

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

PROJECT LABEL:

APNs:	0252-151-08, -50, and -69	USGS Quad:	Fontana 7.5
Applicant:	Xebec Realty Partners	T, R, Section:	T1S R5W Sec. 27
Location	18060 Slover Ave., Bloomington CA	Thomas Bros	Page 605, Grid C6, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties (2013)
Project No:	PROJ-2022-00125	Community Plan:	Community of Bloomington
Rep	Daniel Ricks	LUC: Zone:	Limited Industrial (LI) Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)
Proposal:	Approval of a Minor Use Permit to allow for development a 42,900 SF warehouse building on approximately 2.2 acres.	Overlays:	Burrowing Owl (SE), Zone X, Regional Fee Areas

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency: County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Contact person: Jon Braginton, Planner
Phone No: (909) 387-4110 or **Fax No:** (909) 387-3223
(760) 776-6144
E-mail: Jon.braginton@lus.sbcounty.gov

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Summary

Xebec Realty Partners (Applicant) is proposing the development of a warehouse facility in the unincorporated community of Bloomington, County of San Bernardino (see Figure 1-Regional Map). The Project Site is a 2.2-acre property described as Assessor’s Parcel Nos. 252-151-08, -50-, and 69; it is located on the northwest corner of Slover Avenue and Locust Avenue with an address of 18060 Slover Avenue (see Figure 2-Vicinity Map).

The Proposed Project requires the approval of a Minor Use Permit (MUP) and a Parcel Merger Application to merge the three (3) subject parcels.. The Proposed Project includes a 2,500 square-foot office area within a 42,900 square-foot building, and six dock doors. Access to the site would be via a 32-foot wide driveway at Locust Avenue (see Figure 3-Site Plan).

The Proposed Project is planned to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and requires a maximum of 10 office employees. The Proposed Project includes approximately 45% building lot coverage, approximately 18% landscaping, and a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 0.45:1. The facility would include 51 standard car spaces and 3 handicap accessible spaces. Parking would be for truck drivers, warehouse employees, and office staff. Parking for tractors or trailers would not be provided. A stormwater capture and infiltration system would be constructed in the southwest portion of the Project Site.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The Project Site is within the unincorporated Community of Bloomington, County of San Bernardino. The community of Bloomington is an environmental justice community and is considered a sensitive environment as described in the Countywide Plan. The site is currently being used for a residence and open storage of vehicles and miscellaneous materials. It is adjacent to the Distribution Alternatives, Inc. storage warehouse. As shown on the County of San Bernardino Land Use Map, the Project Site is within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category and is an allowable use. The following table lists the existing adjacent land uses and zoning.

Existing Land Use and Land Use Category			
Location	Existing Land Use	Land Use Category	Zoning
Project Site	Single-Family Residential & Misc. Vehicle Storage	Limited Industrial (LI)	Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)
North	Single-Family Residential	Limited Industrial (LI)	Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)
South	Warehouse	Limited Industrial (LI)	Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)
East	Single-Family Residential & Vacant	Limited Industrial (LI)	Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)
West	Warehouse	Limited Industrial (LI)	Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC)

Project Site Location, Existing Site Land Uses and Conditions

The Project Site is located approximately 1,000 feet south of the BNSF Railroad and approximately 1,200 feet south of Interstate 10 (I-10) in the unincorporated Community of Bloomington in the County of San Bernardino. Access to/from I-10 would be at Cedar Avenue to the east and Sierra Avenue to the west. The site consists of three parcels of land totaling

*Initial Study PROJ-2022-00125
XEBC Slover Avenue Warehouse Facility
APNs: 0252-151-08, 50, & 69
December 2022*

approximately 2.2 acres. One of the parcels is occupied by a residential structure and the other two parcels are vacant but being used to store miscellaneous equipment and tractor trailers.

The Project Site slopes primarily to the south at an approximate grade of 1.8%. Elevation above mean sea level ranges from approximately 1076.2 feet to 1082.7 feet. Surrounding land uses include single-family residences vacant land, and industrial uses.

Surrounding land uses include single-family residences and industrial uses.

ADDITIONAL APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES


Federal: None.

State of California: None.

County of San Bernardino: Land Use Services Department-Building and Safety, Public Health-Environmental Health Services, Special Districts, and Public Works.

Regional: South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Local: None



REGIONAL LOCATION

1806 Distribution Center
Bloomington, California





FIGURE 1




PROJECT SITE

Locust Ave

Slover Ave

PROJECT VICINITY

18060 Distribution Center
Bloomington, California



TABULATION

NET SITE AREA	36,328	s.f.
In area	2,168	sq.
BUILDING AREA		
Office	2,500	s.f.
Warehouses	40,400	s.f.
TOTAL	42,900	s.f.
COVERAGE	46.0%	
AUTO PARKING REQUIRED		
Office 1:250 s.f.	10	spaces
Warehouse 14:000 @ 11,000 s.f.	40	spaces
above 40K @ 114,000 s.f.	104	spaces
TOTAL	50	spaces
AUTO PARKING PROVIDED		
Standard (8' x 18')	35	spaces
ADA Van (9' x 12')	1	space
ADA Stc (9' x 19')	2	spaces
EV ADA Van (9' x 12')	1	space
EV ADA Stc (9' x 19')	1	space
EV Stc (9' x 18')	5	spaces
CAV	5	spaces
Total	54	spaces
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT ALLOWED		
Height - 7'0"		
MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO		
FAR - 45%		
MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE		
Coverage - 85%		
LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT		
Percentage - 10% (Residential)		
ZONING ORDINANCE		
Zoning - Bloomington / Community Industrial (BLCI)		
LANDSCAPE PROVIDED		
sq. ft.	17,276	s.f.
Percentage	18.1%	
SETBACKS		
Front - 5 feet side - 2'		
Rear - 10'		
*No item adjacent property is not commercial / industrial zone.		

Property owner
 HPA architecture
 18831 Bardens
 18831 Bardens Avenue - bldg #100
 P.O. Box 42
 Bloomington, CA 95922
 Tel: (916) 864-1770
 Fax: (916) 864-0651
 email: hpa@hpaarch.com

Applicant


Applicant's Representative

Project Address

Associor's Parcel Number
020216108, 020216150, 020216149

Zoning
BLOOMINGTON / COMMUNITY INDUSTRIAL (BLCI)

Legal description



Owner:

2018 Old Furnace Parkway
 Seal Beach, CA 92740

Project:
 Distribution Center

10480 Locust Avenue
 San Bernardino County

Consultants:

CIVIL
 STRUCTURAL
 MECHANICAL
 ELECTRICAL
 PLUMBING
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
 FIRE PROTECTION ENGINEERING

Title: OVERALL SITE PLAN

Project Number: 21732
Drawn by: JFC
Date: 02/20/22
Revision:

Sheet:
DAB-A1.1

- SITE PLAN KEYNOTES**
1. FUTURE SCHOOL DISTRICT - (SLOVER AVENUE)
 2. EXISTING UTILITIES
 3. EXISTING FOUNDATION
 4. EXISTING CONCRETE FLOOR - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 5. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 6. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 7. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 8. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 9. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 10. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 11. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 12. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 13. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 14. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 15. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 16. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 17. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
 18. EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF - EXISTING AND FUTURE REPAIRS
- SITE LEGEND**
- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ADDITIONAL BUILDING | EXISTING FOUNDATION |
| EXISTING FOUNDATION | EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS |
| EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS | EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF |
| EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF | EXISTING CONCRETE FLOOR |
| EXISTING CONCRETE FLOOR | EXISTING UTILITIES |
| EXISTING UTILITIES | ADDITIONAL BUILDING |
| ADDITIONAL BUILDING | EXISTING FOUNDATION |
| EXISTING FOUNDATION | EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS |
| EXISTING EXTERIOR WALLS | EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF |
| EXISTING EXTERIOR ROOF | EXISTING CONCRETE FLOOR |
| EXISTING CONCRETE FLOOR | EXISTING UTILITIES |
| EXISTING UTILITIES | ADDITIONAL BUILDING |

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

CONSULTATION WITH CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

On December 1, 2022, the County of San Bernardino mailed notification pursuant to AB52 to the following tribes: Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Gabrieleno Tongva Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. On December 1, 2022 notification was mailed to the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. Requests for consultations were due to the County by January 1, 2023. The table below shows a summary of comments and responses and any comments received are included in Appendix I.

AB 52 Consultation

Tribe	Comment Letter Received	Summary of Response	Conclusion
Morongo Band of Mission Indians	December 20, 2022 email	Within ancestral territory, tribal monitors requested, additional data requested	
Gabrieleno Tongva Band of Mission Indians	Pending		
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians	December 6, 2022	No request for consultation but requested Mitigation Measures provided.	Mitigation measures are included in this Initial Study
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians	Pending		
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation	December 14, 2022	<u>Request to schedule consultation</u>	

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.

EVALUATION FORMAT

This Initial Study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq.). Specifically, the preparation of an Initial Study is guided by Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based on its effect on 20 major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------

Substantiation is then provided to justify each determination. One of the four following conclusions is then provided as a summary of the analysis for each of the major environmental factors.

1. **No Impact:** No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
2. **Less than Significant Impact:** No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
3. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List of mitigation measures)
4. **Potentially Significant Impact:** Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (List of the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self- monitoring or as requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

DETERMINATION: Based on 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 shall be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there shall 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 shall 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.

Jon Braginton
 Signature: (Jon Braginton, Planner)

02/03/2023
 Date

Chris Warrick
 Signature: (Chris Warrick, Supervising Planner)

2/6/2023
 Date

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
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 a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located within the view-shed of any Scenic Route listed in the General Plan):

San Bernardino Countywide Plan, approved October 27, 2020, adopted November 27, 2020; San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR; San Bernardino County Development Code

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The Project Site is located within the unincorporated Community of Bloomington, San Bernardino County and is adjacent to warehouses to the west and south, and residential uses to the north and east. The Countywide Plan (adopted November 27, 2020) does not identify a scenic vista within the vicinity of the Project Site.¹ The Project Site has a land use category of Limited Industrial (LI) and is zoned Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). With approval of the MUP, the Proposed Project would be an allowable use. The Proposed Project would be designed to a 41' height and is allowable

¹ San Bernardino Countywide Plan. Adopted November 27, 2020. http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/CWP_PolicyPlan_PubHrngDraft_HardCopy_2020_July.pdf. Accessed July 1, 2022.

within the IC Zone.² Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *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 the northwest corner of Locust Avenue, and Slover Avenue. These streets are neither designated State scenic routes nor County Scenic Routes.³ The closest Scenic Highway is Route 38, located approximately 12 miles east of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would be required to not exceed the maximum height limit of 75 feet, as is allowed within the BL/IC Zone. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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 a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

The Proposed Project is within an urbanized area. The proposed building would be constructed at a maximum height in compliance with the zoning designation. Under the BL/IC Zone, structures are not to exceed 75 feet. Compliance with this height limit will minimize potential obstruction of views of the surrounding mountains and other public views. The Project Applicant is also required to provide a minimum landscape area of 15% of the lot area⁴ and proposes 18%, the majority of which will be on the frontage of the Project Site abutting Slover and Locust Avenues. The development of the proposed concrete tilt-up building will complement the existing surrounding industrial buildings adjacent to the west and south of the Project Site. Development of the Proposed Project would remain consistent with the BL/IC zoning development standards. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

²San Bernardino County. Development Code.
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sanbernardino/latest/sanberncity_ca/0-0-0-168039#JD_Chapter82.06 Accessed July 20, 2022

³ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, NR-3 "Scenic Routes & Highways". Accessed July 20, 2022

⁴ San Bernardino County. Development Code. Table 83-12: Minimum Landscaped Area
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sanbernardino/latest/sanberncity_ca/0-0-0-168039#JD_Chapter82.06. Accessed July 20, 2022.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The current site uses include outdoor lighting. Streetlights occur along Locust Avenue adjacent to the Project Site. The Proposed Project will be designed to adhere to the County lighting standards. According to San Bernardino County Development Code, Section 83.07.050(a), outdoor lighting of commercial or industrial land uses shall be fully shielded to preclude light pollution or light trespass in excess of the maximum allowed foot-candles allowed by subdivision (b) on any of the following:

- (1) An abutting residential land use zoning district;
- (2) A residential parcel; or
- (3) Public right-of-way.

