental increase in runoff from the project site associated with project development. On site flows within the new development will be collected and conveyed in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site through the provision of subsurface storm drains and a new proposed bioretention basin. The development of these drainage improvements would conform to County of San Bernardino Requirements and would prevent flooding onsite or offsite from occurring. Furthermore, the proposed project is required to prepare and implement a WQMP, which would specify specific measures to manage long-term runoff and stormwater onsite. Thus, the implementation of onsite drainage improvements and compliance with the measures developed in

the WQMP, stormwater runoff will not substantially increase the rate or volume of runoff in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant with no mitigation required.

- c. iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated – The proposed project will alter the site such that stormwater runoff within the site may be increased, but will maintain the existing off-site downstream drainage system through control of future discharges from the site to be equivalent to the current conditions. This would prevent the project from exceeding the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and from providing substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The development of the project site collect and convey on site flows in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site through the provision of subsurface storm drains and a new proposed bioretention basin. The development of these drainage improvements would be designed to prevent runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements. Varying amounts of urban pollutants, such as motor oil, antifreeze, gasoline, pesticides, detergents, trash, animal wastes, and fertilizers, could be introduced into downstream stormwater within the watershed. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate discharges that would require pollution controls beyond those already incorporated into the project design as a standard operating procedure to meet water quality management requirements from the RWQCB. As such, the project is not anticipated to result in a significant adverse impact to water quality or flows downstream of the project with implementation of mitigation outlined below.

Although BMPs are mandatory for the project to comply with established pollutant discharge requirements, the following mitigation measure is designed to establish a performance standard to ensure that the degree of water quality control is adequate to ensure the project does not contribute significantly to downstream water quality degradation.

HYD-2 The District will select best management practices and reduce future non-point source pollution in surface water runoff discharges from the site to the maximum extent practicable, both during construction and following development. The identified BMPs shall be installed in accordance with schedules contained in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP).

Compliance will also be ensured through fulfilling the requirements of a SWPPP and WQMP monitored by the District and the County/RWQCB, and through the implementation of mitigation measure **HAZ-1**, which will ensure that discharge of polluted material does not occur or is remediated in the event of an accidental spill. The SWPPP must incorporate the BMPs that meet the performance standard established in **HYD-1** for both construction and operation stages of the project. Thus, the implementation of onsite drainage improvements and applicable requirements will ensure that that drainage and stormwater will not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned offsite stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant with mitigation required.

- c. iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact – As shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) #06071C7315H provided as Figure X-1, the project site is located within Zone D, which represents areas of undetermined flood hazard. Furthermore, according to the Countywide Plan Policy Map showing Flood Hazards (Figure X-2), the proposed project is not located within a flood hazard zone. As such, development of this site is not anticipated to redirect or impede flood flow at the project site, particularly given that surface flows will be conveyed and

captured by subsurface storm drains and a new proposed bioretention basin to prevent increased runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements, which would prevent flooding onsite or offsite from occurring. Therefore, impacts under this issue are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – As stated under issue X(c)(iv), the proposed project is located in an area with no known flood hazard, as mapped by the County and by FEMA. Furthermore, the proposed project is mapped outside of the dam inundation area delineated by the San Bernardino Countywide Plan (Figure IX-3). The proposed project is located in proximity to Big Bear Lake, about 2.9 miles to the east/southeast from the Lake, and is located about 1.7 miles to the west/southwest of Baldwin Lake, though Baldwin Lake is not frequently full with water. The proposed project is also located at an elevation that is about 100 feet higher than Big Bear Lake, and about 50 feet higher than Baldwin Lake, and is separated from both lakes by hills. Big Bear Lake is formed by a dam. As such, dam inundation would occur west of the dam flowing down in elevation to the Santa Ana River watershed several thousand feet below the elevation of the project site. The proposed project is not located within the seiche zone for either lake, and is removed from the ocean by both elevation and a distance of 60 miles. Therefore, given that the proposed project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, there is a less than significant potential for release of pollutants due to project inundation. No mitigation is required.
- e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within the Bear Valley Groundwater Basin, which has been designated very low priority by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The SGMA empowers local agencies to form Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to manage basins and requires GSAs to adopt Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) for crucial groundwater basins in California.⁵ The SGMA “requires governments and water agencies of high and medium priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. Under SGMA, these basins should reach sustainability within 20 years of implementing their sustainability plans. For critically over-drafted basins, that will be 2040. For the remaining high and medium priority basins, 2042 is the deadline.”⁶ Given that the project is located within a basin that is considered very low priority, no conflict or obstruction of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan is anticipated. As such, the project would not conflict with a sustainable groundwater management plan. Water consumption and effects in the basin indicates that the proposed project’s water demand is considered to be minimal. By controlling water quality during construction and operations through implementation of both short- (SWPPP) and long- (WQMP) term best management practices at the site, no potential for conflict or obstruction of the Regional Board’s water quality control plan has been identified.

⁵ <https://www.bbarwa.org/bear-valley-basin-groundwater-sustainability-agency/>

⁶ <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *No Impact* – Refer to the aerial photos provided as Figures 1 and 2, which depict the project’s regional and site-specific location. The project site would be installed within a site zoned for Institutional (IN) use, and the land use designation is Public Facility (PF). The proposed project would occur within a site located within the Sugarloaf Community within the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. The proposed stadium would be developed within the site previously used as the Chautauqua High School, which is adjacent to Big Bear High School, which both contain similar features (fields) what is proposed by the Football and Track Stadium Project. To the west of the project site is vacant undeveloped land, with Baldwin Lane Elementary School being located a little farther to the west. To the south of the project, on the south side of Baldwin Lane, are residences. Given that the development of the proposed sports complex project at this site would be consistent with and similar to the surrounding uses, development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project at this location would be consistent with both the existing uses of the project site, as well as the uses surrounding the project and the surrounding land use designations and zoning classifications. Consequently, the development of the project site with the proposed use will not divide any established community in any manner. Therefore, no significant impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is necessary.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project will develop a stadium athletic complex within a site that previously served as the Chautauqua High School, and as such contains existing vacant development and trees. The project site is located within the Public Facility land use designation, and within the Institutional (IN) zoning classification. The County’s recently approved Countywide Plan lists the following Goals and Policies under the Land Use Element:
 - Goal LU-2 Land Use Mix and Compatibility: An arrangement of land uses that balances the lifestyle of existing residents, the needs of future generations, opportunities for commercial and industrial development, and the value of the natural environment.
 - Applicable policies:
 - Policy LU-2.1: Compatibility with existing uses
 - Policy LU-2.3: Compatibility with natural environment
 - Policy LU-2.4: Land Use Map consistency
 - Policy LU-2.5: Hillside preservation
 - Policy LU-2.6: Coordination with adjacent entities
 - Policy LU-2.8: Rural lifestyle in the Mountain/Desert regions
 - Goal LU-4 Community Design: Preservation and enhancement of unique community identities and their relationship with the natural environment.
 - Applicable policies:
 - Policy LU-4.1: Context-sensitive design in the Mountain/Desert regions
 - Policy LU-4.2: Fire-adapted communities
 - Policy LU-4.3: Native or drought-tolerant landscaping
 - Policy LU-4.4: Natural topography in the Mountain region
 - Policy LU-4.5: Community identity
 - Policy LU-4.7: Dark skies

