PLANNING DIVISION 15900 Smoke Tree Street • Hesperia, CA 92345-3222 (760) 995-8140 Fax (760) 995-8167 http://www.sbcountv.gov



**CHRISTINE KELLY** Director

# **COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO** NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) TO ADOPT AN INTIAL STUDY / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR A VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION **FACILITY**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, County Staff prepared a Draft Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that identify and evaluate the environmental impacts of the below-named Verizon wireless telecommunications facility.

Project Title: Verizon Wireless - Oxford

Project No.: P201100024

**Project Location:** West side of La Mirada Road, 800 feet north of Phelan Road, Phelan, CA 92329;

Assessor's Parcel Number: 3066-521-20

Establishment of a 55-foot tall wireless telecommunication facility with 15 panel antennas and **Project Description:** one GPS antenna concealed within a faux water tank tower, and including equipment cabinets and an electric generator enclosed in a 184-square foot equipment shelter, on a portion of 0.98-acre.

Environmental Review and Public Comment: The circulation of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study is to encourage written public comments. Interested persons can review the Draft IS/MND at www.sbcounty.gov/ehlus and at the following physical location:

High Desert Government Center 15900 Smoke Tree Street, First Floor Hesperia, CA 92345

If unavailable on the web site, the document may be obtained in electronic format by telephoning the Land Use Services Department at (909) 387-4131 or (760) 995-8140, or by emailing the project Planner at Imathieu@lusd.sbcounty.gov to request a PDF version of the document.

The public comment period will end on October 15, 2011 at 5:00 PM. Please submit comments to Imathieu@lusd.sbcounty.gov or to:

Loretta Mathieu, Project Planner County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department, Planning Division 15900 Smoke Tree Street, First Floor Hesperia, CA 92345-3222

Public Hearing: A public hearing will be scheduled to consider adoption of the Final IS/MND at a future date. In advance of the hearing date, Staff will distribute a separate notice regarding that hearing.

**Board of Supervisors** 

# SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY INITIAL STUDY 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:

APN: 3066-521-20-0000

Applicant: VERIZON WIRELESS-OXFORD

Community: PHELAN/1<sup>ST</sup> SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

Location: WEST SIDE OF LA MIRADA ROAD, APPROXIMATELY

800 FEET NORTH OF PHELAN ROAD

Project No: P201100024/CUP-CELL Staff: LORETTA MATHIEU

Rep: SPECTRUM SURVEYING & ENGINEERING

Proposal: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH AN

UNMANNED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY CONSISTING OF A 55-FOOT TALL FAUX WATER TANK TOWER, WITH 15 PANEL ANTENNAS, ONE GPS ANTENNA, A 184 SQUARE FOOT EQUIPMENT SHELTER MOUNTED ON A CONCRETE PAD, AN ELECTRIC GENERATOR MOUNTED ON A 6-FOOT BLOCK WALL WITH A 4-FOOT WIDE WROUGHT IRON GATE WITHIN A 900-SQUARE FOOT LEASE AREA PORTION

OF 0.98-ACRE.

USGS Quad: Phelan

T, R, Section: T4N R6W Sec. 17 SE 1/4

Thomas Bros.: P4473 / GRID: G6

Planning Area: Phelan Community Plan

LUZD: PH/RS-1

Overlays: FS-2 Fire Safety Overlay
Biological Resources Overlay
Paleontological Resources Overlay

#### PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency: County of San Bernardino

Land Use Services Department - Planning Division

15900 Smoke Tree Street Hesperia, CA 92345

Contact person: Loretta Mathieu, Planner

E-mail: <a href="mailto:lmathieu@lusd.sbcounty.gov">lmathieu@lusd.sbcounty.gov</a>

Project Sponsor: Verizon Wireless

15505 Sand Canyon Avenue, Building D-1

Irvine, CA 92618

# **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed project is a **Conditional Use Permit** to establish an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility including a 55-foot tall faux water tank tower, 15 panel antennas, one GPS antenna, a 184-square foot equipment shelter mounted on a concrete pad, an electric generator mounted on a 40-square foot concrete pad, a 6-foot high block wall with a 4-foot wide wrought iron gate within a 900-square foot lease area on 0.98-acre. The project site lies within the unincorporated portion of the County of San Bernardino in the Phelan Community Plan area. The County's General Plan designates the site PH/RS-1 (Phelan Community Plan/Single Residential, 1 acre minimum lot size. The project is located on the west side of La Mirada Road, approximately 600 feet north of Phelan Road. La Mirada Road provides legal access to the project site. The site is regulated by the FS-2 Fire Safety Overlay and by Biological and Paleontological Resources Overlay Districts.