Direct or indirect light from any light source shall not cause light trespass exceeding five-tenths foot-candles when measured at the property line of a residential land use zoning district, residential parcel, or public right-of-way. Light levels shall be measured with a light meter, following the standard spectral luminous efficiency curve adopted by the International Commission on Illumination (CIE).

The Proposed Project will be issued a Condition of Approval requiring demonstration of compliance with Development Code, Section 83.07.050 prior to issuance of a building permit. The Proposed Project's Photometric Study is included in the Application submittal as Sheet FC-1 showing compliance with the Development Code. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required

	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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:				

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: (Check if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

Countywide Plan; California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program; San Bernardino County Agricultural Resources GIS Map; Submitted Project Materials

- 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?*

The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identifies the Project Site as “Urban and Built-Up Land” in its California Important Farmland Finder.⁵ “Urban and Built-Up Land” is occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures. No prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance occurs at the Project Site or within the immediate vicinity. The Proposed Project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

⁵ California Important Farmland Finder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/> Accessed July 20, 2022.

No Impact

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

The Project Site is not under or adjacent to any lands under a Williamson Act Contract. The parcel has a current zoning of Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). There are no areas in the vicinity zoned for agricultural use. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the Countywide Plan and would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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))?*

The Project Site is currently zoned Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). There are no areas in the vicinity zoned for forest or timberland. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The Project Site does not support forest land. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site is currently zoned BL/IC. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district might 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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: *(Discuss conformity with the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):*

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; CalEEMod Output

a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The Project Site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the basin establishes a program of rules and regulations administered by SCAQMD to obtain attainment of the state and federal air quality standards. The most recent AQMP (AQMP 2016) was adopted by the SCAQMD on March 3, 2017; an updated plan is currently in process. The 2016 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including transportation control measures developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) from the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and updated emissions inventory methodologies for various source categories.

As shown on the County of San Bernardino Land Use Map, the Project Site is within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category and designated as Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). The proposed warehouse is an allowable use within the land use

category and zoning designation. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Proposed Project have already been accounted for in the AQMP and approval of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP or obstruct its implementation. Details of the emissions calculations and the resulting emission levels compared to thresholds are presented below in b). No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

The Proposed Project’s construction and operational emissions were screened using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2022.1 prepared by the SCAQMD (available at the County offices for review). CalEEMod was utilized to estimate the on-site and off-site emissions. The emissions incorporate Rule 402 and 403 by default as required during construction. The criteria pollutants screened for include reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), and particulates (PM10 and PM2.5). Two of the analyzed pollutants, ROG and NOx, are ozone precursors. Both summer and winter season emission levels were estimated.

Construction emissions are considered short-term, temporary emissions and were modeled with the following construction parameters: demolition, site preparation, site grading (fine and mass grading), building construction, paving, and architectural coating. The resulting emissions generated by construction of the Proposed Project are shown in Table 1 and Table 2, which represent summer and winter construction emissions, respectively. Note that emissions associated with architectural coating would occur in 2024.

Table 1
Maximum Summer Construction Emissions
(Pounds per Day)

Year	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO₂	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
2023	1.8	17.6	17.2	0.0	3.7	2.1
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

Table 2
Maximum Winter Construction Emissions
(Pounds per Day)

Year	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO₂	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
2023	1.8	17.1	17.2	0.0	0.5	0.3
2024	41.0	9.8	11.4	0.0	0.7	0.4
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

As shown above, construction emissions would not exceed significance thresholds.

Compliance with SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403

Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for construction emissions, the Project Proponent would be required to comply with all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations as the SCAB is in non-attainment status for ozone and suspended particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}).

The Project Proponent would be required to comply with Rules 402 nuisance, and 403 fugitive dust, which require the implementation of Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) for each fugitive dust source, and the AQMP, which identifies Best Available Control Technologies (BACTs) for area sources and point sources. The BACMs and BACTs would include, but not be limited to the following:

1. The Project Proponent shall ensure that any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered prior to the onset of grading activities
 - (a) The Project Proponent shall ensure that watering of the site or other soil stabilization method shall be employed on an on-going basis after the initiation of any grading activity on the site. Portions of the site that are actively being graded shall be watered regularly (3x daily) to ensure that a crust is formed on the ground surface and shall be watered at the end of each workday.
 - (b) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed upon.
 - (c) The Project Proponent shall ensure that landscaped areas are installed as soon as possible to reduce the potential for wind erosion.
 - (d) The Project Proponent shall ensure that all grading activities are suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

During construction, exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and fugitive dust generated by equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, would increase NOX and PM10 levels in the area. Although the Proposed Project does not exceed SCAQMD thresholds during construction, the Applicant/Contractor would be required to implement the below conditions as required by SCAQMD. Specific Best Available Control

Measures will be conditioned to the Proposed Project by County Building and Safety prior to the issuance of grading permits.

2. To reduce emissions, all equipment used in grading and construction must be tuned and maintained to the manufacturer’s specification to maximize efficient burning of vehicle fuel.
3. The Project Proponent shall ensure that existing power sources are utilized where feasible via temporary power poles to avoid on-site power generation during construction.
4. The Project Proponent shall ensure that construction personnel are informed of ride sharing and transit opportunities.
5. All buildings on the Project Site shall conform to energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code.
6. The operator shall maintain and effectively utilize and schedule on-site equipment in order to minimize exhaust emissions from truck idling.
7. The operator shall comply with all existing and future California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SCAQMD regulations related to diesel-fueled trucks, which may include among others: (1) meeting more stringent emission standards; (2) retrofitting existing engines with particulate traps; (3) use of low sulfur fuel; and (4) use of alternative fuels or equipment.

Operational Emissions

The operational mobile source emissions were calculated using the Transportation Study Screening Assessment prepared by Ganddini Group, Inc. April 29, 2022. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 73 daily trips, of which 48 vehicle trips would be produced by passenger cars, while 25 vehicle trips would be produced by a combination of medium heavy-duty vehicles including 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4+-axle trucks. Operational emissions are listed in Table 3 and Table 4, which represent summer and winter operational emissions, respectively.

**Table 3
 Summer Operational Emissions Summary
 (Pounds per Day)**

Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO₂	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area	1.3	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Totals (lbs./day)	1.3	0.6	1.9	0.0	0.1	0.1
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

Table 4
Winter Operational Emissions Summary
(Pounds per Day)

Source	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	1.0	-	-	-	-	-
Energy	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mobile	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Totals (lbs./day)	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

As shown, both summer and winter season operational emissions are below SCAQMD significance thresholds. The Proposed Project does not exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds either during construction or operational activities. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

An operational Health Risk Assessment Analysis (HRA) dated May 20, 2022 was prepared for the Proposed Project by Gandini Group, Inc. The report is summarized herein and is available for review at the County offices. The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) has developed TAC health risk assessment guidelines to provide consistent, statewide procedures for preparing the health risk assessments required under the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Act. The title of these guidelines is CAPCOA Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Program Revised 1992 Risk Assessment Guidelines. The SCAQMD recommends that lead agencies conduct TAC risk assessments in accordance with the CAPCOA Risk Assessment Guidelines, as supplemented by SCAQMD’s supplemental guidelines. According to SCAQMD and CAPCOA guidelines, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. “Individual Cancer Risk” is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 30-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of standard risk-assessment methodology.

The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project Site addressed in the HRA are: the existing single-family residential uses located adjacent to the north, approximately 60 feet to the east (across Locust Avenue), 172 feet to the southeast (across intersection of Locust Avenue and Slover Avenue), 735 feet to the south (along the western side of Slover Avenue), and 783 feet to the southwest (along Otilla Street) of the Project Site. The most recent Health Risk Assessment for Proposed Land Use Projects prepared by CAPCOA (July 2009) recommends avoiding siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week

Per the Transportation Study Screening Assessment (Gandini, 2022), the proposed warehouse use is anticipated to generate approximately 25 truck trips per day. Therefore,

as it is not anticipated to accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, a quantitative health risk assessment for the proposed on-site warehouse use is not warranted or required. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Less than significant impacts would occur and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) *Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)*

The Proposed Project is the development of a warehouse. Potential odor sources associated with the Proposed Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities as well as the temporary storage of domestic solid waste associated with the Proposed Project’s long-term operational uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It should be noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity. It is expected that Project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with County of San Bernardino solid waste regulations. The Proposed Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have substantial adverse effects, 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, and regulations or by the California | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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: (Check if project is located in the Biological Resources Overlay or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database):

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; General Biological Assessment, Jennings Environmental, LLC, June 2022

- a) *Have substantial adverse effects, 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?*

A General Biological Resources Assessment (BRA), dated June 2022, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Jennings Environmental, LLC. (Jennings) and is available for review at County offices. Jennings completed a data search for information on common and protected plants and wildlife species known occurrences within the vicinity of the Project Site. The review included biological texts on general and specific biological resources, and those resources considered to be sensitive by various wildlife agencies, local government agencies and interest groups. Jennings used the data to focus their survey efforts in the field.

A field survey was conducted on June 15, 2022 on the Project Site. The survey showed that the habitat on-site consists of bare ground with patchy ruderal vegetation. The site has been subject to historic human disturbances such as development for residential

uses and use as a tractor-trailer storage yard. Surrounding land uses include residential, industrial, and commercial developments. Plant species found on-site consisted of Puncture vine (*Tribulus terrestris*), Wild tarragon (*Artemisia dracunculus*), Short-pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), Cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), Eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*), Tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*), and Golden crownbeard (*Verbesina encelioides*).

No State and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species or other sensitive species were observed on-site during surveys. Although a portion of the site was historically mapped as Delhi Sands, the site has been heavily disturbed and used for residential and storage purposes. The soil characteristics on-site showed signs of alteration throughout the site from current and past uses. Two birds were seen during the surveys. Species observed or otherwise detected on or in the vicinity of the project site during the surveys included house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*) and northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*).