The proposed project would be consistent with the above goals and policies. A review of all other General Plan Goals (Housing Element, Infrastructure & Utilities Element, Transportation & Mobility Element, Natural Resources Element, Renewable Energy & Conservation Element, Cultural Resources Element, Hazards Element, Personal & Property Protection Element, Economic Development Element, and Health & Wellness Element) indicates that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable Goals, often with mitigation, as demonstrated by the findings in the pertinent sections of this Initial Study. The proposed project can be implemented without significant effects on the circulation system; all infrastructure exists at or can be extended to the site to support the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project; it will not generate significant air emissions or GHG emissions, particularly once in operation; it will meet noise design requirements with mitigation; it can meet all Safety Element requirements; and it implements the Health and Wellness Element objectives and goals. Therefore, the implementation of this project at this site will be consistent with surrounding land uses, and current use of the site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *No Impact* – The proposed project is located on a site that has been previously developed as the Chautauqua High School, containing the structures and sports fields that supported the former school campus. As such, the proposed project site does not, and as such, does not contain any known important minerals resources. Furthermore, the San Bernardino County Countywide Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) map depicting Mineral Resource Zones indicates that the proposed project is not located within an area containing delineated mineral resources (Figure XII-1). Therefore, the development of the site is not anticipated to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

- b. *No Impact* – The proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would not result in a significant impact under any of the Initial Study Checklist Topics, provided mitigation measures are implemented. As stated above, the proposed project site does not contain any known mineral resources delineated by the County in its Countywide Plan (Figure XII-1), and is currently vacant containing trees and other native vegetation. As such, the development of the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project at the proposed site would not result in the loss of any available locally important resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, as no such delineations of this site are known. No impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of a project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: A Noise Impact Analysis is provided as Appendix 5 to this Initial Study, titled “Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, Noise Impact Analysis” prepared by Urban Crossroads dated December 20, 2021.

Background

Noise is generally described as unwanted sound. The proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project will develop a three field multi-use sports complex within a ~7-acre site designated for Institutional use by the San Bernardino Countywide Plan on the northwest corner of Maple Lane and Baldwin Lane in the Unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf. Nearby sensitive uses include BBHS, which is located adjacent to the project site and would essentially be a continuation of BBHS once developed as it will serve the school and the District. Additionally, the project is located about 0.1 mile to the east of Baldwin Lane Elementary School, and is located about 80 feet from the nearest residences to the south of the project site. The existing background noise at the site would be minimal to moderate, given that the site shares a boundary with vacant forest land to the west, while the northern portion of the site shares a boundary with BBHS and the school’s associated fields and sport facilities, and with a park located to the east. Traffic noise in this area is minimal to moderate given that the project site is located at the northwest corner of Maple Lane and Baldwin Lane.

The unit of sound pressure ratio to the faintest sound detectable to a person with normal hearing is called a decibel (dB). Sound or noise can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing. A logarithmic loudness scale, similar to the Richter scale for earthquake magnitude, is therefore used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum. Noise levels at maximum human sensitivity from around 500 to 2,000 cycles per second are factored more heavily into sound descriptions in a process called “A-weighting,” written as “dBA.”

Leq is a time-averaged sound level; a single-number value that expresses the time-varying sound level for the specified period as though it were a constant sound level with the same total sound energy as the time-varying level. Its unit of measure is the decibel (dB). The most common averaging period for Leq is hourly.

Because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during more sensitive evening and nighttime hours, state law requires that an artificial dBA (A-weighted decibel) increment be added to quiet time noise levels. The State of California has established guidelines for acceptable community noise levels that are based on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) rating scale (a

24-hour integrated noise measurement scale). The guidelines rank noise land use compatibility in terms of "normally acceptable," "conditionally acceptable," and "clearly unacceptable" noise levels for various land use types. The State Guidelines, Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure, single-family homes are "normally acceptable" in exterior noise environments up to 60 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL based on this scale. Multiple family residential uses are "normally acceptable" up to 65 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 CNEL. Schools, libraries and churches are "normally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL, as are office buildings and business, commercial and professional uses with some structural noise attenuation.

a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated –*

Short Term Construction Noise

Short-term construction noise impacts associated with the proposed project will occur in phases as the project site is developed. The earth-moving sources are the noisiest type of equipment typically ranging from 82 to 85 dB at 50 feet from the source. Temporary construction noise is exempt from the County Noise Performance Standards between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., except Sundays and Federal holidays. The proposed project would be constructed within the confines of these hours, and therefore would be in compliance with the County's Noise Performance Standards, and therefore construction of the project would be less than significant. However, to minimize the noise generated on the site to the extent feasible, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

NOI-1 All construction vehicles and fixed or mobile equipment shall be equipped with operating and maintained mufflers.

NOI-2 All employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8-hour period shall be provided adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities.

NOI-3 No construction activities shall occur during the hours of 7 PM through 7 AM, Monday through Saturday; at no time shall construction activities occur on Sundays or holidays, unless a declared emergency exists.

NOI-4 Equipment not in use for five minutes shall be shut off.

NOI-5 Equipment shall be maintained and operated such that loads are secured from rattling or banging.

NOI-6 Construction employees shall be trained in the proper operation and use of equipment consistent with these mitigation measures, including no unnecessary revving of equipment.

NOI-7 The District shall require that all construction equipment be operated with mandated noise control equipment (mufflers or silencers). Enforcement will be accomplished by random field inspections by the District.

NOI-8 Construction staging areas shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptor locations as possible, for example toward the middle/northwestern boundary of the site.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact –* Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object. The rumbling sound caused by vibration of room surfaces is called structure borne noises. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena (e.g., earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides) or human-made causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous or transient. Vibration is often described in units of velocity (inches per second), and discussed in decibel (VdB) units in order to compress the range

of numbers required to describe vibration. Vibration impacts related to human development are generally associated with activities such as train operations, construction, and heavy truck movements.

The background vibration-velocity level in residential areas (from ongoing activities in a residential area such as cars driving by, etc.) is generally 50 VdB, while the groundborne vibration directly adjacent to an industrial facility requiring movement of heavy machinery might be greater. Groundborne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB, while 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Construction activity can result in varying degrees of groundborne vibration, but is generally associated with pile driving and rock blasting. Other construction equipment—such as air compressors, light trucks, hydraulic loaders, etc.—generates little or no ground vibration. The San Bernardino County Development Code offers guidance on Vibration. San Bernardino County Development Code 83.01.090 provides guidance regarding how vibration should be measured and offers the following Standard:

(a) Vibration standard. No ground vibration shall be allowed that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, nor shall any vibration be allowed which produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line.

Additionally, according to the San Bernardino County Development Code, construction is exempt from vibration regulations during the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM. As such, vibration related to construction activities will be less than significant because the project will limit construction to these hours. Operational vibration is anticipated to be less than significant given that there are no large pieces of heavy machinery that would operate at or near the property line. Therefore, any vibration generated within the site is not anticipated to be felt beyond the lot line. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

- c. *No Impact* – There nearest public airport is the Big Bear City Airport, which is located less than a mile to the northwest. According to the Big Bear City Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan⁷, the project is not located within a safety zone requiring an aviation easement as this project is located beneath the flight path for the airport. Additionally, the proposed project is located outside of the delineated noise contours for the Airport, as shown on Figure XIII-1. Given that the proposed project is located outside of the 65 CNEL dBA airport noise contour, the project area has a less than significant potential to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels as a result of the site's proximity to the airport. No mitigation is required.