# **ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:**

The project site is a vacant, undeveloped parcel of approximately one acre and is situated in a rural residential area. Properties surrounding the site are characterized by fairly large lots that are vacant to the north and west and developed with scattered single-family residences to the east and south. A single family residence is located directly east of the project site across La Mirada Road. Terrain on the site and within the surrounding area is fairly flat, sloping gently to the north. There are no defined watercourses on the site and no significant topographic conditions exist on the site.

Several individual and clumping Joshua trees (Yucca brevifolia), as well as a few large juniper shrubs/trees (Juniperus californica), occur on the property. Extensive occurrences of dead and down woody debris associated with Joshua trees, also exist on the site.

AREA	EXISTING LAND USE	OFFICIAL LAND USE DISTRICT
Site	Vacant	PH/RS-1
North	Vacant	PH/RS-1
South	Vacant & SFR (SW)	PH/RS-1
East	Single-Family Residence (& NE)	PH/RS-1
West	Vacant	PH/RS-1

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

Federal: Fish & Wildlife

State of California: Regional Water Quality Control Board; Fish & Game; Mojave Desert Air Quality

Management District

<u>County of San Bernardino</u>: Land Use Services – Building and Safety; Public Health – Environmental Health Services; Public Works – Roads/Drainage, Traffic, and Surveyor; County Fire; County Fire – Hazardous Materials; and Information Services Department.

Local: N/A

# **EVALUATION FORMAT**

This initial study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) 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 Less than Less than No Significant Significant Impact Impact with Mitigation

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. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- 2. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- 3. 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 mitigation measures)
- 4. Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (Listing 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.

Page 4 of 37

# **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

	environmental factors checked be impact that is a "Potentially Signifi								
П	Aesthetics	П	Agriculture Resources	П	Air Quality				
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils				
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality	П	Land Use/ Planning				
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing				
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic				
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance						
DETI	ERMINATION: (To be completed by	the	Lead Agency)						
On th	ne basis of this initial evaluation, the	follo	wing finding is made:						
	The proposed project COULD NO DECLARATION will be prepared.	)T ha	ave a significant effect on the	e enviro	nment, and a NEGATIVE				
	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.								
	The proposed project MAY have a IMPACT REPORT is required.	a sig	nificant effect on the environ	ment, a	nd an ENVIRONMENTAL				
	The proposed project MAY have mitigated" impact on the environme earlier document pursuant to apple measures based on the earlier ar IMPACT REPORT is required, but it	ent, l licabl nalys	but at least one effect 1) has e legal standards, and 2) ha is as described on attached	been a as been sheets.	dequately analyzed in an addressed by mitigation An ENVIRONMENTAL				
	Although the proposed project could significant effects (a) have been an pursuant to applicable standards, as NEGATIVE DECLARATION, include proposed project, nothing further is	nalyze nd (b ding	ed adequately in an earlier E ) have been avoided or mitiga revisions or mitigation meas	IR or NE	EGATIVE DECLARATION suant to that earlier EIR or				
L.	Tricta Mathie			91	6/2011				
signatui	re: (prepared by Loretta Mathieu, Planner)			Date	#8				
111	althur & Con	in	1	91	6/2011				
Signatur	e: Matthew Slowik, MURP, MPA, Supervising Pla	nner	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O	Date '					

September, 2011

Page 5 of 37

Less than

No

Less than

Potentially

			Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Significant	Impact
I.		AESTHETICS - Would the project		AAACOO 50ACOO • 4444		
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and				
		historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			$\boxtimes$	
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character		A-1000		
		or quality of the site and its surroundings?			$\boxtimes$	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime				
		views in the area?			$\boxtimes$	

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

- Less Than Siginficant. The site of the proposed project is situated in an area that consists primarily of vacant land with scattered rural-residential development. Although mountain views can be seen in the distance north of the project area, the project site is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor and will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, as there are none identified within the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would alter the existing view of the project site, which is currently vacant desert land, by developing approximately 900 square feet of the one acre parcel with a wireless telecommunications facility. However, the site is flat and contains no significant geological or vegetation features that could be considered scenic. The towers and transmission lines of the existing DWP power transmission corridor, which traverses the area to the north, are substantially more intrusive to area views than the proposed 55-foot tall telecommunications tower would be. Furthermore, the tower will be disguised as a faux water tank and the associated equipment will be screened so as to blend with the rural environment and limit any potential impact on the scenic vista to a level below significant.
- Ib) Less Than Siginficant. The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway, because the site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway. Several Joshua trees exist on the site. However, no trees are proposed for removal by the project.
- I c) Less Than Siginficant. The proposed project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because the project is consistent with the existing visual character of the area. The telecommunications tower will be disguised as a faux water tank and a six foot high masonry wall, compatible with the surrounding visual character of the site, is required to screen the lease area. This will reduce impacts to a level below significant.
- I d) Less Than Siginficant. The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, because the minimal lighting proposed by the project must be shielded and designed to reflect away from adjoining properties and public thoroughfares in compliance with section 83.07.040 of the Development Code.