At the time of the survey, there was suitable nesting habitat on and around the property for nesting birds (two trees at existing residential structure). Therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is recommended to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1:

Nesting bird nesting season generally extends from February 1 through September 15 in southern California and specifically, March 15 through August 31 for migratory passerine birds. To avoid impacts to nesting birds (common and special status) during the nesting season, a qualified Avian Biologist will conduct pre-construction Nesting Bird Surveys (NBS) prior to project-related disturbance to nestable vegetation to identify any active nests. If no active nests are found, no further action will be required. If an active nest is found, the biologist will set appropriate no-work buffers around the nest which will be based upon the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, nesting stage, and expected types, intensity, and duration of the disturbance. The nests and buffer zones shall be field-checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved no-work buffer zone shall be clearly marked in the field, within which no disturbance activity shall commence until the qualified biologist has determined the young birds have successfully fledged and the nest is inactive.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effects on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Three key agencies regulate activities within inland streams, wetlands, and riparian areas in California. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Regulatory Branch

regulates discharge of dredge or fill materials into waters of the United States. These watersheds include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), through provisions of State of California Administrative Code, is empowered to issue agreements for any alteration of a river, stream or lake where fish or wildlife resources may adversely be affected. Streams (and rivers) are defined by the presence of a channel bed and banks, and at least an intermittent flow of water. The use of a 404 permit in California is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act regulations. The Board has authority to issue a 401 permit that allows the use of a 404 permit in the state.

Jennings' survey found no streams, channels, washes, or swales that meet the definitions of Section 1600 of the State of California Fish and Game Code (FGC) under the jurisdiction of the CDFW, Section 401 ("Waters of the State") of the Clean Water Act (CWA) under the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or "Waters of the United States" (WoUS) as defined by Section 404 of the CWA under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) within the subject parcel. Jennings concluded that the Project Site does not have any drainages or areas that support riparian habitat. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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*

The ACOE regulates discharge of dredge or fill materials into waters of the United States. These watersheds include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria. CDFW regulates wetland areas only if those wetlands are part of a river, stream or lake as defined by CDFW. The Project Site does not have any drainages or areas that support wetland, as stated in the BRA. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

Wildlife movement and the fragmentation of wildlife habitat are recognized as critical issues that must be considered in assessing impacts to wildlife. Habitat fragmentation is the division or breaking up of larger habitat areas into smaller areas that may or may not be capable of independently sustaining wildlife and plant populations. Habitat linkages provide connections between larger habitat areas that are separated by development. Wildlife corridors are similar to linkages but provide specific opportunities for animals to disperse or migrate between areas. The Project Site and surrounding areas have been disturbed or developed and the site is just south of a major railroad and freeway.

Therefore, the Project Site would not be suitable as a native resident or migratory wildlife corridor or for facilitating the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

The Project Site and surrounding areas have been disturbed or developed. The plant community on-site is ruderal species. The site also contains a residential use with ornamental landscaping. The plant species found on-site consisted of London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*), Wild tarragon (*Artemisia dracunculus*), Short-pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), tumbleweed (*Salsola tragus*), Prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), Tree of heaven (*Ailanthus altissima*), Aloe Vera (*Aloe barbadensis miller*), Beavertail Cactus (*Opuntia basilaris*), Paperflower (*Bougainvillea glabra*), Flag spine bur ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya*), Chinaberry tree (*Melia azedarach*) and Golden crownbeard (*Verbesina encelioides*). None of the trees found on-site are protected by any County ordinance. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site is not located within the planning area of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan as identified in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s California Natural Community Conservation Plans Map (April 2019).⁶ No impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated with the implementation of mitigation measures.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				

⁶ California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s California Natural Community Conservation Plans Map (April 2019), <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline>. Accessed July 25, 2022.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if the project is located in the Cultural or Paleontologic Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review):

Cultural Resource Study, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc, August 1, 2022; South Central Coast Information Center, California State University Fullerton, Department of Anthropology-MH 426

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

A Cultural Resources Study, dated August 1, 2022, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc (BFSA) and is available for review at County offices. The purpose of the assessment was to identify and document any cultural resources that may potentially occur within the Project Site. The investigation was completed for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended, the San Bernardino County policies and guidelines. The archaeological investigation of the project also includes the review of an archaeological records search performed at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton (CSU Fullerton) in order to assess previous archaeological studies and identify any previously recorded archaeological sites within the project or in the immediate vicinity. A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was also requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

The SCCIC records search results indicated that there are two previously recorded resources located within one-half mile of the project, neither of which are located within the project's boundaries. These resources include one historic railroad and one historic structure.

Principal Investigator Brian F. Smith conducted the archaeological survey for the 10486 Locust Avenue Project on May 3, 2022. The archaeological survey was an intensive reconnaissance consisting of a series of survey transects across the Project Site. The entire Project Site was accessible and ground surface visibility was generally good as property had been cleared and graded. Visibility was hindered near the residence and garage buildings due to their development, as well as denser vegetation in the back yard area. Vegetation within the property consisted of ornamental trees as well as weeds and small patches of grass. The survey resulted in the identification of one historic residence with an associated detached garage within Project Boundary.

Aerial photographs indicate that the subject property was utilized agriculturally and residentially from as early as the 1930s. The residence was constructed in 1946 and the associated detached garage was built between 1948 and 1967. Both the residence and the detached garage were constructed in an unknown style. Between 1966 and 1967, the central portion of the subject property was developed. Between 1985 and 1994, the development east of the 18060 Slover Avenue residence was demolished. After 2005, several modern structures were built to the rear of the residence and after 2012 the parcels east of the residence were utilized as a storage area for tractor trailers and large vehicles.

The buildings located within Project boundary are evaluated as not historically or architecturally significant under any CEQA criteria due to a lack of association with any significant persons or events. Additionally, the buildings also only retain integrity of location and are not considered representative examples of any specific architectural style. Because the buildings are not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, no mitigation measures are required for any future alterations or planned demolition of the buildings.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

An archaeological records search for a one-half-mile radius around the project was requested by BFSA at the SCCIC at CSU Fullerton on April 21, 2022. Results were received from the SCCIC on May 19, 2022. The SCCIC records search results indicated that there are two previously recorded resources located within one-half mile of the project, neither of which are located within the project's boundaries. The records search results also indicated that a total of eight cultural resources studies have been conducted within one-half mile of the project. None of these studies include the Project Site. None of these studies include the Project Site.

While BFSA's investigation did not indicate the presence of any visible archaeological resources within the project, the absence of positive results does not necessarily indicate the absence of resources. Therefore, it is recommended that the Mitigation Measures CR-1 to CR-2 above be implemented. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2, less than significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measure CR-1:

During Grading an archaeological monitor shall be present. In the event of an archaeological discovery, either historic or prehistoric, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted, as detailed within TCR-1, regarding any pre-contact and/or historic-era finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

Mitigation Measure CR-2:

If significant pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to tribal representatives for review and comment. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- c) *Disturb any human remains, including those outside of formal cemeteries?*

Construction activities, particularly grading, could potentially disturb human remains interred outside of a formal cemetery. Field surveys conducted as part of the Cultural Resource Study did not encounter any evidence of human remains. The Project Site is not located on or near a known cemetery. However, to insure adequate and compliant management of any buried remains that may be identified during project development, the following Mitigation Measure CR-3 is required to reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure CR-3:

The monitor shall evaluate the significance of any resources found. If human remains are involved, the County Coroner will be contacted immediately and permitted to inspect the remains. San Bernardino County and the Project Applicant shall also be informed of the discovery. The Coroner will determine if the bones are historic/archaeological or a modern legal case. The Coroner will immediately contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in the event that remains are determined to be human and of Native American origin, in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section § 5097.98.

All discovered human remains shall be treated with respect and dignity. California state law (California Health & Safety Code § 7050.5) and federal law and regulations ([Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) 16 USC 470 & 43 CFR 7], [Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) 25 USC 3001 & 43 CFR 10] and [Public Lands, Interior 43 CFR 8365.1-7]) require a defined protocol if human remains are discovered in the State of California regardless if the remains are modern or archaeological.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, CR-2 and CR-3, the Proposed Project would not have a significant impact on human remains.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
VI. ENERGY – Would the project:				

- a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of

energy resources, during project construction or operation?

- b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

SUBSTANTIATION: California Energy Consumption Database; Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards; Submitted Project Materials

- a) *Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

Electricity

Southern California Edison (SCE) currently provides electrical service to the project area. The demand for electricity associated with the Proposed Project would be for operation of the warehouse. In 2021, the Industry sector of the Southern California Edison planning area consumed 12717.05 Millions of kWh (GWh) of electricity.⁷ Based on the CalEEMod emission output tables for the Proposed Project, the estimated electricity demand is 0.409168 GWH (refer Air Quality Report). The Proposed Project's estimated annual electricity consumption compared to the 2021 annual electricity consumption of the overall Industry Sector in the SCE Planning Area would be approximately 0.0032174 percent of total electricity consumption. Total electricity demand in SCE's service area is estimated to increase by approximately 12,000 GWH between the years 2015 and 2026. The increase in electricity demand from the Proposed Project is insignificant compared to the projected electricity demand for SCE's Industry sector demand and SCE's estimated increase in demand between 2015 and 2026. Furthermore, the project design and materials would comply with the applicable Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the County of San Bernardino shall review and verify that the project plans demonstrate compliance with the current version of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The Proposed Project would also be required adhere to CALGreen, which establishes planning and design standards for sustainable site development, and energy efficiency. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Natural Gas

Southern California Gas Company currently provides natural gas service to the project area. In 2021, the Industry sector of the Southern California Gas Company planning area consumed 1649.55 million therms of natural gas.⁸ Based on the CalEEMod emission output tables for the Proposed Project, the estimated demand is 18,398.14 therms of natural gas (refer to Air Quality Report). The Proposed Project's estimated annual gas consumption compared to the 2021 annual natural gas consumption of the

⁷ <https://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/Default.aspx>. Accessed April 2022.

⁸ <https://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/Default.aspx>. Accessed July 2022.

overall Industry Sector in the Southern California Gas Company Planning Area would account for approximately 0.0011153 percent of total consumption. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, and the State Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). Project development would therefore not cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce GHG emissions, including Title 24, AB 32, and SB 32; therefore, the Project is consistent with AB 32, which aims to decrease emissions statewide to 1990 levels by to 2020. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

No Impact

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 on or off site 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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: (Check if project is located in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District):

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Fault Activity Map of California, 2010; California Important Land Finder; Geotechnical Investigation Report, Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation

- 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

A Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated December 17, 2021, was prepared for the Proposed Project by TGR Geotechnical, Inc. and is available for review at County offices. The Project Site does not occur within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone⁹ or County Fault Hazard Zone.¹⁰ As stated in the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the

⁹Department of Conservation Fault Activity Map of California (2010). <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed January 30, 2020.