⁷ <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the project will not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). This project proposes to develop a new stadium within an approximately 7-acre site. The provision of a new stadium is not typically considered to be growth inducing, but instead is considered growth accommodating to meet the current demand for an athletic stadium to serve the student athletics within the District boundaries. It should be noted that the District currently utilizes Big Bear Middle School to hold District football and other sports games, and these activities would be relocated to Big Bear High School; there is no increase in attendance anticipated with the new stadium. The proposed project would not require a significant number of employees to operate, only an anticipated 2 additional employees will be necessary to serve the new Stadium. It is unknown whether the new employees will be drawn from the general area or will bring new residents to the project area, but it is anticipated that the employees will reside in Mountain Region, which is an unincorporated area in San Bernardino County. According to the Countywide Plan, the total population within unincorporated San Bernardino County was 304,300 persons in 2020, or 13.8% of the overall County population of 2,197,400. According to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan PEIR, the population of unincorporated San Bernardino County is anticipated to grow to 344,100 by 2040. The proposed project would create a potential for 2 more permanent opportunities for employment during operation, and 25 temporary opportunities for employment in support of project construction. This would constitute a permanent increase in population of 0.00066% if each of the 2 new workers are new residents to unincorporated San Bernardino County. Given that the County General Plan indicates that the planned population within unincorporated San Bernardino is anticipated to grow by 39,800 from the 2020 population identified in the Countywide Plan (304,300), the potential increase in residents is well within the planned population growth within unincorporated San Bernardino County. As such, the County has planned for growth in population beyond that which exists at present, and should the project result in a temporary increase in population by 25 persons, or by 2 persons in the long term to manage and maintain the new sports complex, this growth would be well within the planned growth within the County as indicated by the Countywide Plan PEIR. Thus, based on the type of project, and the small increment of potential indirect population growth the project may generate, the population generation associated with project implementation will not induce substantial population growth that exceeds either local or regional projections.

- b. *No Impact* – There are no residences within the project site, as the project site contains the former Chautauqua High School campus. No persons currently reside on the site and therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, or persons necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, no impacts will occur and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project site is served by the Big Bear Fire Department, and the nearest Fire Station to the proposed project is Station #283, which is located across the street to the east of the project site at 550 Maple Ln, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315. Station #283 provides fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency medical services to the Big Bear Lake area. The proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would result in some potential increase in emergency and fire protection services at the project location. However, this would generally be a transfer of demand for such services as the District currently utilizes the Big Bear Middle School campus for football games. Given the close proximity to fire protection and emergency services, the project will be adequately served by fire equipment at Station #283, which would be capable of reaching the proposed project in the event of an emergency of fire in less than 3 minutes. Based on the above information, the proposed project does not pose a significant fire or emergency response hazard, nor is the proposed project forecast to cause a significant demand for fire protection services. The District will be required to ensure adequate fire flow at the proposed facilities. These requirements are considered adequate measures to prevent any significant impacts under this issue, thus no mitigation is required.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The community of Sugarloaf receives police services through the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department. The Department enforces local, state, and federal laws; performs investigations and makes arrests; administers emergency medical treatment; and responds to County emergencies. The Big Bear Sheriff’s Station is located at 477 Summit Boulevard, Big Bear Lake, California 92315, which is approximately 3 miles to the west of the project site. The Station polices 258 square miles of unincorporated area to include the communities of Big Bear City, Sugarloaf, Erwin Lake, Baldwin Lake, Lake Williams and Fawnskin. In general, the Mountain Area has a low crime rate, which can be attributed to an increased law enforcement staff that includes both Sheriff personnel and an active Citizen Patrol with about 50 to 60 volunteer members funded by donations.

The project site is located within existing Sheriff patrol routes and future calls can be responded to within the identified priority call target response times. The proposed project will incrementally add to the existing demand for police protection services. The proposed stadium is anticipated to create a minimal demand for law enforcement protection services based on the type of uses and the general lack of activities that would substantially increase demand for such services. As such, the project is not expected to result in any unique or more extensive crime problems that cannot be handled with

the existing level of police resources. No new or expanded police facilities would need to be constructed as a result of the project. Therefore, impacts to police protection resources from implementation of the proposed project are considered less than significant; no mitigation measures are required.

- c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is anticipated to temporarily employ a maximum of 25 persons during construction. The project is not anticipated to generate any new direct demand for the area schools. The BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would be developed within a site adjacent to both BBHS and Baldwin Lane Elementary School, which contain fields that are similar in nature to that which is proposed by this project, with the stadium being a unique feature intended to serve the District athletics. As addressed above under issue Population and Housing, XV(a) above, the proposed project does not include any land uses that would substantially induce population growth, and will not require a substantial temporary or permanent labor force. The development of a stadium at this site is not anticipated to adversely impact schools in any manner. Furthermore, the proposed project is intended to support the District, and thus support the schools and students within the District. As such, the proposed project would benefit schools, as it would provide a stadium in support of student athletics. Furthermore, as discussed throughout this Initial Study, the development of the proposed stadium project is not anticipated to cause any significant adverse impacts. As such, given that the proposed project would develop new school facilities to serve the Bear Valley Unified School District, it is anticipated that the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would have a less than significant potential to cause a substantial adverse impact to Parks. No mitigation is required.
- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would develop a stadium with a multi-use field and track to serve the District's students. The BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would develop a field for use during school-related events, and therefore would not contribute to the area public park acreage. However, the proposed project would not significantly impact area parks as it would not include any land uses that would substantially induce population growth, and will not require a substantial temporary or permanent labor force. The proposed project will not directly add to the existing demand on local park facilities. The County collects a park and recreation impact fee from residential projects. The proposed project would be developed by the Bear Valley Unified School District, which is exempt from payment of such fees, and no residences are proposed; thus, with no existing or planned park facilities located within the project site, and no required payment of fees, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to parks and recreation facilities.
- e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Other public facilities include library and general municipal services. Since the project will not directly induce substantial population growth, it is not forecast that the use of such facilities will increase as a result of the proposed project. The project will develop a stadium that will contribute to the County's available Public Services, as it would develop a stadium that would serve Bear Valley Unified School District athletics. Thus, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVI. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – As addressed in the discussion under XIV and XV(d) above, the proposed project does not include a use that would substantially induce population growth. As stated in the discussion under Population and Housing, the project would create approximately 2 permanent and 25 temporary positions of employment. It is unknown what portion of the temporary workforce will be new residents. The County collects a park and recreation impact fee from residential projects. The proposed project would be developed by the Bear Valley Unified School District, which is exempt from payment of such fees, and no residences are proposed. Additionally, the proposed project will be developed on land that is designated by the County’s General Plan for Institutional use, and is not listed in any planning documents as desirable land for future park or recreation development. Furthermore, the proposed project would install a football field and track, but does not include any public recreational facilities that would contribute to the availability of recreational facilities in the area. As the project would not substantially induce population growth such that area recreation facilities would deteriorate from over-use, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to physically deteriorate park or recreational facilities through increased use. No mitigation is required.