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford

P201100024/CUP-CELL

September, 2011

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact		
II.	AGRICULTURE 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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?	П	П	П	$\bowtie$		
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$		
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				$\boxtimes$		
	SUBSTANTIATION (Check [] if project is located in t	he Import	ant Farmla	nds Overl	lay):		
II a)							
II b)	<b>No Impact.</b> The project site is designated Single Reuse does not conflict with any agricultural land use contract, as none exists on the site.	esidential or Willia	(PH/RS-1) mson Act	and the pland cons	roposed servation		
II c)	No Impact. The subject property is designated S	Single Re	sidential (F	PH/RS-1)	and the		

Page 6 of 37

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

proposed use does not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Prime Farmland, to a non-agricultural use.

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford

P201100024/CUP-CELL

September, 2011

		Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Significant	Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:		Incorp.		
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality or Green House Gas Emissions violations?				$\boxtimes$
c)	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 (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				$\boxtimes$
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				$\boxtimes$
;	SUBSTANTIATION (Discuss conformity with the Mapplicable):	lojave Air	Quality Ma	inagement	t Plan, if
III a)	No Impact. The project will not conflict with or on Desert Air Quality Plan, because the proposed	obstruct ii uses do	mplementat not excee	ion of the	Mojave resholds

Page 7 of 37

Loce than

I ace than

Potentially

III b) **No Impact.** The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use will not exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. Ingress and egress will be provided to the site via a short access road that will be graded to connect with the unpaved La Mirada Road adjacent to the site on the east. The access road and small parking area will be provided with a gravel surface assuring that little or no wind-blown dust or particulate matter will leave the site. Construction activities and equipment proposed for this project are deemed incapable of generating long term criteria pollutants and no Green House Gas (GHG) emissions are anticipated.

any substantial way to the degradation of local region air quality.

established for air quality concerns within the CEQA Air Quality Handbook developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and used as a guide by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. The proposed faux water tank tower and any associated traffic increase are not significant based on the handbook criteria and will not contribute in

Page 8 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

- III c) **No Impact.** The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), because the proposed use will not exceed established thresholds of concern.
- III d) **No Impact.** The nearest off-site residence, considered a sensitive receptor, is located approximately 450 feet from the project site. However, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because there are no identified concentrations of substantial pollutants associated with the project site. If such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and additional land use review.
- III e) **No Impact.** The project will not create odors affecting a substantial number of people because there are no identified potential uses that will result in the production of objectionable odors.

September, 2011

Potentially Significant Less than Less than No Significant with Significant Impact Mitigation 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? X 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? X c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc...) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? M 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?  $\boxtimes$ e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  $\boxtimes$ 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? X

Page 9 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Page 10 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located in the Biological Resources Overlay or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database ⊠): Desert Tortoise Category 3