¹⁰ San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Geology and Soils. Figure 5.6-1 "Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones and County Fault Hazard Zones."

nearest fault to the Project Site is the San Jacinto fault mapped approximately 5.4 miles to the northeast. Other nearby faults include the Cucamonga fault mapped approximately 7.8 miles to the northwest of the Project Site and the San Andreas fault mapped approximately 10.3 miles to the northeast. Although the potential for rupture on-site cannot be dismissed, it is considered low due to the absence of known faults within the immediate vicinity. Nonetheless, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the California Building Code requirements and the Uniform Fire Code requirements and all applicable statutes, codes, ordinances, and standards of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Compliance with these codes and standards would address potential impacts resulting from an earthquake event. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No active faults pass through Bloomington.¹¹ As is the case for most areas of Southern California, ground shaking resulting from earthquakes associated with nearby and more distant faults may occur at the Project Site. The design of any structures on-site would incorporate measures to accommodate projected seismic ground shaking in accordance with the California Building Code (CBC) and local building regulations. The CBC is designed to preclude significant adverse effects associated with strong seismic ground shaking. Compliance with the CBC would minimize the Proposed Project's exposure of people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including loss, injury or death, involving seismic ground shaking. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1 below would ensure that seismic impacts due to seismic activity are reduced to less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1:

The recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation Report and as approved by the County Geologist shall be incorporated into the Proposed Project's design and construction specifications.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1, the Proposed Project would not cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Liquefaction is a process in which cohesion-less, saturated, fine-grained sand and silt soils lose shear strength due to ground shaking and behave as fluid. Areas overlying groundwater within 30 to 50 feet of the surface are considered susceptible to liquefaction hazards. Ground failure associated with liquefaction can result in severe

¹¹ San Bernardino Countywide Plan: HZ-1 Earthquake Fault Zones. 2020

damage to structures. The Project Site is not located in an area susceptible to liquefaction.¹² The 2021 geotechnical investigation included four (4) hollow stem auger borings utilizing a hollow stem drill rig to an approximate depth of 26.5 feet; no groundwater was not encountered. USGS groundwater data from wells nearest to the subject site indicate that groundwater historically is more than 250 feet below the surface. The report concluded that the Project Site is considered non-susceptible to seismically-induced soils liquefaction. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

iv) Landslides?

Seismically induced landslides and other slope failures are common occurrences during or soon after earthquakes. The Project Site is not located within an area susceptible to landslides.¹³ Furthermore, the Project Site is near level with the surrounding area. As concluded in the geotechnical report, the potential for seismically induced landslides to occur is considered low. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Implementation of the Proposed Project would disturb more than one acre of soil. Therefore, the Proposed Project is subject to requirements of the State Water Resources Control Boards General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-2009-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize soil erosion. Adherence to BMPs would ensure that the Proposed Project does not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

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 on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

¹² San Bernardino Countywide Plan HZ-2: Liquefaction and Landslide. 2020

¹³ San Bernardino Countywide Plan HZ-2: Liquefaction and Landslide. 2020

The Project Site is relatively flat with no prominent geologic features occurring on or within the vicinity of the Project Site. The Project Site is not within an area susceptible to liquefaction or landslides.¹⁴ As stated in the geotechnical report, the proposed building is expected to withstand predicted vertical and lateral ground spreading/displacements to an acceptable level of risk with implementation of recommended geotechnical measures and as approved by the County Geologist. Seismically induced lateral spreading involves lateral movement of soils due to ground shaking. Because the Project Site is relatively level, the geotechnical report concludes that the potential for seismically induced lateral ground spreading should be considered low. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

Expansive soils (shrink-swell) are fine-grained clay silts subject to swelling and contracting in relation to the amount of moisture present in the soil. Structures built on expansive soils may incur damage due to differential settlement of the soil as expansion and contraction takes place. A high shrink-swell potential indicates a hazard to structures built on or with material having this rating. According to the geotechnical study, the subject area is underlain by approximately 5 to 10 feet of light brown silty sand with gravel. The silty sand is underlain by interbedded mixtures of gravelly sands, silty sands, and sandy silts to approximately 26.5 feet below existing grade. These materials are considered “very low” in expansion characteristics. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

The Proposed Project is expected to connect to the existing sewer collection system, which currently provides service to the surrounding vicinity and would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- f) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

¹⁴ San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Geology and Soils. Figure 5.6-3 “Liquefaction and Landslide Susceptibility.”

A Paleontological Assessment dated July 28, 2022 was completed by Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc. for the Proposed Project. According to the paleontological assessment, the existence of potentially fossiliferous late Pleistocene old alluvial fan deposits that may underlie the Holocene and late Pleistocene young alluvial fan sediments mapped at the surface of the Project Site is likely. The occurrence of terrestrial vertebrate fossils at shallow depths from Pleistocene alluvial fan sediments across the Inland Empire is well documented. The “High” paleontological sensitivity rating typically assigned to Pleistocene alluvial fan sediments for yielding paleontological resources supports the recommendation that paleontological monitoring be implemented during mass grading and excavation activities in undisturbed Pleistocene old alluvial fan sediments to mitigate any adverse impacts (loss or destruction) to potential nonrenewable paleontological resources.

The following mitigation measure is recommended to insure adequate and compliant management of any resources that may be identified within the Project Site during project development:

Mitigation Measure GEO-2:

A paleontological monitor shall be on-site during mass grading and excavation activities that occur in undisturbed Pleistocene old alluvial fan sediments.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

Therefore, potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures above.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency 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:

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) Reduction Plan (September 2011)

- a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

Emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod version 2022 Parameters used to estimate construction emissions, such as the worker and vendor trips and trip lengths, utilized the CalEEMod defaults for industrial warehouse land uses. Operational emissions are categorized as area (operational use of the project), energy (generation and distribution of energy to the end use), mobile (vehicle trips), waste (landfill), and water. The operational mobile source emissions were calculated in accordance with the Transportation Study Screening Assessment prepared for the Proposed Project by Gandini Group Inc. in April 2022. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 73 average daily trips, of which 48 vehicle trips would be produced by passenger cars, while 25 vehicle trips would be produced by a combination of medium heavy-duty vehicles including 2-axle, 3-axle, and 4+-axle trucks.

Many gases make up the group of pollutants that contribute to global climate change and are classified as Greenhouse Gases (GHGs). However, three gases are currently evaluated and represent the highest concentration of GHG: Carbon dioxide (CO₂), Methane (CH₄), and Nitrous oxide (N₂O). SCAQMD provides guidance methods and/or Emission Factors that are used for evaluating a project's emissions in relation to the thresholds. A threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂E per year has been adopted by SCAQMD for industrial uses. The modeled emissions anticipated from the Proposed Project compared to the SCAQMD threshold are shown below in Table 5 and Table 6.

**Table 5
 Greenhouse Gas Construction Emissions
 (Metric Tons per Year)**

Source/Phase	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O
2023	229	0.0	0.0
2024	14.9	0.0	0.0
Total MTCO₂e	246.0		
Construction Amortized 30 Years	8.2		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
Significant	No		

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

**Table 6
 Greenhouse Gas Operational Emissions
 (Metric Tons per Year)**

Source/Phase	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O
Area	0.9	0.0	0.0
Energy	162	0.0	0.0
Mobile	2.0	0.0	0.0
Water	14.1	0.3	0.0
Waste	4.8	0.5	0.0
Construction Amortized 30 Years	8.2		
MTCO₂e	217.2		
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000		
Significant	No		

Source: CalEEMod.2022.1

As shown in Table 5 and Table 6, the Proposed Project’s emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD’s 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold of significance. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- b) *Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Any project that does not exceed 3,000 MTCO₂e per year would be considered to be consistent with the GHG Reduction Plan and determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate 463.2 MTCO₂e which would not exceed the County Screening Threshold. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, potential impacts can be reduced to less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures above.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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:
Submitted Project Materials; EnviroStor Database; San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR: Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment dated January 18, 2022 was completed for the Project Site by Hazard Management Consulting, Inc. and is available for review at County offices. The Project Site was historically undeveloped vacant land as early as 1896, and was developed with the residential buildings from 1938 on the east and west portion of the Site. No evidence of historical Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) were noted.

The Proposed Project is for the development of a warehouse with office space, landscaping, and parking for automobiles. The uses of the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment due to the use of hazardous materials. However, asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint may be present in the residential structure located at the Project Site. Given the age of the structure, asbestos-containing materials exist. Therefore, possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measure is required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level of less than significant:

Mitigation Measure HAZ 1:

An Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Program shall be implemented in order to safely manage the suspected asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint located at the Project Site until such time that demolition of the structure is scheduled.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- 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?*

Hazardous or toxic materials transported in association with construction of the Proposed Project may include items such as oils, paints, and fuels. The uses associated with the Proposed Project would include the utilization of hazardous materials as part of the day-to-day operations, such as, fuel for trucks. Hazardous materials used by the future tenant of the Project Site may include chemical reagents, solvents, fuels, paints, and cleansers. Potential on-site uses also could generate hazardous byproducts that eventually must be handled and disposed of as hazardous materials. If businesses that use or store hazardous materials occupy the Project Site, the business owner and operator would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations including all CUPA regulations and maintain a Business Emergency Contingency Plan. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

Bloomington High School is the nearest school to the Project Site. It occurs approximately 0.27 miles southwest of the Project Site at 10750 Laurel Avenue. No hazardous materials would be emitted as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. The future building occupant(s) for the project site are not yet identified. However, the project would be designed for occupancy during business hours of warehouse distribution staff and that it is possible that hazardous materials could be used during future operations. Therefore, any future tenant that occupies the warehouse and handles hazardous materials (as defined in Section 25500 of California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95) will require a permit from the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division in order to register the business as a hazardous materials handler. No impacts associated with emission of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of a school are anticipated.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site was not found on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor data management system.¹⁵ EnviroStor tracks cleanup, permitting, enforcement and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known

¹⁵California Department of Toxic Substances Control. EnviroStor. Accessed July 28, 2022.

or suspected contamination issues. No hazardous materials sites are located within or in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site is not within an airport safety review area or Airport Runaway Protection Zone.¹⁶ The closest airports to the Project Site are the Flabob Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 5.2 miles to the south; the Riverside Municipal Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 8.0 miles to the south; the San Bernardino International Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 9.1 miles to the northeast; and the Ontario International Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 9.80 miles to the southwest of the project site. The closest airport runways are more than five miles from the Project Site and therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- f) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The Project Site does not contain any emergency facilities. The I-10 freeway is an evacuation route within the Valley Region of the County.¹⁷ The Project Site is approximately 0.25 miles south of I-10. The Proposed Project is the development of a warehouse. Adequate on-site access for emergency vehicles would be verified during the County's plan review process. During construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the County. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- g) *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

The Project Site is not located within a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.¹⁸ In addition, there are no intermixed wildland areas within the vicinity of the Project Site.

¹⁶ San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Figure 5.8-2 "Airport Safety Zones."

¹⁷ San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Table 5.8-10 "Evacuation Routes in San Bernardino County."