- b. *No Impact* – As discussed under issue XV(d) and issue XVI(a) above, the proposed project consists of the development of a stadium to serve District athletics. The project will provide a football field and track, but as the stadium is intended to provide an event space for District use, and may be used by students for practice, it does not include any public recreational facilities that would contribute to the availability of recreational facilities in the area. Based on the data and analysis contained in this Initial Study, the proposed construction of the stadium is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse impact on the environment under any issue. As such, though the proposed project includes the construction of park/recreational facilities, the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would have a less than significant potential to have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: A Trip Generation Assessment (TGA) is provided as Appendix 6a to this Initial Study, titled “Big Bear High School Football Stadium Trip Generation Assessment” prepared by Urban Crossroads, dated November 1, 2021. Additionally, Urban Crossroads prepared a Vehicle Miles Traveled Screening Evaluation (VMT Evaluation) dated September 27, 2021 and provided as Appendix 6b to this initial Study.

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The proposed project is located at the northwest intersection of Baldwin Lane and Maple Plan. Baldwin Lane delineated as a Mountain Major Highway serving the Community of Sugarloaf and Mountain Region, while Maple Lane is considered a Mountain Secondary Highway serving the community of Sugarloaf, connecting the community with Big Bear City and Baldwin Lake.

The TGA provided as Appendix 6a indicates that the high school football games are currently being held at Big Bear Middle School (located at 41275 Big Bear Boulevard in Big Bear Lake). The football games are the only events that are affected (being relocated) by the new proposed stadium as graduations and other large events are currently already held at the high school. The existing seating capacity is currently 550 seats for the home team and approximately 100 seats for visitors. The seating for the visiting team is low in comparison to the home team due to the travel distance of the visiting teams which limits the attendees to immediate family only.

In order to determine the trip generation associated with the existing football games that would be relocated from Big Bear Middle School to Big Bear High School, the activities on September 25, 2021 and October 2, 2021 were observed and counted. Both of these dates included both Junior Varsity and Varsity games which anticipated a high turnout. There are other weekday games that were scheduled, but they are relatively new and have fewer attendees and are usually Junior Varsity games only. Night games are also rare since there are currently no permanent lights for the evening games and portable lights need to be brought in. Traffic counts were collected at the driveways and on-street parking (where applicable along Jeffries Road and Georgia Street) were surveyed at Big Bear Middle School on September 25, 2021, and October 2, 2021 (both Saturdays). A summary of the count data collected is provided in Attachment A. Table 1 summarizes the trip generation for the existing football games (accounting for all driveways). As shown on Table 1, the existing football games generate an average of 460 two-way trips per day (on Saturday), with 160 trips during the afternoon peak hour. The peak activity on both Saturdays occurred between 3:30 and 4:30 PM.

**Table XVII-1
EXISTING SURVEY DATA FOR BIG BEAR MIDDLE SCHOOL**

Land Use	Saturday Peak Hour			Daily
	In	Out	Total	
Day 1: September 25, 2021 Total Trips	18	125	143	352
Day 2: October 2, 2021 Total Trips	27	150	177	565
2-Day Average Trip Generation Total Trips	23	138	150	460

According to the County Guidelines, operations analysis (traffic study) may not be required if the weekday AM or PM peak hour trip generation is less than 100 vehicle trips. The Project is anticipated to generate 160 Saturday afternoon peak hour trips, however, the weekday trips for Junior Varsity games occur during the mid-day outside of the typical peak commute hours. Lastly, it should be noted that these are not new trips as they are existing trips occurring at Big Bear Middle School that would be relocated to Big Bear High School (there is no increase in attendance anticipated with the new stadium). As such, no significant impacts on the Bear Valley automobile circulation system are anticipated over the long-term.

The project will also generate construction traffic, which is temporary; during construction, the project is anticipated to generate no more than 50 round truck trips per day, and a maximum of 60 employee roundtrips per day; these trips will be spread throughout the day during construction. As such, no significant impacts on the automobile circulation system are anticipated over the short-term period of construction.

The project site is currently accessible by car, by adjacent sidewalk, and is planned to be accessible by an adjacent Class III Bike Trail along Baldwin Lane. The site will continue to be accessible by the above means of transport once the stadium has been developed, with enhanced access to the site through the new driveways.

The Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA) is the primary public transportation provider on the mountain-top, providing local and off-the-mountain bus service to the Big Bear Valley, Running Springs, Lake Arrowhead, Crestline and San Bernardino. MARTA operates both fixed route and demand-response services (Dial-A-Ride). The proposed project is located about three-quarter mile away from the nearest bus stop located at Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane through the Big Bear Route 11 (Erwin Lake to Interlaken Center). The proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project is not anticipated to conflict with the circulation of any alternative modes of transportation.

Based on a review of the circulation in the vicinity of BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project, the minimal peak hour traffic that would be generated over the short- and long-term by the proposed project, and that will contribute to off- and on-site improvements to area roadways and sidewalks, this project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. No mitigation is required.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would develop a stadium within the unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf in San Bernardino County. The County of San Bernardino utilizes the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) VMT Screening Tool (Screening Tool). The Screening Tool allows users to input an assessor's parcel number (APN) to determine if a project's location meets one or more of the screening thresholds for land use projects. The County Guidelines provides details on appropriate screening criteria that can be used to identify when a proposed land use project is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact without conducting a more detailed analysis. Screening thresholds are broken into the following three types

and a land use project need only to meet one of the above screening thresholds to result in a less than significant impact:

- **Local Community Screening:** The County Guidelines notes projects which serve the local community and have the potential to reduce VMT should not be required to complete a full VMT analysis. Projects such as local serving retail (less than 50,000 square feet in building area), K-12 schools, local parks, day care centers, local serving gas stations, local serving banks, student housing, and local serving community colleges are examples of local serving land uses that would tend to shorten vehicle trips. The Project intends to develop an athletic field as the continuation of Big Bear High School. Currently, games and events are held at nearby Big Bear Middle School. Upon Project completion games and events will be relocated from Big Bear Middle School into the newly developed facility. In other words, the Project would serve these existing attendees and guests; and not result in new vehicle trips coming to and from the local area.
 - Local Community screening criteria is met.
- **Projects Generating Less Than 110 Daily Vehicle Trips**
 - Projects Generating Less Than 110 Daily Vehicle Trips screening criteria is not met.
- **Transit Priority Area (TPA) Screening**
 - The TPA screening criteria is not met.
- **Low VMT Area Screening:** The Screening Tool uses the sub-regional San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM) to measure VMT performance within individual traffic analysis zones (TAZ's) within the region. The parcel containing the proposed Project was selected and the Screening Tool was run for Production/Attraction (PA) VMT per employee and VMT per capita measure of VMT. County Guidelines indicate that projects within traffic analysis zones (TAZs) that are found to generate VMT per employee 4% below the unincorporated County's existing regional baseline VMT per employee are considered to have a less than significant impact. Based on the Screening Tool results the baseline VMT per employee is 5.9 or 69.73% below the County VMT per employee average and VMT per capita is 16.6 or 33.09% below the County VMT per capita average. Therefore, the Project resides within a TAZ that generates VMT per employee and VMT per capita that exceeds 4% below the unincorporated County existing VMT per employee and per capita threshold.
 - The Low VMT Area Screening is met.