- IV a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is within designated Desert Tortoise habitat as well as within an area known to support the Mohave Ground Squirrel (MGS). A survey to determine the presence or absence of these species was conducted on March 22, 2011 by Stephen Myers of AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc. (AMEC). While no special status species were found to occur on the project property, suitable habitat for Mohave ground squirrel and migratory birds was found to occur. The project parcel was also found to support several moderate height Joshua trees (Yucca brevifolia); however no removal of trees is proposed by the project. Biological Resources Assessment, Desert Native Plant Assessment, Desert Tortoise Focused Survey and Mohave Ground Squirrel Visual Habitat Assessment" Report, dated August 1, 2011, concluded that the project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on Desert Tortoise because the species were not observed on the site and existing vegetation provides only marginally suitable habitat for the species. To further reduce the potential for adverse impacts to the species, a preconstruction survey for tortoise will be required as a condition of project approval. Suitable habitat for MGS was noted on the project property and on surrounding undeveloped lands. Consequently, the presence of MGS may be presumed; in which case incidental take permitting is required in compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). A mitigation measure will be incorporated into the conditions of project approval requiring the applicant to include the Mohave Ground Squirrel in the Incidental Take Permit (2081 Permit) through the California Department of Fish & Game, or have a CDFG-authorized biologist conduct a trapping survey for Mohave Ground Squirrel 30 days prior to the start of construction to confirm the presence/absence of MGS. The results of the trapping survey must be submitted to the California Department of Fish & Game for review.
- Less Than Significant. The Desert Native Plant Assessment conducted on the site on July 29, 2011, noted that vegetative cover on the site is both extensive and diverse. Several individual and clumping Joshua trees and a few large juniper shrubs/trees occur on the property. This cover is comprised primarily of short to tall stature non-native grasses, as well as small to large-sized forbs. Barren ground was observed only within the La Mirada roadway and in a few wildlife trails. Joshua trees on the site range in height from small (2 to 6 feet) to moderate (10-15 feet), and are largely single-trunk with minimal branching. Approximately five Joshua trees occur in the anticipated construction zone and an additional five trees occur along the shoulders of La Mirada Road. However, the distribution of Joshua trees and juniper is such that this vegetation could largely be avoided in construction of the proposed facility and installation of improvements of La Mirada Road. The implementation of mitigation measures incorporated into the conditions of project approval will assure that any adverse impacts in this area reduced to a level of less than significant.
- No Impact. This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because no washes, California streambeds, federal waters or wetland features occur on the property.

Page 11 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

- IV d) Less Than Significant. This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, construction within a 900-square foot lease area on 1 acre will not interfere with movement of any species.
- IV e) Less Than Significant. The project parcel supports several moderate height Joshua Trees (Yucca brevifolia), the removal of which is regulated by San Bernardino County and the State of California. However, no trees are proposed to be removed with construction of the project. As a condition of approval, the project will be required to comply with the Desert Region Plant Protection and Management Ordinance of the San Bernardino County Development Code.
- IV f) **No Impact.** This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site.

Significance: Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant:

# **BIOLOGICAL MITIGATION MEASURES:**

IV-1: The project proponent will ensure a 45-day pre-construction clearance survey of the subject property and area immediately adjacent to the proposed La Mirada access road is completed by a qualified biologist prior to any surface disturbance occurring on the property to ascertain the potential for burrowing owl presence.

Should any identifiable sign of burrowing owl use or burrows identified on the subject property that are potentially suitable for use by burrowing owl during this pre-construction survey, a focused burrowing owl survey will be conducted according to established protocol (BOC 1993) to ensure burrowing owls would not be adversely impacted by proposed construction work. If any potential impact to burrowing owls is noted during this focused burrowing owl survey, established mitigation measures outlined in CDFG (1995), such as avoidance of active burrows, establishment of a non-work buffer area, potentially passive relocation by a qualified biologist while burrows are unoccupied and habitat compensation will be implemented by the project proponent in consultation with CDFG to avoid, minimize and mitigate any potential impacts to burrowing owl.

IV-2: The project proponent will ensure a 45-day pre-construction clearance survey of the subject property and area immediately adjacent to the proposed La Mirada access road is completed by a qualified biologist prior to any surface disturbance occurring on the property to identify all potentially active Le Conte's thrasher and migratory bird nests.

Should this pre-construction survey identify active avian nests, work activity in the specific nest locality will be re-scheduled to occur outside the active nesting season (February through July) or an exclusion buffer around the active nest will be identified by a qualified biologist where work activity does not occur until after nestlings have fledged and no longer occupy the nest.

Page 12 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

IV-3: An environmental awareness education program will be developed and provided to all Project personnel prior to working onsite. This program will consist of a presentation from a qualified biologist that outlines listed and special status species which could be encountered in the project area and project-specific protective measures. Project personnel shall be informed during this training program that the desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel are listed species and cannot be "taken" under respective federal and California laws without an authorized incidental take permit. If a desert tortoise is observed during ground disturbance, all activities that could harm the animal shall be immediately halted. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game shall be contacted to determine appropriate action.

IV-4: A trash abatement plan will be developed and employed during pre-construction and operations phases of the project. Trash and food items will be contained in closed (ravenproof) containers and removed regularly (at least once a week) to avoid attracting opportunistic predators such as ravens, coyotes and feral dogs.