¹⁸ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, HZ-5: Fire Hazard Severity Zones. 2020

The nearest wildland areas would be Jurupa Hills, located approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project Site. The Proposed Project is for the development of a warehouse, including landscaping and office space. It would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. The Proposed Project is subject to review and approval from the San Bernardino County Fire Marshal. All new construction shall comply with the current Uniform Fire Code requirements and all applicable statues, codes, ordinances, and standards of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that 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 on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on 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 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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:

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Preliminary WQMP; Hydrology and Hydraulics Report

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

The Proposed Project would disturb approximately 2.2 acres and would therefore be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The State of California is authorized to administer various aspects of the NPDES. Construction activities covered under the State’s General Construction permit include the removal of vegetation, grading, excavating, or any other activity that causes the disturbance of one acre or more. The General Construction permit requires recipients to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems, and to develop and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP is based on the principles of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control and abate pollutants. The SWPPP must include BMPs to prevent project-related pollutants from impacting surface waters. Examples of BMPs include i.e., sandbag barriers, geotextiles, storm drain inlet protection, sediment traps, rip rap soil stabilizers, sweep roadway from track-out, and rumble strips. BMPs applicable to the Proposed Project will be subject to County approval and provided in contract bid documents.

The RWQCB has issued an area-wide NPDES Storm Water Permit for the County of San Bernardino, the San Bernardino County Flood Control District and the unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. The implementation of NPDES permits ensures that the State and Federal mandatory standards for the maintenance of clean water are met.

In addition, the County requires the preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for development projects that involve the creation of 10,000 ft² or more of impervious surface collectively over the entire site and parking lots of 5,000 ft² or more exposed to storm water. A preliminary WQMP, dated September 19, 2022, was prepared for the Proposed Project by CA Engineering, Inc. and is available for review at County offices. The WQMP is intended to comply with the requirements of the County of San Bernardino and the NPDES Area wide Stormwater Program requiring the preparation of a WQMP. All BMPs included as part of the project WQMP are required to be maintained through regularly scheduled inspection and maintenance. Review and approval of the WQMP would ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are minimized or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the Project

Site. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

The San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD) is a regional water management agency that covers about 325 square miles in southwestern San Bernardino County, including the Community of Bloomington. Water supply to the Project Site would be provided by the West Valley Water District (WVWD), a retailer within the boundaries of the SBVMWD. The SBVMWD has developed a cooperative recharge program that is being successfully implemented to help replenish groundwater, using the State Water Project and local runoff.

The Proposed Project is an allowable use within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category. Approval of the CUP would allow for the development of a warehouse on the Project Site. During operations of the Proposed Project, management of the landscape, and use of the office space and repair bays would be the only sources of demand for water on-site. It does not include uses that are water intensive. Moreover, implementation of the project WQMP would ensure that stormwater would be collected and treated in an infiltration system allowing it to be utilized as a resource for groundwater recharge. The Proposed Project is consistent with land use and zoning designations. As such, the SBVMWD Regional Integrated Urban Water Management Plan has accounted for anticipated water use at the Project Site in calculating future supply and demands. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not anticipated to have a substantial impact on groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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 on- or off-site;*

Erosion is the wearing away of the ground surface as a result of the movement of wind or water, and siltation is the process by which water becomes dirty due to fine mineral particles in the water. Soil erosion could occur due to a storm event. Thus, the Proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. As stated in Section VII(b), during development of the Project Site, erosion of soils could occur due to a storm event. Development of the Proposed Project would disturb more than one acre of soil; therefore, the Proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board General Permit for Discharges of Storm

Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-2009-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP must list the types of BMPs (as listed in Discussion 10a) to avoid and minimize soil erosion and prevent discharge of turbid runoff off-site. Adherence to BMPs is anticipated to ensure that the Proposed Project does not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite;*

In accordance with the Proposed Project's WQMP, a subsurface infiltration system has been designed to retain and infiltrate all on-site storm water flows, exceeding the Design Capture Volume as calculated (8,124 cubic feet). The system's catch basins will be located at the drive aisle at the southern border of the site, the southerly driveway entrance, and a portion of the landscaped area to the east of the proposed building (refer to Sheet C-2 of WQMP). The flows will be collected by catch basins and conveyed, via the on-site storm drain, to the underground infiltration system. The catch basins will have filter inserts installed to remove sediment, debris, and other pollutants of concern from the storm flows prior to the flows being infiltrated.

In accordance with the San Bernardino County's drainage requirements, the infiltration system has been sized to retain the difference in runoff volume between the proposed condition and the existing condition for the 100-year storm. Storm flows that exceed the capacity of the infiltration system will be transported off-site through a proposed curb inlet catch basin located on Locust Avenue. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of runoff; or*

The infiltration system will be sized to retain the difference in runoff volume between the proposed condition and the existing condition at the Project Site for the 100-year storm. Storm flows that exceed the capacity of the infiltration system will be transported through a proposed curb inlet catch basin located on Locust Avenue. With incorporation of an underground storm infiltration chamber with the capacity of 8,124 CF into site design, the Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of runoff. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

The Project Site is not within a 100-Year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone, 100-year Department of Water Resources Awareness Zone, or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.¹⁹ In accordance with the Proposed Project's WQMP, a subsurface infiltration system will be constructed to retain and infiltrate on-site storm water flows. The system's catch basins will be located at the drive aisle at the southern border of the site, the southerly driveway entrance, and a portion of the landscaped area to the east of the proposed building. The flows will be collected by catch basins and conveyed, via the on-site storm drain, to the underground infiltration system. The catch basins will have filter inserts installed to remove sediment, debris, and other pollutants of concern from the storm flows prior to the flows being infiltrated. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

Due to the inland distance from the Pacific Ocean and any other significant body of water, tsunamis and seiches are not potential hazards in the vicinity of the Project Site. The closest body of water to the Project Site is Lake Evans, located approximately 5.0 miles southeast of the site and approximately 200 feet lower in elevation. The Project Site is neither located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain nor a 500-year floodplain.²⁰ Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

e) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The Proposed Project is subject to the NPDES permit. Requirements of the permit would include development and implementation of a SWPPP, which is subject to RWQCB review and approval. There is no sustainable groundwater management plan within the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

¹⁹ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, HZ-4 Flood Hazards. 2020.

²⁰ San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Hydrology and Water Quality. Figure 5.9-2 "Flood Hazard Zones in the Valley and Mountain Regions."

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials

- a) *Physically divide an established community?*
- 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?*

a) The Project Site is within the unincorporated Community of Bloomington, County of San Bernardino. The physical division of an established community is typically associated with construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility in an existing community or between a community and an outlying area. The Proposed Project does not include the construction of a linear feature. The existing residential structures on-site have been vacated. Therefore, the Proposed Project would neither physically divide an established community nor cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plans or policies.

As shown on the County of San Bernardino Land Use Map, the Project Site is within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category and designated as Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). The proposed warehouse is an allowable use within the land use category and zoning designation. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located within the Mineral Resource Zone Overlay):

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Mineral Land Classification

- a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

According to the California Department of Conservation, Mineral Land Classification map, the Project Site occurs in the southwestern region of San Bernardino County, specifically in the 2008 Open File Report (OFR) SR206 Plate 1 and the 1995 OFR 94-08 (west).²¹ The western portion of the Project Site occurs within Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) and the eastern portion occurs within MRZ-3.²² An MRZ-2 zone is an area where geologic data indicate that significant Portland Cement Concrete (PCC)-Grade aggregate resources are present. Approximately half of the Project Site is an MRZ-2 zone; an MRZ-2 zone of this size would not be economically viable to mine. An MRZ-3 zone is an area containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. An area with undetermined mineral significance would not be valuable to the region or residents of the State until its mineral significance is confirmed. Moreover, the Project Site is surrounded primarily by industrial and residential uses. The current surrounding uses are not compatible for mineral resource extraction. Therefore, less than significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

²¹ Mineral Land Classification of a Part of Southwestern San Bernardino County: Open-File Report 94-08 (west) and SR206 Plate 1. Accessed July 27, 2022.

²² San Bernardino Countywide. NR-4 Mineral Resources Zones. 2020

As shown on the County of San Bernardino Land Use Map, the Project Site is within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category and designated as Bloomington Community Industrial (BL/IC). With the approval of the CUP, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the Countywide Plan. Although the Project Site is within MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 zones, the size of the property and surrounding uses make the site unsuitable for mineral resources extraction. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIII. NOISE - Would the project result in:				

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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: (Check if the project is located in the Noise Hazard Overlay District or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element):

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Noise Impact Analysis, Ganddini Group, Inc, July 8, 2022

- a) *Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

A Noise Impact Analysis, dated July 8, 2022 (updated November 18, 2022), was prepared for the Proposed Project by Ganddini Group, Inc. to determine the noise

impacts associated with the development of the Proposed Project. The report is available for review at County offices.

Noise is measured on a logarithmic scale of sound pressure level known as a decibel (dB). A-weighted decibels (dBA) approximate the subjective response of the human ear to broad frequency noise source by discriminating against very low and very high frequencies of the audible spectrum.

The State of California defines sensitive receptors as those land uses that require serenity or are otherwise adversely affected by noise events or conditions. Schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, single and multiple-family residential, including transient lodging, motels and hotel uses make up the majority of these areas. According to the noise study, sensitive land uses that may be affected by project noise include the existing single-family residential uses located adjacent to the north and approximately 60 feet to the east (across Locust Avenue), 172 feet to the southeast (across intersection of Locust Avenue and Slover Avenue), 735 feet to the south (along the western side of Slover Avenue), and 783 feet to the southwest (along Otilla Street) of the Project Site. In addition, a church use is located approximately 390 feet to the southeast (along the eastern side of Locust Avenue) of the Project Site.

On-Site Construction

Construction noise will vary depending on the construction process, type of equipment involved, location of the construction site with respect to sensitive receptors, the schedule proposed to carry out each task (e.g., hours and days of the week) and the duration of the construction work. Construction activities will occur in phases including demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Assumptions for the phasing, duration, and required equipment for the construction of the Proposed Project were obtained from the project applicant. Construction noise was modeled with activities being anticipated to begin no sooner than the beginning of October 2022 and be completed by mid-October 2023.

Construction noise associated with each phase of project construction associated with the proposed project was calculated utilizing methodology presented in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (2018) together with several key construction parameters including: distance to each sensitive receiver, equipment usage, percent usage factor, and baseline parameters for the Project Site.

Modeled unmitigated construction noise levels reached 74.8 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the east of the project site, 70.3 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the southeast of the project site, 66.3 dBA Leq at the nearest church property line to the southeast of the project site, 62.7 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the south of the project site, and 76.8 dBA Leq at the nearest residential property line to the north of the Project Site.

Construction noise sources are regulated within Section 83.01.080(g)(3) of the County of San Bernardino's Development Code which prohibits construction activities other than between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and Federal holidays.

Project construction will not occur outside of the hours prohibited by Development Code Section 83.01.080(g)(3) and therefore, will not result in or generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project.