In addition to the above, the proposed BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project is located in an area that connects to alternative modes of transportation, such as sidewalks, planned bike paths, and is located near an existing bus route, making the area in the vicinity of the project accessible to alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, in accordance with the VMT thresholds and the analysis above and contained within Appendix 6b, the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project is not anticipated to result in significant impact related to vehicle miles travelled, and thus would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project will occur entirely within the project site boundaries, though it will involve improvements along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane in order to develop the proposed driveways that will provide access to the proposed stadium. Large trucks delivering equipment or removing small quantities of excavated dirt or debris can enter the site without major conflicts with the flow of traffic on the roadways used to access the site. Primary access to the site will be provided along existing and new driveways along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane. Baldwin Lane delineated as a Mountain Major Highway serving the Community of Sugarloaf and Mountain Region, while Maple Lane is considered a Mountain Secondary Highway serving the community of Sugarloaf, connecting the community with Big Bear City and Baldwin Lake. The project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Maple Lane and Baldwin Lane, and these roadways are generally moderately heavily traveled as the roads serve as a major access roads to the Community of Sugarloaf. The proposed new driveways will be designed such that the project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance require-

ments for construction and access to the site. Emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated with the District and the County, as well as the police and fire departments. Because the proposed project will require development of new driveways to provide access to the proposed stadium, the project will require implementation of a traffic management plan, which will ensure adequate circulation within the area. As such, to mitigate the potential impacts to traffic flow during construction, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

TRAN-1 *The District shall require its contractors prepare a construction traffic control plan. Elements of the plan should include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:*

- *Develop circulation and detour plans, if necessary, to minimize impacts to local street circulation. Use haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.*
- *To the extent feasible, and as needed to avoid adverse impacts on traffic flow, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.*
- *Install traffic control devices as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones where needed to maintain safe driving conditions. Use flaggers and/or signage to safely direct traffic through construction work zones.*
- *For roadways requiring lane closures that would result in a single open lane, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow and utilize flagger-controls.*
- *Coordinate with facility owners or administrators of sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, hospitals, and schools. Provide advance notification to the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities.*

TRAN-2 *The District shall require that all disturbances to public roadways be repaired in a manner that complies with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (green book) or other applicable County of San Bernardino standard design requirements.*

Upon implementation of a construction traffic management plan, any potential increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible use will be considered less than significant in the short term. In the long term, no impacts to any hazards or incompatible uses in existing or planned roadways are anticipated. Operation of the proposed project would be similar to the surrounding uses, and the design of the project would not create any hazards to surrounding roadways. Thus, any impacts are considered less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project consists of activities that will take place along Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane within the Community of Sugarloaf in the County of San Bernardino. Vehicles travelling to and from the project site would utilize Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane and nearby State Highway 38 to access the site. Primary access to the site will be provided by the new proposed driveways. Access to the site is adequate and the nearest emergency response station is located across the street from the project site at 550 Maple Ln, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315. There is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. With implementation of MMs **TRAN-1** and **TRAN-2**, adequate emergency access along Baldwin Lane will be maintained. Furthermore, the proposed stadium would utilize existing parking at BBHS to serve the stadium, as such, in the event of an emergency during the event, safe evacuation can be accomplished through use of existing facilities. Site access would mainly serve to enable pick up and drop off at the stadium with limited parking available onsite, primarily to provide handicapped site access. Thus, because of the lack of adverse impact on local circulation a less than significant

potential for significant impacts on emergency access are forecast to occur during construction and operation. No further mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project cause a substantial change in the significance of tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to the California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Bear Valley Unified School District has not been contacted by any Tribes under Assembly Bill (AB) 52. Therefore, no consultation is required, and the analysis and conclusions under the Cultural Resources Section above shall ensure that no significant impacts to any Tribal Cultural Resources occur. As such, MM **CUL-1** and **CUL-2**, which requires earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of any cultural materials to be halted and for an onsite inspection to be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. No further mitigation is required beyond that which was identified under Section V, Cultural Resources, above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

a. Water
Less Than Significant Impact – Water will be provided by the BBLDWP. Water service is available through existing connections at the project site that previously served the Chautauqua High School. As previously stated under Issue X, Hydrology and Water Quality, the BBLDWP’s 2020 UWMP identifies sufficient water resources to meet demand in its service area. The anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP’s retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Wastewater
No Impact – Municipal wastewater collection will not be required at the project site as the District will utilize portable restrooms onsite. This will require trips to and from the site to collect the portable restrooms and dispose of the waste. This will be handled by the portable restroom service provider. This action will require minimal trips to and from the site, and would not result in any significant impacts related to waste disposal, as the waste will be handled in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations. Therefore, development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities.

Stormwater
Less Than Significant Impact – The surface water runoff from the project site will be managed in accordance with the approved SWPPP and WQMP, as discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality

Section (Section X) of this Initial Study. The onsite drainage system will capture the incremental increase in runoff from the project site associated with project development. The development of the project site stormwater management system will require incorporation of infiltration mechanisms throughout the site to prevent runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements. Therefore, surface water will be adequately managed on site and as such, development of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Electric Power

Less Than Significant Impact – Bear Valley Electric Service (BVES) (a division of Golden State Water Company) will provide electricity to the site, at which a connection already exists due to the previous site use as the Chautauqua High School. The BVES power distribution system will be able to supply sufficient electricity. The effort to connect to the existing electrical system, and to install electricity connections within the project site to serve the lighting requirements and electricity requirements for visitors of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts, as evidenced by the discussions in preceding sections. Therefore, development of the Football and Track Stadium Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Natural Gas

No Impact – Development of the proposed stadium would not create a demand for natural gas. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded natural gas facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Telecommunications

No Impact – Development of the proposed stadium would not require installation of wireless internet service or phone service; regardless, access to internet service is available at the site as services are and were available for BBHS and Chautauqua High School. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded telecommunication facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under Hydrology, Section X(b). The project is located within Bear Valley, which lies in the northeastern portion of the Santa Ana River Watershed, and the underlying groundwater basin is the Bear Valley groundwater basin. The proposed project would require use of water to support site landscaping and to support drinking fountains within the project site, as well as to serve the hoses developed on site for fire flow in instances where such flow is needed. Based on the data contained in the BBLDWP 2020 UWMP, as discussed under Section X(b), BBLDWP receives about 3,100 AFY of groundwater from the Bear Valley groundwater basin as a base supply within its service area. The BBLDWP 2020 UWMP indicates that the anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP's retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, while the maximum perennial yield for the Bear Valley groundwater basin has been estimated at 4,800 AFY, approximately 3,100 AFY of that volume is made available to the BBLDWP, which exceeds the service area's demand for water. Thus, based on the availability of water within the area the development of the proposed project, which is anticipated to require about 1 AFY, is not forecast to cause a significant demand for water supplies and is therefore anticipated to be served by a water provider with sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Based on these substantiating data, provision of domestic water supply can be accomplished without causing significant impacts on the existing water system or existing entitlements. The potential impact under this proposed project is considered less than significant; no mitigation measures are required.