IV-5: The applicant shall either include the Mohave Ground Squirrel in the Incidental Take Permit (2081 Permit) through the California Department of Fish & Game, or have a CDFG-authorized biologist conduct a trapping survey (performed between February and July) for Mohave Ground Squirrel, 30 days prior to the start of construction to confirm the presence/absence of MGS. The results of the trapping survey must be submitted to the California Department of Fish & Game for review. Verification of compliance with the option chosen shall be submitted to the Planning Division, Land Use Services Department prior to any ground disturbance and/or grading permit issuance.

IV-6: Prior to any land disturbance (e.g. grading or land clearance) the developer shall obtain a preconstruction inspection and approval from the Building and Safety Division that said land disturbance will not result in the removal of any regulated native tree or plant. Removal of any Joshua Tree shall be subject to a Tree Removal Permit in compliance with the San Bernardino County Development Code.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures shall reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Page 13 of 37 Verizon Wireless - Oxford

P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact		
٧.		CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project		ilicorp.				
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			$\boxtimes$			
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				$\boxtimes$		
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				$\boxtimes$		
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				$\boxtimes$		
	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if the project is located in the Cultural ☐ or Paleontologic ☒ Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review):							
			1900 95					

- V a) Less Than Significant. This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a condition shall be added to the project that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.
- V b) **No Impact.** This project will not cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a condition shall be added to the project that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.
- V c) **No Impact.** This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because no such resources have been identified on the site. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a condition shall be added to the project that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.
- V d) **No Impact.** This project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, because no such burials grounds are identified on this project site. If any human remains are discovered, during construction of this project, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner, County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures and a Native American representative, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin.

Page 14 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

#### SIGNIFICANCE:

No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required. As a precautionary measure to further reduce any potential for impacts, the following requirement shall apply:

# **CULTURAL RESOURCES:**

If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation. If human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find and all work shall halt until clearance is received. If the remains or cultural artifacts are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall be notified.

September, 2011

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
VI.		GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
	a)	Expose people or structures to 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			$\boxtimes$	
		ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$	
		iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			$\boxtimes$	
		iv. Landslides?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
	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?				$\boxtimes$
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?				$\boxtimes$
	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?				$\bowtie$

Page 15 of 37

Page 16 of 37

SUBSTANTIATION	(Check	if	project	is	located	in	the	Geologic	Hazards	Overlay
	District):									

- VI a) (i-iv) Less Than Significant. The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or iv) landslides, because there are no such geologic hazards identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a complete set of plans is required to be submitted to County Building and Safety. These plans will be reviewed to ensure proper seismic measures are in place.
- VI b) Less Than Significant. The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because only minimal land disturbance, a 900 square foot lease area, is associated with the project.
- VI c) **No Impact.** The project is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- VI d) **No Impact.** The project site is not located in an area that has been identified by the County Building and Safety Geologist as having the potential for expansive soils.
- VI e) **No Impact.** The proposed project is an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility that will not generate wastewater. There will be no impact in this area.

September, 2011

		Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation	Significant	Impact
VII.	<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -</b> Would the project:		Incorp.		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
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 for people residing or working in the project area?				$\boxtimes$
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				$\boxtimes$
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				$\boxtimes$
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?			$\boxtimes$	

Page 17 of 37

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Page 18 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

#### **SUBSTANTIATION**

VII a) **No Impact.** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because no use approved on the site is anticipated to be involved in such activities. If such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department and in some instances additional land use review.

- VII b) **No Impact.** The project will not 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, because any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.
- VII c) **No Impact.** The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials and all existing and proposed schools are more than one-quarter mile away from the project site. Heritage Elementary School is located approximately 0.4-mile south of the project site.
- VII d) **No Impact.** The project site is not included on the San Bernardino County list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and therefore, will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.
- VII e) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport. The nearest public airport is Hesperia Airport, located approximately thirteen miles east of the project site.
- VII f) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip. The nearest private airstrip is Adelanto Airport, approximately thirteen miles northeast of the project site.
- VII g) **No Impact.** The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access from two or more directions.
- VII h) Less Than Significant. Prior to any construction occurring, the applicant shall contact the County Fire Department for verification of current fire protection requirements. All new construction shall comply with the current Uniform Fire Code requirements and all applicable statutes, codes, ordinances and standards of the Fire Department. The project site is in the FS-2 Fire Safety Overlay. The requirements of the overlay district are designed to reduce fire hazard risk to below a level of significance.

Page 19 of 37

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -</b> Would the project:		Incorp.		
Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				$\boxtimes$
Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				$\boxtimes$
Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				$\boxtimes$
Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				$\boxtimes$
Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				$\boxtimes$
Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				$\boxtimes$
Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				$\boxtimes$
Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				$\boxtimes$
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				$\boxtimes$
	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?  Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:  Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?  Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:  Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?  Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:  Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?  Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?  Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?  Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Page 20 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

#### SUBSTANTIATION

VIII a) **No Impact.** The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because the project will not consume or create a demand for any water and no wastewater will be generated. There will be no impacts.