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

In addition to adherence to the County of San Bernardino Development Code which limits the construction hours of operation, the following best management practices will be implemented as part of the project to further reduce construction noise emanating from the Proposed Project: Construction Noise - Best Management Practices

1. All construction equipment whether fixed or mobile, will be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer standards.
2. All stationary construction equipment will be placed so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
3. As applicable, all equipment shall be shut off when not in use.
4. Equipment staging in areas shall be located to create the greatest distance between construction-related noise/vibration sources and existing sensitive receptors.
5. Jackhammers, pneumatic equipment, and all other portable stationary noise sources will be directed away and shielded from existing residences in the vicinity of the project site. Either one-inch plywood or sound blankets can be utilized for this purpose. They should reach up from the ground and block the line of sight between equipment and existing residences. The shielding should be without holes and cracks.
6. No amplified music and/or voice will be allowed on the Project Site.
7. Haul truck deliveries will not occur outside of the hours presented as exempt for construction per County of San Bernardino Development Code within Section 83.01.080(g)(3).

Off-Site Construction Noise

Construction truck trips would occur throughout the construction period. According to the FHWA, the traffic volumes need to be doubled in order to increase noise levels by 3 dBA CNEL.⁸ The estimated existing average daily trips along Slover Avenue in the vicinity of the project site range between 8,921 to 10,368 average daily vehicle trips. As shown in the CalEEMod output files provided in the Air Quality Analysis prepared for the proposed project (Lilburn Corporation, 2022) the greatest number of construction-related vehicle trips per day would be during building construction at up to 56 vehicle trips per day (40 for worker trips and 16 for vendor trips). Given the Project Site's proximity to the 10 Freeway, it is anticipated that vendor and/or haul truck traffic would take the most direct route to the appropriate freeway ramps. Therefore, the addition of project vendor/haul

trucks and worker vehicles per day along off-site roadway segments would not be anticipated to result in a doubling of traffic volumes. Off-site project generated construction vehicle trips would result in a negligible noise level increase and would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

On-Site Operational Noise

The SoundPLAN noise model was utilized to estimate peak hour operation of the project in order to determine if it is likely to result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels. A description of each noise source and model parameters are discussed in Section 5 of this report. The modeled peak hour project operational noise is expected to range between 22 and 42 dBA Leq at these receptors. Existing measured ambient noise levels at the sensitive receptor locations ranged between 46 and 70 dBA Leq. At the most, project generated ambient noise levels may result in an increase of 1 dB at existing sensitive receptors. This increase would not be readily noticeable. Project operation would not result in substantial increases in ambient noise levels. No mitigation is required.

Further, residential construction typically provides an exterior to interior noise reduction of 20 dB with a windows-closed condition. An exterior sound level of 65 is typically required to necessitate mitigation for interior noise levels. Given that project operational noise is not expected to exceed 42 dBA Leq at nearby residences, it is not likely that project operation would cause interior noise levels at nearby residences to exceed the State of California interior noise level standard of 45 dBA CNEL (State of California 2019). Project operational noise levels would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

During operation, the Proposed Project is expected to generate approximately 73 average daily trips with 7 trips during the AM peak-hour and 7 trips during the PM peak-hour. A Project generated vehicle noise along affected roadways was modeled utilizing a computer program that replicates the FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model FHWA-RD-77-108. Project generated vehicle trips are anticipated to increase noise levels by between approximately 0.1 to 2 dB along modeled roadway segments and would not result in significant increases in ambient noise levels. The impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Excessive groundborne vibration levels can result in two types of impacts; architectural/structural related impacts and annoyance impacts. Section 83.01.090(a) of the County of San Bernardino Development Code prohibits, *the creation of ground vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, nor shall*

any vibration be allowed which produces a peak particle velocity (PPV) greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second (in./sec.) measured at or beyond the lot line. However, per 83.01.090 (c) construction activities are exempt from compliance with this code as long as construction and demolition activities occur between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Mondays through Saturdays and not on Sundays or Federal holidays. Project construction will only occur between the hours during which construction activities are exempt. Therefore, project demolition and construction will be consistent with the applicable code and will result in less than significant impacts. No mitigation is required.

It should be noted that the Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (2020) establishes that there is a risk of architectural damage at modern residential and commercial/industrial buildings when groundborne vibration levels reach a PPV of 0.5 (in./sec.). The nearest off-site structure is a residential structure located approximately 29 feet north of the project's northern property line, a residential structure located approximately 91 feet to the east of the project's eastern property line, and an industrial structure located approximately 138 feet to the west of the project's western property line. Therefore, the nearest off-site structure is the residential structure located approximately 29 feet to the north of the northern project property line. At 29 feet, use of a vibratory roller would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.168 in/sec and a bulldozer would be expected to generate a PPV of 0.071 in/sec. Temporary vibration levels associated with project construction would not exceed the threshold at which there is a risk to "architectural" damage to modern residential and commercial/industrial buildings of a PPV of 0.5 in/sec PPV. Impacts associated with construction equipment would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Operation of the Proposed Project will involve the movement of passenger vehicles and trucks. Driving surfaces associated with the project will be paved and will generally be smooth. Loaded trucks generally have a PPV of 0.076 (in./sec.) at a distance of 25 feet (Caltrans 2020). Trucks entering and exiting the site via the driveway proposed in the northeast corner of the project site may result in groundborne vibration levels of up to 0.058 PPV (in./sec.) at the property line northern property line that is shared with the closest sensitive receptor. Section 83.01.090(a) of the County of San Bernardino Development Code prohibits *the creation of ground vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, nor shall any vibration be allowed which produces a peak particle velocity (PPV) greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second (in./sec.) measured at or beyond the lot line.* The Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (2020) establishes that there is a risk of architectural damage at modern residential and commercial/industrial buildings when groundborne vibration levels reach a PPV of 0.5 (in./sec.). Groundborne vibration associated with heavy loaded trucks entering and exiting the project site would not exceed the County's vibration threshold of 0.2 PPV (in./sec.) or the Caltrans damage threshold of 0.5 PPV (in./sec). Groundborne vibration levels associated with passenger vehicles is much lower.

The movement of vehicles on the Project Site would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise perceptible to sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

The closest airports to the Project Site are the Flabob Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 5.06 miles to the south; the Riverside Municipal Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 7.88 miles to the south; the San Bernardino International Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 9.12 miles to the northeast; and the Ontario International Airport, with associated airport runways located as close as approximately 9.18 miles to the southwest of the Project Site.

According to the City of Riverside General Plan Safety Element, the Project Site is well outside Zone E for both the Riverside Municipal Airport and the Flabob Airport. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document (ALUCP) Map FL-3 Noise Compatibility Contours (December 2004) provides the noise compatibility contours for the Flabob Airport, which show that the Project Site is well outside the 55 dBA CNEL noise contour for the airport. The Riverside County ALUCP Policy Document Map RI-1 Noise Compatibility Contours (March 2005) shows that the Project Site is also well outside the 55 dBA CNEL noise contour for the Riverside Municipal Airport.

The San Bernardino International Airport noise contours provided in the Technical Memorandum prepared for the San Bernardino International Airport – Eastgate Air Cargo Facility – Aircraft Noise Contour Development (July 2019) shows that the Proposed Project is well outside the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour for the San Bernardino International Airport. In addition, Policy Map HZ-9 Airport Safety and Planning of the County's Policy Plan shows that the Project Site is well outside the 60 Ldn noise contour as well as the Airport Safety Review Area of the San Bernardino International Airport. As shown on the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) Map 2-3, the Project Site is just outside of the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour for the Ontario International Airport. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. There is no impact, and no mitigation is required

No Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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:
Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Material

- a) *Induce substantial unplanned 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)?*

The Proposed Project is planned to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and would require less than 10 office employees. The unemployment rate for the San Bernardino County area is currently estimated to be at 4.2 percent²³. The Proposed Project would provide employment opportunities for the area. Construction activities would be temporary and would not attract new employees to the area. The Project Site has a current zoning of Bloomington Industrial (BL/IC) and the Proposed Project is consistent with the Countywide Plan. The Proposed Project does not involve construction of new homes nor would it induce unplanned population growth by creating a substantial number of new jobs. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The existing residential structure on-site is currently non-conforming to the County-designated land use and has been vacated. Implementation of the Proposed Project would therefore not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or require construction of replacement housing. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

²³ U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

No Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) 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:				
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:
Countywide Plan, 2020; Submitted Project Materials

a) *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:*

Fire Protection?

The nearest Fire Station is located at San Bernardino County Fire Station 77, at 17459 Slover Ave, is located approximately 0.75 miles east of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would receive adequate fire protection services and would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with County fire suppression standards, provide adequate fire access and pay required development impact fees prior to building permit issuance. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Police Protection?

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department (SBCSD) serves the Community of Bloomington and other unincorporated portions of the County. The nearest police station to the Project Site is the SBCSD station located at 17780 Arrow Boulevard, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project Site. The Proposed Project use is not typically related to a high demand for law enforcement response. The SBCSD reviews staffing needs on a yearly basis and adjusts service levels as needed to maintain an adequate level of public protection. Additionally, development impact fees are collected prior to the issuance of building permit issuance which also includes property tax revenues generated from development of the site that would provide funding to offset potential increases in the demand for police services at project buildout. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Schools?

The Project Site is served by the Colton Joint Unified School District. Construction activities would be temporary and would not result in substantial population growth. As previously stated, employees required for operations are expected to come from the local labor force. The Proposed Project is not expected to draw any new residents to the region that would require expansion of existing schools or additional schools. With the collection of development impact fees prior to building permit issuance, impacts related to school facilities are expected to be less than significant. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Parks?

The Proposed Project would not induce residential development nor significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of any facilities would result. Operation of the Proposed Project would place no demands on parks because it would not involve the construction of housing and would not involve the introduction of a permanent population into the area. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

Other Public Facilities?

The Proposed Project would not result in an increased residential population or a significant increase in the work force. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not adversely affect other public facilities or require the construction of new or modified facilities. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 will occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:
Submitted Project Materials

- 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 will occur or be accelerated?*

Employees are expected to come from the local labor force. The Proposed Project does not include development of residential housing or other uses that would lead to substantial population growth. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Proposed Project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The employees required for the operations of the Proposed Project would come from the local labor force. No recreational facilities would be removed, and the

addition of employees would not create the need for additional facilities. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

Therefore, no adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the project 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>SUBSTANTIATION:</i>				
<i>Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; Traffic Study Screening Assessments, Urban Crossroads, April 29,2022</i>				

- a) *Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

A Transportation Study Screening Assessment, dated April 29,2022 was prepared for the Proposed Project by Ganddini Group, Inc. and is available for review at County offices. The purpose of this screening assessment is to provide a preliminary review of the Proposed Project's potential for level of service (LOS) impacts with respect to local performance standards or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts with respect to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements.

The percentage of truck trips for warehousing land use was obtained from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) recommendations for non-cold storage warehouse. The project trip generation was also calculated in terms of Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) trips. The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 73 daily vehicle trips, including 7 trips during the AM peak hour and 7 trips during the PM peak hour.