- c. *No Impact* – No sewer connections are required as the project will provide restroom services through portable facilities. Given that no municipal wastewater connections are required in order to install the proposed project, the proposed project will not result in the determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The portable restroom service provider will be responsible for the collection of the portable restrooms and disposal of the waste. As such, no impacts under this issue are anticipated to occur.
- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – BBCCSD collects approximately 6,800 tons of trash and over 80 tons of household recyclables from 11,000 residences within a service area of 11.4 square miles. A fleet of 7 refuse-hauling trucks and 3 support vehicles sustain department operations. BBCCSD offer monthly dumpster rentals with timely and flexible pickups. The nearest landfill to the project area is the Big Bear Transfer Station, at 38550 Holcomb Valley Road in Big Bear City, which can receive 400 tons per day. Beyond the Transfer Station, the nearest landfills are either the Landers Landfill in Landers, CA, the San Timoteo Landfill in Redlands, CA or the Victorville Landfill in Victorville, CA. The Landers Sanitary Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 1,200 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of 11,148,100 cubic yards (CY), with a maximum permitted capacity of 13,983,500 CY according to CalRecycle.⁸ The San Timoteo Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 2,000 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of 12,360,396 cubic yards (CY), with a maximum permitted capacity of 22,685,785 CY according to CalRecycle.⁹ The Victorville Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 3,000 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of 81,510,000 CY, with a maximum permitted capacity of 83,200,000 CY according to CalRecycle.¹⁰ Using the an averaging of the Solid Waste Generation Rates from CalRecycle¹¹, the solid waste generation rate for a golf course (the most applicable use listed), is 0.5 lbs per day per visitor. With an average number of up to 1,000 visitors per day for about 40 days per year and use by up to 75 students and staff about 260 days per year, the proposed project is anticipated to generate 14.88 tons per year, or about 81.5 pounds of waste per day without the required 50% diversion of waste as required by BBCCSD and the County. BBCCSD maintains, operates, and facilitates operations for solid waste disposal in an effort to meet AB939 (50% diversion by the year 2000).

Construction would require demolition of structures, the materials of which can be removed and transported by a construction and demolition (C&D) hauler. There is adequate capacity at the nearest landfill as well as in other landfills that serve the area to handle construction and operational waste from the proposed project. Any hazardous materials collected on the project site during construction of the project will be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider. Since the proposed project involves the demolition of the existing structures on site, some of which may contain asbestos or lead based paint, appropriate abatement of identified asbestos is necessary prior to demolition, federal and State regulations govern the demolition of structures where materials containing lead and asbestos are present. Asbestos and lead abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certifications from the California Department of Health Services. All demolition that could result in the release of lead and/or asbestos would be conducted according to Cal/OSHA standards. Adherence to existing regulations pertaining to lead and asbestos disposal would ensure that potential impacts related to ACMs and LBPs would be less than significant.

Considering the availability of landfill capacity and the amount of solid waste generation from the proposed project during both construction and operations, project solid waste disposal needs can be adequately met without a significant impact on the capacity of the nearest landfills. However, to further reduce potential impacts to solid waste facilities due to the large scale of the materials that may require disposal or recycling, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

⁸ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1882?siteID=2664>

⁹ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1906?siteID=2688>

¹⁰ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1870?siteID=2652>

¹¹ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>

UTIL-1 *The contract with construction contractors shall include the requirement that all materials that can feasibly be recycled shall be salvaged and recycled, including C&D materials, and trees and site vegetation that must be removed. The contractor shall submit a recycling plan to the District for review and approval prior to the start of demolition/construction activities to accomplish this objective.*

Therefore, with the above mitigation measure, it is expected that implementation of the BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project will be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

- e. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – All collection, transportation, and disposal of any solid waste generated by the proposed project is required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. As previously stated, solid waste produced in the Community of Sugarloaf is collected and transported by the BCCSD. The area is served by several nearby landfills, though the closest are the Big Bear Transfer Station, the San Timoteo Landfill or the Victorville Landfill, which, as stated under issue XIX(d) above, have adequate capacity to serve the project. Additionally, any hazardous materials collected on the project site during either construction or operation of the project will be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider, as stated under issue IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials above. The construction contract for this project will require concrete, asphalt and base material to be recycled by grinding, which allows reuse of these materials, should any require removal as part of the project. All woods and other vegetation that is reusable shall be recycled or composted, where applicable.

Thus, with the implementation of MM **UTIL-1**, and the amount and types of wastes that will be generated both during construction and operation of the project, the potential impacts to the waste disposal systems are considered less than significant. Therefore, the project is expected to comply with all regulations related to solid waste under federal, state, and local statutes. No further mitigation is necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project area is an area susceptible to wildland fires, and is located within an area delineated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a State Responsibility Area (SRA); the majority of the area surrounding Big Bear Lake and Baldwin Lake are located within a VHFHSZ, as shown on Figure IX-3, the Countywide Plan Policy Map of Fire Hazard Severity Zones. As stated under Section XVII, Transportation under issue (d), there is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. The proposed project is not located along this emergency route, nor would implementation of the project impede emergency response from accessing the site or surrounding area. As stated under issue XVIII(c), the proposed project would develop a stadium and access to the site as well as site design must comply with County design standards to ensure that inadequate design features or incompatible uses do not occur. Furthermore, the proposed stadium would utilize existing parking at BBHS to serve the stadium, as such, in the event of an emergency during the event, safe evacuation can be accomplished through use of existing facilities. Site access would mainly serve to enable pick up and drop off at the stadium with limited parking available onsite, primarily to provide handicapped site access. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction and access to the site. Though the project is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone within an SRA, impacts to emergency response and/or emergency evacuation plans are considered less than significant.

- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within the former Chautauqua High School which contains structures and compacted dirt and grass fields, in addition to developed parking areas located in the Community of Sugarloaf. It is located on a relatively flat parcel, due to this previous development. The project site slopes gently from north to south, and will be graded to create level foundations upon which to develop the proposed stadium, parking lot, and other design features. The proposed project is located in a relatively rural environment, though it has been urbanized as much of the site is surrounded by development. The proposed project is also located in an area adjacent to the nearby forest. Effectively, the proposed project will constitute a replacement

of an existing use with a new, similar use, which would not result in any greater potential to expose visitors of the project site to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire. Once in operation, the proposed project will consist of a stadium, with no indoor structures. The proposed project will remove onsite vegetation, including trees on the boundaries of the site, thereby minimizing the potential fire risks within this site, and the proposed project be designed in accordance with fire department recommendations and design standards. Furthermore, based on past experience with wildfires in the area, the Mountain Region can be successfully evacuated and life preserved due to the availability of evacuation routes. As such, there is a less than significant potential for the proposed project to expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project will require associated infrastructure in support of the stadium development as follows: the project will require a potable water connection to BBLDWP's service area; the project will require a connection to BVES's electrical system though electricity and water service are already available at the project site due to the past site use; and the project will develop new driveways providing access to the stadium that will intersect with Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane. As stated above, the project will require removal of a majority of the trees located on the boundaries of the project site. The removal of these trees and other vegetation in support of the proposed project could exacerbate fire risk due to the type of equipment that may be necessary to facilitate the tree removal. Because the project will be required to implement the following mitigation measure, which would minimize fire risk during activities that would utilize electric equipment by requiring construction crews to carry fire prevention equipment during activities involving electrical equipment.