- VIII b) **No Impact.** The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level because the project will not consume or create a demand for any water and no wastewater will be generated so there will be no impacts.
- VIII c) **No Impact.** The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in erosion or siltation on-site or off-site, because the project does not propose any alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river.
- VIII d) **No Impact.** The project will not substantially alter any existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site because the project does not propose any alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river.
- VIII e) **No Impact.** The site is outside of any natural flows, flood prone areas, or other hazards associated with water resources.
- VIII f) **No Impact.** The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection, including erosion control measures will be required and implemented.
- VIII g) **No Impact.** The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map because the project is not designated as being in a flood hazard area.
- VIII h) **No Impact.** The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, because the site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.
- VIII i) **No Impact.** The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.
- VIII j) **No Impact.** The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL

September, 2011

Page 21 of 37

X.		LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	a)	Physically divide an established community?				
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				$\nabla$
		miligating an environmental effect?				$\boxtimes$
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				$\boxtimes$
	_					

# SUBSTANTIATION

- IX a) No Impact. The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned land uses and development that are established within the surrounding area. The project is subject to and consistent with the criteria set forth in County Development Code section 84.27 regarding the location and design of telecommunications facilities.
- IX b) No Impact. The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect because the project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and General Plan. The project complies with all hazard protection, resource preservation, and land-use-modifying Overlay District regulations.
- IX c) **No Impact.** The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, because there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchase as mitigation for the proposed project.

Page 22 of 37

Χ.		MINERAL RESOU	RCES - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	a)		of availability of a known mineral d be of value to the region and state?			$\boxtimes$	
	b)	mineral resource re	availability of a locally important covery site delineated on a local ic plan or other land use plan?				
	S	SUBSTANTIATION	(Check ☑ if project is located Overlay): MRZ-4	within t	he Mineral	Resource	Zone

- X a) Less Than Significant. The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, because there are no identified important mineral resources on the project site. The project site lies within the Mineral Resources Zone, Classification Four (MRZ-4) Overlay, which indicates an area of unknown mineral resource significance. There are no known mineral occurrences on the site.
- X b) Less Than Significant. The project will not 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, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the project site. The project site lies within the Mineral Resources Zone Four (MRZ-4) Overlay which indicates an area of unknown mineral resource significance. There are no known mineral occurrences on the site.

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford

P201100024/CUP-CELL

September, 2011

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact		
XI.	NOISE - Would the project:		Incorp.				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				$\boxtimes$		
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?				$\boxtimes$		
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				$\boxtimes$		
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			$\boxtimes$			
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				$\boxtimes$		
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				$\boxtimes$		
<b>SUBSTANTIATION</b> (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  ):							
XI a)	XI a) No Impact. The project will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess or standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, because the project is required to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed uses.						

XI b) No Impact. The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive

exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed uses.

ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels, because the project is required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no vibration

Page 23 of 37

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Page 24 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

XI c) No Impact. The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project, because the project is required to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the project.

- XI d) Less Than Significant. Construction of the telecommunications tower and facilities will cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. The project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project because adherence with the noise standards of the County Development Code is required as a condition of project approval. Subsequent noise from maintenance vehicles and any associated repair activity will be periodic and minor.
- XI e) **No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land-use plan area or within two miles of a public/public use airport. The nearest public airport is Hesperia Airport, located approximately thirteen miles east of the project site.
- XI f) **No Impact.** The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest private airstrip is Adelanto Airport, approximately thirteen miles northeast of the project site.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011 Page 25 of 37

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact		
XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:		incorp.				
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				$\boxtimes$		
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$		
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$		
	SUBSTANTIATION						
XII a)	No Impact. The project provides cellular telephone service for high desert residents and commuters. No permanent employees will report to the site for work and no additional housing will be needed or created as a result of this project.						
XII b)	<b>No Impact.</b> The proposed use will not displace an construction of replacement housing because no hidemolished as a result of this proposal.						

XII c) **No Impact.** The proposed use will not displace any people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, because the project will not displace any existing housing or existing residents.