PCE factors are based on the County of San Bernardino Congestion Management Program (2016 Update), "Appendix B – Summary of Analysis Assumptions for the CMP Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines". Truck trips were converted to PCE trips based on the equivalent factor of 1.5 for 2-axle trucks, 2.0 for 3-axle trucks and 3.0 for 4+-axle trucks. The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 112 daily PCE trips, including 7 PCE trips during the AM peak hour and 7 PCE trips during the PM peak hour.

Level of Service Screening

As specified in the County TIS Guidelines, the requirement to prepare a transportation impact study with LOS analysis should be based on one or more of the following criteria:

- If a project generates more than 100 or more trips without consideration of pass-by trip reductions during any peak hour.
- If a project is located within 300 feet of intersection of two streets designated as Collector or higher on the County's General Plan circulation system or an impacted intersection as determined by the County Traffic Division.
- If the project creates safety or operational concerns.
- If a project generates less than 100 trips without consideration of pass-by trip reductions during any peak hour, a study may be required if there are special concerns.

The Proposed Project is forecast to generate fewer than 100 peak hour trips, and is located more than 300 feet from the nearest intersection of two streets designated as Collector or higher on the County's General Plan circulation system. The Proposed Project's Preliminary Grading Plan shows curb and gutter to be installed along the project frontage on Locust Street. These improvements and others required during plan review and prior to grading permit issuance will be project conditions. Assuming the project shall construct all on-site and off-site improvements (if any) in accordance with County design standards, the project would not create any new safety or operational concerns. Therefore, the Proposed Project does not warrant preparation of a transportation impact study with LOS analysis based on the County-established screening criteria

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

According to the Countywide Plan TM-4: Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning shows that is a planned Class II Bicycle path along Locust Avenue.²⁴ The development of the Proposed Project is not anticipated to impact the planned bicycle lane. Therefore, no significant impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities are anticipated.

Transit Service

The study area is currently served by Omnitrans, a public transit agency serving various jurisdictions within San Bernardino County, with bus service along Cedar Avenue and Slover Avenue via Omnitrans Route 29. Omnitrans Route 29 runs along the I-10 Freeway. The bus stop nearest the Project Site is at Cedar Avenue and San Bernardino Avenue. No transit stops exist along the Project's Frontage. Therefore, no significant impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities are anticipated.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?*

The VMT screening assessment has been prepared in accordance with the County TIS Guidelines, which were developed based on guidance from the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (State of California, December 2018) ["OPR Technical Advisory"]. In general terms, VMT quantifies the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project or region. The OPR Technical Advisory provides technical considerations regarding methodologies and thresholds with a focus on office, residential, and retail developments as these projects tend to have the greatest influence on VMT. The County guidelines identify screening criteria for certain types of projects that typically reduce VMT and may be presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact. The project need only satisfy one of the following screening criteria:

- Transit Priority Area (TPA) Screening
- Low VMT Area Screening
- Project Type Screening

A land use project needs to meet one of the above screening thresholds to result in a less-than-significant impact.

The Proposed Project is forecast to generate approximately 73 daily vehicles trips; therefore, the Proposed Project satisfies the County-established criteria for project type screening and may be presumed to have a less than significant VMT impact. Therefore,

²⁴ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, TM-4: Bicycle & Pedestrian Planning. 2020.

no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) *Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The Proposed Project would not create substantial hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The 32-foot driveway will provide access for both passenger cars and trucks (see Figure 3 – Site Plan). With County approval of the Site Plan, the Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

The 32-foot driveway will provide access for both passenger cars and trucks. With County approval of the Site Plan, the Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required at this time.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	------------------------------	------------------

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) 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"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	------------------------------	------------------

set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

SUBSTANTIATION:

Cultural Resources Study, Brian F. Smith and Associates, Inc., Tribal Consultation

- a) *i) 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;*
- ii) 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

California Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) was approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014. AB52 specifies that CEQA projects with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the bill requires lead agency consultation with California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a Proposed Project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed of Proposed Projects in that geographic area. The legislation further requires that the tribe-requested consultation be completed prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project.

A Cultural Resources Study, dated August 1, 2022, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Brian F. Smith and Associates Inc. (BFSA). The NAHC completed a record search of their Sacred Lands File (SLF) and results were negative. With the exception of the three historic structures, the Phase I survey of the Project Site did not result in the identification of any cultural resources within the Project's boundary.

On December 1, 2022, the County of San Bernardino mailed notification pursuant to AB52 to the following tribes: 29 Palms Band of Mission Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, San Gabriel Bank of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. On December 1, 2022 notification was mailed to the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. Requests for consultations were due to the County by January 1, 2023. Mitigation measures are provided below and any additional recommended mitigation provided by the tribes prior to conclusion of consultations will be added as final Conditions of Approval upon

approval of the project. The Initial Study/MND will be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration of project approval following the conclusion of consultation(s).

On December 6, 2022, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation indicated the project area is within Serrano ancestral territory and therefore of interest to the Tribe. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation requested consultation with the County. The following Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-5 be made a part of the project conditions.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1

The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted, as detailed in CR-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with the aforementioned tribes, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for tribal monitors to be present that represents YSMN and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians for the remainder of the project, should either or both tribes elect to place a monitor on-site.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2

Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.

Mitigation Measure TCR-3:

Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities:

- a. The project applicant/lead agency shall retain a Native American Monitor from or approved by the YSMN and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject project at all project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the project description/definition and/or required in connection with the project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" shall include, but is not limited to, demolition, pavement

removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching.

- b. A copy of the executed monitoring agreement shall be submitted to the lead agency prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.
- c. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribes. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the project applicant/lead agency upon written request to the Tribes.
- d. On-site tribal monitoring shall conclude upon the latter of the following (1) written confirmation to the YSMN and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians from a designated point of contact for the project applicant/lead agency that all ground-disturbing activities and phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site or in connection with the project are complete; or (2) a determination and written notification by the YSMN and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians to the project applicant/lead agency that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase at the project site possesses the potential to impact YSMN or Morongo Band of Mission Indians TCRs.

Upon discovery of any TCRs, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall cease (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) and shall not resume until the discovered TCR has been fully assessed by the tribal monitors and/or tribal archaeologists. The YSMN and/or Morongo Band of Mission Indians will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribes deems appropriate, in the Tribes' sole discretion, and for any purpose the Tribes deems appropriate, including for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

Mitigation Measure TCR-4:

Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects:

- a. Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute.
- b. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods discovered or recognized on the project site, then all construction activities shall immediately cease. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal

material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and all ground-disturbing activities shall immediately halt and shall remain halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission, and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed.

- c. Human remains and grave/burial goods shall be treated alike per California Public Resources Code section 5097.98(d)(1) and (2).
- d. Construction activities may resume in other parts of the project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or burial goods, if the tribes determine in their sole discretion that resuming construction activities at that distance is acceptable and provides the project manager express consent of that determination (along with any other mitigation measures the tribal monitors and/or archaeologists deems necessary). (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f).)
- e. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or burial goods. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCR) shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.
- f. Any discovery of human remains/burial goods shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

Mitigation Measure TCR-5:

Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains:

- a. To Native American Tribes, the term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones. In ancient as well as historic times, Tribal Traditions included, but were not limited to, the preparation of the soil for burial, the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains.
- b. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the discovery location shall be treated as a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created.
- c. The prepared soil and cremation soils are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later; other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered as associated funerary objects. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure complete recovery of all sacred materials

- d. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribes will make every effort to recommend diverting the project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed.
- e. In the event preservation in place is not possible despite good faith efforts by the project applicant/developer and/or landowner, before ground-disturbing activities may resume on the project site, the landowner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects.
- f. Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items should be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Tribes and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.
- g. The Tribes will work closely with the project's qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be prepared and shall include (at a minimum) detailed descriptive notes and sketches. All data recovery data recovery-related forms of documentation shall be approved in advance by the Tribes. If any data recovery is performed, once complete, a final report shall be submitted to the Tribes and the NAHC. The Tribes do not authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive and/or destructive diagnostics on human remains.

With implementation of the mitigation measures provided above and as provided in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to be adopted by the County, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required at this time.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water,

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; California Energy Commission Energy Report

- a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The Proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The Proposed Project is expected to connect to the existing sewer collection system, which currently provides service in the vicinity and to the existing uses on the Project Site. The Stormflows will be collected by on-site catch basins and conveyed, via the on-site storm drain, to the underground infiltration system. The catch basins will have filter inserts

installed to remove sediment, debris, and other pollutants of concern from the storm flows prior to the flows being infiltrated. In accordance with San Bernardino County's drainage requirements, the infiltration system will be sized to retain the difference in runoff volume between the proposed condition and the existing condition for the 100-year storm. Storm flows that exceed the capacity of the infiltration system will be transported off-site through a proposed curb inlet catch basin located on Locust Avenue.

Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electrical service to the project area. The Proposed Project will receive electrical power by connecting to SCE's existing power lines along Locust Avenue, south of the Project Site. The increased demand is expected to be sufficiently served by the existing SCE electrical facilities. Total electricity demand in SCE's service area is estimated to increase by approximately 12,000 Gigawatt hours between the years 2015 and 2026. The increase in electricity demand from the Proposed Project as previously presented (see Section VI. Energy) would represent an insignificant percent of the overall demand in SCE's service area. The Proposed Project would not require the expansion or construction of new electrical facilities.

Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) would provide natural gas service to the Project Site. Therefore, the Proposed Project would connect to SoCalGas's high-pressure distribution lines along Locust Avenue. The natural demand from the Proposed Project as previously presented would represent an insignificant percent of the overall demand in SCE's service area. The Proposed Project would not require the expansion or construction of new natural gas facilities.

The Proposed Project is the development of a warehouse. The Proposed Project will be served by AT&T for telecommunication services. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD) is a regional water management agency that covers about 325 square miles in southwestern San Bernardino County, including the Community of Bloomington. Water supply to the Project Site would be provided by the West Valley Water District (WVWD), a retailer within the boundaries of the SBVMWD. According to the 2020 Upper Santa Ana River Watershed Urban Water Management Plan, during a five year drought, the total water supply for the region is to be 519,910 acre-feet, while the total five year drought water demand is projected to be 410,712 AF in the same year, resulting in a surplus of 108,698 AF. Therefore, region's supplies are sufficient to meet demand within the district's service area. Furthermore, the Proposed Project is an acceptable use within the Limited Industrial land use designation and therefore would result in the requirement of water supply that has been anticipated by the Countywide Plan and evaluated in the 2020 UWMP. There are no groundwater recharge facilities in the area; the Proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with

groundwater recharge such that the project may impede substantial groundwater management of the basin.²⁵

The Proposed Project is an allowable use within the Limited Industrial (LI) land use category. Approval of the CUP would allow for the development of a warehouse on the Project Site. During operations of the Proposed Project, management of the landscape, and use of the office space and repair bays would be the only sources of demand for water on-site. It does not include uses that are water intensive. Moreover, implementation of the project Best Management Practices (BMPs) would ensure that stormwater discharge does not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern and water quality, thereby allowing runoff from the Project Site to be utilized as a resource that can eventually be used for groundwater recharge. The Proposed Project is consistent with land use and zoning designations. As such, the SBVMWD Urban Water Management Plan has accounted for anticipated water use. Water supplies would be sufficient to serve the Proposed Project and reasonably foreseeable future development. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- 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?*

The City of Fontana is responsible for constructing and maintaining sewage collection facilities to serve the City of Fontana, and its Sphere of Influence. The City owns Fontana's sanitary sewer system of over 250 miles of sewer lines and six sewage pump stations. While Fontana owns this infrastructure, the wastewater treatment services are supplied by a regional authority, the Inland Empire Utilities Authority (IEUA). The City of Fontana is within the service area of two of IEUA's Regional Plants (RP), RP-1 and RP 4. The treatment capacity of RP#1 is 44 million gallons per day (gpd), and currently treats approximately 28 million gpd, or 65% of its capacity. This is down from a high of approximately 37 million gpd in 2006/2007. The treatment capacity of RP-4 is 14 million gpd, and typically treats approximately 10 million gpd or approximately 71% of capacity.