WF-1 *All staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development that are planned to use spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other material that could ignite. Any construction equipment that can include a spark arrestor shall be equipped with a spark arrestor in good working order. During the construction of the project facilities, all vehicles and crews working at the project site shall have access to functional fire extinguishers and related fire prevention equipment (such as emergency sand bags, etc.) at all times. In addition, construction crews shall have a spotter during welding activities to look out for potentially dangerous situations, including accidental sparks.*

The proposed project would not result in any ongoing impacts to the environment that would exacerbate fire risk as the proposed project is a stadium that will be designed in accordance with fire department recommendations and design standards. Therefore, with the implementation of MM **WF-1** above, the project would not have a significant potential to exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within a site that slopes slightly from north to south, with a minor variation in elevation. The discussion under Section VII, Geology and Soils, concluded that the project would not have a significant potential to experience landslides or slope instability, particularly given that this project area has not been delineated as containing potential for landslides or slope instability by the San Bernardino Countywide Plan, and that the project would be graded to enable a level surface for the stadium to be developed by this project. Furthermore, the project site has previously been in use as the Chautauqua High School, and no landslides are known to have occurred at the site since it has been occupied. The proposed project is located in an area that has not been historically subject to flooding. The site design will incorporate driveways providing access to the site such that the project drainage would be controlled on site or otherwise discharged in conformance with County requirements. Furthermore, given that the project would construct an athletics stadium containing a field, much of the runoff associated with the site would be retained within the field and landscaped areas; compaction, grading, and overall construction of this site would minimize slope instability by design. Therefore, the development of the

BBHS Football and Track Stadium Project at this site is anticipated to have a less than significant potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: The analysis in this Initial Study and the findings reached indicate that the proposed project can be implemented without causing any new project specific or cumulatively considerable unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation is required to control potential environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant impact level. The following findings are based on the detailed analysis of the Initial Study of all environmental topics and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the previous text and summarized in this section.

- a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project has no potential to cause a significant impact to any biological or cultural resources. The project has been identified as having no potential to degrade the quality of the natural environment, substantially reduce habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project requires contingency mitigation to prevent significant impacts from occurring as a result of implementation of the project. Based on the data contained in the Cultural Resources Report (Appendix 3), the potential for impacting cultural resources is low. The Cultural Resources Report determined that no cultural resources of importance were found at the project site upon field review and a review of the records search performed for the project and project area, so it is not anticipated that any resources could be affected by the project because no cultural resources exist. However, because it is not known what could be unearthed upon any excavation activities, contingency mitigation measures are provided to ensure that, in the unlikely event that any resources are found, they are protected from any potential impacts, and to ensure that any potential resources are treated in accordance with guidance from a qualified archaeologist. Please see biological and cultural sections of this Initial Study, as well as the technical studies that have been prepared to substantiate these findings (Appendices 2 and 3).
- b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project has fourteen (14) potential impacts that are individually limited, but may be cumulatively considerable. The issues of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts

to a less than significant level and ensure that cumulative effects are not cumulatively considerable. The project is not considered growth-inducing, as defined by *State CEQA Guidelines*, as it would develop a stadium to accommodate the existing and future needs of the population for such uses that are intended to serve the Community. These issues require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and ensure that cumulative effects are not cumulatively considerable. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts without implementation of mitigation. The potential cumulative environmental effects of implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than considerable and thus, would have a less than significant cumulative impact.

- c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project will achieve long-term community goals by providing additional school athletic facilities to the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. The short-term impacts associated with the project, which are mainly construction-related impacts, are less than significant with mitigation, and the proposed project is compatible with long-term environmental protection. The issues of Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Wildfire require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce human impacts to a less than significant level. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts on humans without implementation of mitigation. The potential for direct human effects from implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than significant.

Conclusion

This document evaluated all CEQA issues contained in the latest Initial Study Checklist form. The evaluation determined that either no impact or less than significant impacts would be associated with the issues of Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Land Use, Mineral Resources, Population/Housing, Public Services, and Recreation. The issues of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The required mitigation has been proposed in this Initial Study to reduce impacts for these issues to a less than significant impact.

Based on the findings in this Initial Study, Bear Valley Unified School District (BVUSD or District) proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project. A Notice of Availability/Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (NOA/NOI) will be issued for this project by the District. The Initial Study and NOA/NOI will be circulated for 30 days of public comment because this project involves the state as either a responsible or trustee agency. At the end of the 30-day review period, a final MND package will be prepared and it will be reviewed by the District for a possible adoption at a future School Board hearing, the date for which has not yet been determined. If you or your agency comments on the MND/NOA/NOI for this project, you will be notified about the meeting date in accordance with the requirements in Section 21092.5 of CEQA.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2019

Authority: Public Resources Code sections 21083 and 21083.09

Reference: Public Resources Code sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/ 21084.2 and 21084.3

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Aesthetics

- AES-1 A facilities lighting plan shall be prepared and shall demonstrate that glare from the proposed sports complex lighting and facility design that may create light and glare affecting adjacent occupied property are sufficiently shielded to prevent light and glare from spilling into occupied structures. This plan shall specifically indicate that the lighting doesn't exceed the standards set forth in Section 83.07.040 of the County's Development Code pertaining to lighting requirements. This plan shall be reviewed and implemented by the District to minimize light or glare intrusion onto adjacent properties.
- AES-2 Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting of the project that may impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be prepared and approved by the District. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to orientation and/or shielding of lighting, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the District shall modify the lighting orientation, use non-glare reflective materials or shall implement other design solutions to eliminate any identified potentially significant glare impacts.

Air Quality

- AQ-1 Fugitive Dust Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:
- Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.
 - Water exposed surfaces to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (at least 2-3 times/day).
 - Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day and as needed during the construction day.
 - Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials.
 - Require the contractor to minimize in-out traffic from construction zone to the extent feasible, and enforce a speed limit of 15 MPH on site to avoid dust migration from the site.
 - Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
 - Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.
- AQ-2 Exhaust Emissions Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:
- Utilize off-road construction equipment that has met or exceeded the maker's recommendations for vehicle/equipment maintenance schedule.
 - Contactors shall utilize Tier 4 or better heavy equipment.
 - Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.

Biological Resources

- BIO-1 To avoid potential impacts to nocturnal species including SPOW, and other nocturnal species due to light pollution, project related night lighting (both temporary and permanent) shall be directed away from adjacent undeveloped areas to protect nocturnal species from direct night lighting. Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in adjacent habitat on the project's western boundary specifically, is not increased.
- BIO-2 Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities. Preconstruction surveys shall focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting

behavior. The qualified avian biologist will make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If active nests are found during the preconstruction nesting bird surveys, a Nesting Bird Plan (NBP) shall be prepared and implemented by the qualified avian biologist. At a minimum, the NBP shall include guidelines for addressing active nests, establishing buffers, ongoing monitoring, establishment of avoidance and minimization measures, and reporting. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be based on the nesting species, individual/pair's behavior, nesting stage, nest location, its sensitivity to disturbance, and intensity and duration of the disturbance activity. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, any grubbing or vegetation removal should occur outside peak breeding season (typically February 1 through September 1).

- Preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall include a nighttime component to address the potential for presence of nocturnal species in which a qualified avian biologist will conduct 3 consecutive nights of survey.

Cultural Resources

- CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these sewer facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with BVUSD. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.
- CUL-2 If significant cultural resources, as defined by CEQA, are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to District for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of ground disturbing activities and shall implement the Plan accordingly.
- CUL-3 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.