September, 2011

Page 26 of 37

XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES	Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
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?				$\boxtimes$
	Police Protection?				$\boxtimes$
	Schools?				$\boxtimes$
	Parks?				$\boxtimes$
	Other Public Facilities?				$\boxtimes$
5	SUBSTANTIATION				

XIII a) **No Impact.** The project has no identifiable impacts upon any of these public services. Electrical and telephone services exist at the site, which are the only public services needed for the project. No significant impact to any public service is anticipated as a result of this project.

Page 27 of 37

XIV.	RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$
	SUBSTANTIATION				

#### SUBSTANTIATION

- XIV a) **No Impact.** This project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities because the site will be an unmanned telecommunication facility providing telephone service for high desert residents and commuters.
- XIV b) **No Impact**. This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, because the type of project proposed will not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities. No development of new parkland is required.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011 Page 28 of 37

		Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Significant	Impact
XV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:		moorp.		
a)	Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				$\boxtimes$
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				$\boxtimes$
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				$\boxtimes$
	SUBSTANTIATION				

- XV a) **No Impact.** The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, because the increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, and the congestion level at intersections will remain below the planned thresholds for those facilities. The facility will be unmanned and only periodic maintenance visits will be conducted.
- XV b) **No Impact.** The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service [LOS] standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, because the facility will be unmanned and only periodic maintenance visits will be conducted.
- XV c) No Impact. The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, because there are no airports in the vicinity of the project and there is no anticipated impact on air traffic volumes by passengers or freight generated by the proposed use.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Page 29 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

XV d) No Impact. The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses because the project site is adjacent to an established road that is accessed at points with good site distance and properly controlled intersections. There are no incompatible uses proposed by the project that will impact surrounding land uses.

- XV e) **No Impact**. The project will not result in inadequate emergency access because there are a minimum of two access points.
- XV f) **No Impact.** The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity because the project will meet the parking standards established by the County Development Code at the time development is proposed.
- XV g) **No Impact.** The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks). The Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) currently provides a bus-based alternative transportation system, which serves the Phelan area. This project will not affect this existing service.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011 Page 30 of 37

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
XVI.	<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - </b> Would the project:		Incorp.		
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				$\boxtimes$
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				$\boxtimes$
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new, or expanded, entitlements needed?				$\boxtimes$
e)	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?				$\boxtimes$
f)	Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				$\boxtimes$
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

#### SUBSTANTIATION

- XVI a) No Impact. The project does not produce wastewater so there will be no impacts.
- XVI b) **No Impact.** The project does not require water service or nor will it generate wastewater. There will be no impacts.
- XVI c) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that cause significant environmental effects. All construction must meet the requirements of the County Public Works-Land Development Division (Roads/Drainage).
- XVI d) No Impact. The project does not require water so there will be no impact in this area.

APN: <u>3066-521-20</u> - Initial Study Page 31 of 37

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

XVI e) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not have any wastewater needs due to the nature of its development. Any future development or expansion that will demonstrate such needs will be subject to approval by the County Department of Environmental Health Services.

- XVI f) **No Impact.** The proposed project is served by the Phelan (Sheep Creek) Transfer Station or the Hesperia Community Collection Center and the Victorville Sanitary Landfill, which have sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- XVI g) **No Impact.** The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

September, 2011

Potentially Less than Less than Significant Significant Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorp. XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?  $\boxtimes$ 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)? X c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings. either directly Or indirectly? X

Page 32 of 37

#### SUBSTANTIATION

XVII a) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the region's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population or drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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. The project site is within designated Desert Tortoise habitat and was found to contain habitat that could support Mohave Ground Squirrel. The mitigation measures listed below will be required to reduce any potential impact to less than significant

There are no identified historic or prehistoric resources identified on this site. No archaeological or paleontological resources have been identified in the project area. To further reduce the potential for impacts, the developer is required to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.

The project site contains several protected Joshua Trees, and the mitigation measure listed below will be required to reduce any potential impact to less than significant.

Page 33 of 37

APN: 3066-521-20 - Initial Study Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

- XVII b) Less Than Significant. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The sites of projects in the area to which this project would add cumulative impacts have either existing or planned infrastructure that is sufficient for all planned uses. These sites either are occupied or are capable of absorbing such uses without generating any cumulatively significant impacts.
- XVII c) Less Than Significant. The project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, as there are no such impacts identified by the studies conducted for this project or identified by review of other sources or by other agencies.

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 insure that no potential for adverse impacts will be introduced by construction activities, initial or future land uses authorized by the project approval.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required to be implemented as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant.