The Proposed Project will connect to an existing Fontana sewer line in Locust Avenue that currently serves the Project Area. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site is located approximately 6.0 miles southeast of the West Valley Transfer Station and approximately 5.55 miles south of the Mid-Valley Landfill. The 2,500 square-

²⁵ 2020 Upper Santa Ana River Watershed Integrated Regional Urban Water Management Plan, Table 5-7. Regional Water Budget Summary for a 5-Year Drought (AFY). Page 5-17.

foot office building would be the Proposed Project’s greatest generator of solid waste. According to the CalRecycle’s estimated solid waste generation rates for the industrial sector, the Proposed Project would generate a maximum of 89.3 pounds of solid waste per day or approximately 0.05 tons per day based on 8.93 pounds per employee per day.²⁶ The Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill currently has a maximum permitted throughput of 7,500 tons/day. The anticipated waste for the Proposed Project would account approximately 0.00006 percent of the maximum permitted throughout at the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill. Therefore, waste generated from the Proposed Project is not expected to significantly impact solid waste collection systems. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Burrtec is the franchise waste hauler for the general area. The purpose of California Assembly Bill 341 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting commercial solid waste from landfills by recycling. It mandates businesses and public entities generating 4-cubic yards or more of trash to establish and maintain recycling services. The San Bernardino County Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Management Division reviews and approves all new construction projects which are required to submit a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan (waste management plan).

A project’s waste management plan is to consist of two parts which are incorporated into the Conditions of Approval (COA’s) by the San Bernardino County Planning and Building & Safety divisions. As part of the plan, projects are required to estimate the amount of tonnage to be disposed and diverted during construction. Additionally, projects must provide the amount of waste that will be diverted and disposed of. Disposal/diversion receipts or certifications are required as a part of that summary.

The mandatory requirement to prepare a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan would ensure that impacts related to construction waste would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Solid waste produced during the construction phase or operational phase of the Proposed Project would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------

²⁶ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>. Accessed August 3, 2022.

		<i>Mitigation Incorporated</i>			
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 wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a 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 resources, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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:
County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan; Submitted Project Materials; CalFire VHFHSZ in LRA

a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The Project Site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.²⁷ The Project Site does not contain any emergency facilities. The I-10 freeway is an evacuation route within the Valley Region of the County. The Project Site is at the northwest corner of Slover Avenue and Locust Avenue, approximately 1,700 feet south of I-10. The Proposed Project is the development of a warehouse. Furthermore, adequate on-site access for emergency vehicles would be verified during the County's plan review process. During construction, the contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles as required by the County. Operations at the site would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

²⁷ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, HZ-5 Fire Hazards Severity Zones. 2020.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

The Project Site is relatively flat with dramatic elevation changes. The Project Site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.²⁸ No wildlands occur within the vicinity. Due to the lack of wildfire fuel factors within the Project Site, the risk of wildfires is low. Therefore, no significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) *Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water resources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

The Project Site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. It does not include the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk. Infrastructure such as utilities needed to serve the Proposed Project are currently in place to serve existing uses at the Project Site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would reduce the risk of wildfires by eliminating ruderal grasses and providing hardscape. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

No Impact

- 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?*

The Project Site is not within a 100-Year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone, 100-year Department of Water Resources Awareness Zone, or a 500-year FEMA flood zone.²⁹ Moreover, there are no dams, reservoirs, or large bodies of water near the Project Site. The Project Site is not located within an area susceptible to landslides. Furthermore, the Project Site is near grade level with the surrounding area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not 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. No significant impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

²⁸ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, HZ-5 Fire Hazards Severity Zones. 2020.

²⁹ San Bernardino Countywide Plan, HZ-4 Flood Hazards. 2020.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---------------	---------------------------------------	---	------------------------------	------------------

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 would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) | <i>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?</i> | | | | |

The General Biological Resources Assessment prepared for the Proposed Project documents that no State and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species or other sensitive species were observed on-site during surveys. Two birds were seen during the surveys and there was suitable nesting habitat on and around the Project Site. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is recommended to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to less than significant. A Cultural Resources Study, dated August 1, 2022, was prepared for the Proposed Project by Brian Smith and Associates Inc (BFSA). Although mitigation measures are not required, archaeological monitoring is recommended because grading may expose historic features or deposits associated with the historic

use of the property since the 1930s. Therefore, to ensure less than significant impacts, mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-3 are required. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2, the potential impacts to paleontological resources can be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

- 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)?*

Cumulative impacts are defined as two or more individual affects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the development when added to the impacts of other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable or probable future developments. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, developments taking place over a period. The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (a) and (b), states:

- (a) Cumulative impacts shall be discussed when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.
- (b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.

As concluded in the Transportation Study Screening Assessment, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact to traffic and would not be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. Similarly, the pollutant emissions from the Proposed Project are below SCAQMD thresholds and therefore, the Proposed Project would be in compliance SCAQMD’s AQMP. In addition, greenhouse gas emissions from the Proposed Project are below thresholds. Therefore, air quality and greenhouse gas impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Although cumulative impacts are always possible, by incorporating all mitigation measures outlined herein, as part of approving the Proposed Project, would reduce the Project’s contribution to any such cumulative impacts to levels that are not cumulatively considerable. Additionally, mitigation measures have been adopted by the County of San Bernardino for buildout of the Countywide Plan, Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation identified in this document, the Project would result in individually limited, but not cumulatively considerable, impacts. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Bloomington, as is the case for most of Southern California, is located within a seismically active region. As stated in the soils report, the San Jacinto Fault is 5.06 miles from the Project Site. Although the potential for rupture on-site cannot be dismissed, it is considered low due to the absence of known faults within the immediate vicinity. Nonetheless, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the California Building Code requirements and the Uniform Fire Code requirements and all applicable statutes, codes, ordinances, and standards of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 can reduce the potential environmental effects due to geological hazards.

All potential impacts have been thoroughly evaluated and have been deemed to be neither individually significant nor cumulatively considerable in terms of any adverse effects upon the region, the local community or its inhabitants. The Proposed Project does not involve a General Plan Amendment or Zone change and therefore the County policies related to an Environmental Justice Community (which Bloomington is) are not applicable. At a minimum, the project will be required to meet the conditions of approval for the project to be implemented. It is anticipated that all such conditions of approval will further ensure that no potential for adverse impacts will be introduced by construction activities, initial or future land uses authorized by the project approval.

The incorporation of design measures, County of San Bernardino policies, standards, and guidelines and proposed mitigation measures as identified within this Initial Study would ensure that the Proposed Project would have no significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly on an individual or cumulative basis.

Less than Significant with Mitigation

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated with incorporation of mitigation measures.

GENERAL REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation, California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed July 2022 from <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>
- California Department of Conservation, Mineral Land Classification of a Part of Southwestern San Bernardino County: Open-File Report 94-08 (west) and SR206 Plate 1.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control, EnviroStor Database. Accessed July 2022.
- CalFire. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA.
https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6783/fhszl_map62.pdf. Accessed July 2022.
- California Energy Commission, California Energy Consumption Database. Accessed July 2022 from <https://ecdms.energy.ca.gov/Default.aspx>
- California Energy Commission Efficiency Division. *Title 24: 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards*. Accessed on July, 2022 from <https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2019-building-energy-efficiency>
- County of San Bernardino, Countywide Plan. Approved October 27, 2020, Adopted November 27, 2020. http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/CWP_PolicyPlan_PubHrngDraft_HardCopy_2020_July.pdf
- County of San Bernardino, Countywide Plan Draft EIR. Prepared June 2022.
http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Ch_000_TITLE-PAGE.pdf
- California Department of Conversation. Fault Activity Map of California (2010).
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam>. Accessed July 2022.
- County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works. More About Mandatory Recycling Brochure.<http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/50/solidwaste/MandatoryCommercialRecyclingBrochure08012012.pdf>. Accessed July, 2022.
- Bloomington Community Action Guide. Adopted 2007 and Amended May 2019.
- San Bernardino County. Agricultural Resources.
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fcb9bc427d2a4c5a981f97547a0e3688>. Accessed July 2022.
- CalRecycle. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates.
<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>. Accessed July 2022.
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Region 8 Basin Plan Map.
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/maps/RWQCB_BPmap_BUandGWMGMTZNS.pdf. Accessed July 2022.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06071C8667H, Accessed on July 2022 from
<https://hazardsfema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&extent=-117.08220168334944,33.85816731678714,-116.86693831665052,34.00059917947498>

Initial Study PROJ-2022-00125
XEBC Slover Avenue Warehouse Facility
APNs: 0252-151-08, 50, & 69
December 2022

San Bernardino County Code -Title 8–Development Code.

<http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode/DCWebsite.pdf>. Accessed periodically.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2001. Employment Density Study Summary Report. October 31, 2001. Accessed July 2020.

www.mwcog.org/asset.aspx?id=committeedocuments/bl5aX1pa20091008155406.pdf.

Upper Santa River Watershed. Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.

<https://www.sbvwd.org/docman-projects/upper-santa-ana-integrated-regional-water-management-plan/3802-usarw-irwmp-2015-ch1-9-final/file.html>. Accessed July 2022.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES

Brian F Smith and Associates, Inc. August 2, 2022. Cultural Resources Study for the 10486 Locust Avenue Project

Brian F Smith and Associates, Inc. July 2022. Paleontological Assessment the 10486 Locust Avenue Project

CA Engineering, Inc. September 26, 2022 Water Quality Management Plan for: 18060 Slover Industrial Project.

Ca Engineering, Inc. September 2022 Preliminary Hydrology Report for 18060 Slover Avenue Industrial Project

Ganddini Group Inc. July 8, 2022 (updated November 18, 2022), 18060 Slover Avenue Warehouse Noise Impact Analysis

Ganddini Group Inc. April 29, 2022 18060 Slover Avenue Warehouse Project Transportation Study Screening Assessment

Jennings Environmental, LLC. June 2022. Biological Resources Assessment for the Warehouse Development at 18060 Slover Avenue

TGR Geotechnical, Inc. Geotechnical Investigation Report, 10428 Locust Avenue and 18060 Slover Avenue