Geology and Soils

- GEO-1 Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. Where covering is not possible, measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the project site for future cleanup such that erosion does not occur.
- GEO-2 All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the project is being constructed.
- GEO-3 The District shall retain the services of a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the standards of SVP (2010). The Qualified Paleontologist shall determine the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, by taking into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available. Should the project require excavation that will exceed the depth of low sensitivity surficial sediments as determined by a Qualified Paleontologist, a project-specific paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan (PRMMP) shall be developed and adhered to for the duration of ground disturbance activities during construction or as otherwise determined by the Qualified Paleontologist. This plan will address specifics of

monitoring and mitigation for the development project, and will take into account updated geologic mapping, geotechnical data, updated paleontological records searches, and any changes to the regulatory framework. This PRMMP shall meet the standards of the SVP (2010).

GEO-4 In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work will halt within a 50-ft. radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a Qualified Paleontologist. Significant fossils will be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the SVP (2010) and BLM (2009). A repository will be identified and a curatorial arrangement will be signed prior to collection of the fossils. Although the San Bernardino County Museum is specified as the repository for fossils found in the county in the current General Plan (San Bernardino County, 2007), the museum may not always be available as a repository. Therefore, any accredited institution may serve as a repository.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG-1 The Project shall be required to adhere to the following GHG reduction measures:

- The District shall implement water-efficient landscaping practices.
- The District shall utilize recycled water for landscaping purposes if recycled water connections become available at the project site in the future. The District shall establish a goal that at least 50% of the water used for non-potable sources be recycled wastewater, where such sources are available for use at the site.
- The District shall work to exceed the waste diversion goal recommended by Assembly Bill 939 and CalGreen.
- The District shall retain a landscaping contractor(s) that uses electric landscaping equipment, if contractors with electric equipment readily available are feasible to retain within the immediate project area, or shall otherwise mandate that future landscaping at the site shall utilize electric equipment where feasible and reduce gasoline-powered landscaping equipment use and reduce the number and operating time of such equipment.
- The District shall install water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings in accordance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: All accidental spills or discharge of hazardous material during construction activities shall be reported to the Certified Unified Program Agency and shall be remediated in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste shall be collected and disposed of at a licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure shall be incorporated into the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared or each future facility developed under the CBP. Prior to accepting the site as remediated, the area contaminated shall be tested to verify that any residual concentrations meet the standard for future residential or public use of the site.

Hydrology and Water Quality

HYD-1 The District shall require that the construction contractor prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite into receiving waters. The SWPPP shall include a Spill Prevention and Cleanup Plan that identifies the methods of containing, cleanup, transport and proper disposal of hazardous chemicals or materials released during construction activities that are compatible with applicable laws and regulations. BMPs to be implemented in the SWPPP may include but not be limited to:

- The use of silt fences;
- The use of temporary stormwater desilting or retention basins;
- The use of water bars to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff;
- The use of wheel washers on construction equipment leaving the site;
- The washing of silt from public roads at the access point to the site to prevent the tracking of silt and other pollutants from the site onto public roads;
- The storage of excavated material shall be kept to the minimum necessary to efficiently perform the construction activities required. Excavated or stockpiled material shall not be stored in water courses or other areas subject to the flow of surface water; and
- Where feasible, stockpiled material shall be covered with waterproof material during rain events to control erosion of soil from the stockpiles.

HYD-2 The District will select best management practices and reduce future non-point source pollution in surface water runoff discharges from the site to the maximum extent practicable, both during construction and following development. The identified BMPs shall be installed in accordance with schedules contained in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP).

Noise

NOI-1 All construction vehicles and fixed or mobile equipment shall be equipped with operating and maintained mufflers.

NOI-2 All employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8-hour period shall be provided adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities.

NOI-3 No construction activities shall occur during the hours of 7 PM through 7 AM, Monday through Saturday; at no time shall construction activities occur on Sundays or holidays, unless a declared emergency exists.

NOI-4 Equipment not in use for five minutes shall be shut off.

NOI-5 Equipment shall be maintained and operated such that loads are secured from rattling or banging.

NOI-6 Construction employees shall be trained in the proper operation and use of equipment consistent with these mitigation measures, including no unnecessary revving of equipment.

NOI-7 The District shall require that all construction equipment be operated with mandated noise control equipment (mufflers or silencers). Enforcement will be accomplished by random field inspections by the District.

NOI-8 Construction staging areas shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptor locations as possible, for example toward the middle/northwestern boundary of the site.

Transportation

TRAN-1 The District shall require its contractors prepare a construction traffic control plan. Elements of the plan should include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Develop circulation and detour plans, if necessary, to minimize impacts to local street circulation. Use haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.
- To the extent feasible, and as needed to avoid adverse impacts on traffic flow, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.

- Install traffic control devices as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones where needed to maintain safe driving conditions. Use flaggers and/or signage to safely direct traffic through construction work zones.
- For roadways requiring lane closures that would result in a single open lane, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow and utilize flagger-controls.
- Coordinate with facility owners or administrators of sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, hospitals, and schools. Provide advance notification to the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities.

TRAN-2 The District shall require that all disturbances to public roadways be repaired in a manner that complies with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (green book) or other applicable County of San Bernardino standard design requirements.

Utilities and Service Systems

UTIL-1 The contract with construction contractors shall include the requirement that all materials that can feasibly be recycled shall be salvaged and recycled, including C&D materials, and trees and site vegetation that must be removed. The contractor shall submit a recycling plan to the District for review and approval prior to the start of demolition/construction activities to accomplish this objective.

Wildfire

WF-1 All staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development that are planned to use spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other material that could ignite. Any construction equipment that can include a spark arrestor shall be equipped with a spark arrestor in good working order. During the construction of the project facilities, all vehicles and crews working at the project site shall have access to functional fire extinguishers and related fire prevention equipment (such as emergency sand bags, etc.) at all times. In addition, construction crews shall have a spotter during welding activities to look out for potentially dangerous situations, including accidental sparks.

REFERENCES

- CRM TECH. "Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, 525 Maple Lane, Sugarloaf Area, San Bernardino County, California" dated December 15, 2021
- Giroux & Associates. "Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-191, Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, Big Bear (San Bernardino County), California" dated October 19, 2021
- Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. "Bear Valley Unified School District Big Bear High School Sports Field Project Biological Resources Assessment and Jurisdictional Delineation Report" dated December 2021
- Urban Crossroads, "Big Bear High School Football and Track Stadium Project, Noise Impact Analysis" dated December 20, 2021
- Urban Crossroads. "Big Bear High School Football Stadium Trip Generation Assessment" dated November 1, 2021
- Urban Crossroad. Vehicle Miles Traveled Screening Evaluation (VMT Evaluation) dated September 27, 2021
- San Bernardino County General Plan and General Plan EIR, February 2007
- San Bernardino Countywide Plan Program EIR, approved on October 27, 2020

Websites

- <https://sitecheck.opr.ca.gov/>
- <https://databasin.org/datasets/2e85241791144ded9bba064b7d196f7b/>
- <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>
- <https://www.bbldwp.com/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/249>
- <https://www.bbarwa.org/bear-valley-basin-groundwater-sustainability-agency/>
- <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management>
- <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>
- <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1882?siteID=2664>
- <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1906?siteID=2688>
- <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1870?siteID=2652>
- <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>

FIGURES

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 4

APPENDIX 5

APPENDIX 6a

APPENDIX 6b