Verizon Wireless - Oxford P201100024/CUP-CELL September, 2011

#### **XVIII. MITIGATION MEASURES**

(Any mitigation measures, which are not 'self-monitoring', shall have a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared and adopted at time of project approval)

MITIGATION MEASURES: (Condition compliance will be verified by existing procedure [CCRF])

## **BIOLOGICAL MITIGATION MEASURES:**

# **BIOLOGICAL MITIGATION MEASURES:**

IV-1: The project proponent will ensure a 45-day pre-construction clearance survey of the subject property and area immediately adjacent to the proposed La Mirada access road is completed by a qualified biologist prior to any surface disturbance occurring on the property to ascertain the potential for burrowing owl presence.

Should any identifiable sign of burrowing owl use or burrows identified on the subject property that are potentially suitable for use by burrowing owl during this pre-construction survey, a focused burrowing owl survey will be conducted according to established protocol (BOC 1993) to ensure burrowing owls would not be adversely impacted by proposed construction work. If any potential impact to burrowing owls is noted during this focused burrowing owl survey, established mitigation measures outlined in CDFG (1995), such as avoidance of active burrows, establishment of a non-work buffer area, potentially passive relocation by a qualified biologist while burrows are unoccupied and habitat compensation will be implemented by the project proponent in consultation with CDFG to avoid, minimize and mitigate any potential impacts to burrowing owl.

IV-2: The project proponent will ensure a 45-day pre-construction clearance survey of the subject property and area immediately adjacent to the proposed La Mirada access road is completed by a qualified biologist prior to any surface disturbance occurring on the property to identify all potentially active Le Conte's thrasher and migratory bird nests.

Should this pre-construction survey identify active avian nests, work activity in the specific nest locality will be re-scheduled to occur outside the active nesting season (February through July) or an exclusion buffer around the active nest will be identified by a qualified biologist where work activity does not occur until after nestlings have fledged and no longer occupy the nest.

IV-3: An environmental awareness education program will be developed and provided to all Project personnel prior to working onsite. This program will consist of a presentation from a qualified biologist that outlines listed and special status species which could be encountered in the project area and project-specific protective measures. Project personnel shall be informed during this training program that the desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel are listed species and cannot be "taken" under respective federal and California laws without an authorized incidental take permit. If a desert tortoise is observed during ground disturbance, all activities that could harm the animal shall be immediately halted. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game shall be contacted to determine appropriate action.

IV-4: A trash abatement plan will be developed and employed during pre-construction and operations phases of the project. Trash and food items will be contained in closed (raven-proof) containers and removed regularly (at least once a week) to avoid attracting opportunistic predators such as ravens, coyotes and feral dogs.

IV-5: The applicant shall either include the Mohave Ground Squirrel in the Incidental Take Permit (2081 Permit) through the California Department of Fish & Game, or have a CDFG-authorized biologist conduct a trapping survey (performed between February and July) for Mohave Ground Squirrel, 30 days prior to the start of construction to confirm the presence/absence of MGS. The results of the trapping survey must be submitted to the California Department of Fish & Game for review. Verification of compliance with the option chosen shall be submitted to the Planning Division, Land Use Services Department prior to any ground disturbance and/or grading permit issuance.

IV-6: Prior to any land disturbance (e.g. grading or land clearance) the developer shall obtain a preconstruction inspection and approval from the Building and Safety Division that said land disturbance will not result in the removal of any regulated native tree or plant. Removal of any Joshua Tree shall be subject to a Tree Removal Permit in compliance with the San Bernardino County Development Code.

Implementation of the above mitigation measures shall reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance

# **GENERAL REFERENCES**

Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Ground Water Bulletin #118 Update, 2003

CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G

California Standard Specifications, July 1992

County Museum Archaeological Information Center

County of San Bernardino Development Code, 2007, amended 2008, 2010

County of San Bernardino General Plan, 2007, revised 2008

County of San Bernardino Land Use Zoning District/Hazard Overlay Map: FH04

County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998

County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995

County of San Bernardino, June 2004, San Bernardino County Storm Water Program, Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance.

County of San Bernardino Road Planning and Design Standards

Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007

Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, <u>Mojave Desert Planning Area – Federal Particulate</u> <u>Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan</u>, July 1995

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan, June 2007

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, <u>California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines</u>, June 2007.

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, <u>Draft 8-hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-Attainment Area)</u>, June, 2008

# PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCES

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., General Biological Resources Assessment, April 20, 2011

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., General Biological Resources Assessment, July 29, 2011

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., Desert Tortoise Focused Survey, July 29, 2011

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., Mohave Ground Squirrel Visual Habitat Assessment, July 29, 2011

AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc., Desert Native Plant Assessment, July 29, 2011