

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY INITIAL STUDY MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) 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: | 0457-052-14 (Multiple Parcel Associations) | USGS Quad: | Shadow Mountains, SE Shadow Mountains |
| Applicant: | Sorrento West Properties | T, R, Section: | T06N R07W Sec. 10 |
| Community: | El Mirage | Planning Area: | N/A |
| Project No: | P201700655 | LUZD: | IN, Institutional/RL, Rural Living |
| Staff: | Anthony DeLuca | | |
| Rep: | Ken Anderson/General Atomics | Overlays: | Noise Hazard Overlay, Biotic Resources Overlay |
| Proposal: | Conditional Use Permit for the following A) Phase I: 144,810 sf in five new structures, and five new shade cover structures B) Phase II: Permanently Permit 39 buildings | | |

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency: County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
385 N. Arrowhead Ave. 1st Flr.
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Contact person: Anthony DeLuca
Phone No: (909) 387-3067
E-mail: Anthony.DeLuca@lus.sbcounty.gov
Fax No: (909) 387-3223

Project Sponsor: Sorrento West Properties, Inc., Ken Anderson
3550 General Atomics Court
San Diego, CA 92121

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The applicant has applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the construction of various new structures and the permitting of existing structures within an existing 640 acre airport industrial facility located in the unincorporated community of El Mirage, in the County of San Bernardino to be completed in two phases.

Phase I will include the construction of an additional 144,610 square feet in five (5) separate structures, consisting of a two-story office building alongside a new hangar, a shipping & receiving building, a GSE maintenance building, a support building, and five (5) new shade structures.

Phase II will include the permitting of eight (8) currently unpermitted permanent buildings, one (1) steel canopy, and four (4) fabric canopies, as well as thirty-nine (39) modular buildings that are currently permitted under Temporary Use Permits. These facilities will be supported by an additional 1.5 mile access road and additional underground utilities to service the buildings.

According to the San Bernardino County General Plan, the project is located in Institutional (IN), and Rural Living (RL) land use zoning districts. The project is located at the terminus of El Mirage Airport Road, approximately one mile north of El Mirage Road. The project is being undertaken by Sorrento West Properties, Inc. The site is operated by General Atomics-Aeronautical Systems Inc. (GA-ASI).

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project site is located in the community of El Mirage near the far western edge of the County of San Bernardino. The subject property is located at the terminus of El Mirage Airport Road, a local road according to the County's Master Plan of Highways, and is bound by Linson Road on the southern edge and by Colusa Road on the northern edge of the project (Exhibit 1). The site is presently occupied by the El Mirage Field Adelanto Airport, which includes multiple existing buildings and existing runway and taxiway improvements. The El Mirage Field Adelanto Airport is a private use airport, owned and operated by General Atomics, Aero Systems, Inc. for the purposes of operating and testing both manned and unmanned aircraft. The proposed project includes the development of two 80 acre parcels adjoining the existing airport to the east that have been recently developed to accommodate a runway extension that has been conditionally approved under a separate permit. The location of the site is south of the El Mirage Dry Lake. Portions of the site are presently occupied with desert native plants and scattered Joshua Trees. Surrounding land use are generally rural in nature with scattered agricultural and single family residential uses found on the eastern, western and southern edges of the project site. The project site and surrounding areas are characterized by rural desert terrain sloping gradually from northwest to southeast. The project site is identified in the Noise Hazard and Biotics Resources Overlay Districts of County of San Bernardino.

| AREA | EXISTING LAND USE | LAND USE ZONING DISTRICT | OVERLAYS |
|-------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Site | El Mirage Field Airport/Vacant | IN, Institutional RL, Rural Living | BIO/Noise |
| North | Vacant Land, El Mirage Dry Lake | RC, Resource Conservation | BIO/Noise |
| South | Vacant/ Single Family Residences | AG, Agricultural RL, Rural Living | BIO/Noise |
| East | Vacant Land, Field Crops | RL, Rural Living | BIO/Noise |
| West | Vacant Land, Single Family Residence | RL, Rural Living | BIO/Noise |

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

Federal: US Fish & Wildlife, Federal Aviation Administration

State of California: Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board; CA Fish & Wildlife, MDAQMD, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics

County of San Bernardino: Land Use Services – Building and Safety, Traffic, Land Development Engineering – Roads/Drainage; Public Health – Environmental Health Services; Public Works, Surveyor; and County Fire

Local: N/A

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, has consultation begun? The required notification of affected tribes has occurred. Consultation by the San Manuel tribe was requested and has commenced. Based on the Initial Study previously prepared for the Runway expansion for this property, the tribe is willing to impose the same conditions for this project given that the site has already been evaluated.

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

Sorrento West Properties

P201700655

August 2018

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.



Exhibit 1: Project Location

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 18 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. 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- 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 significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- 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.
- 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.


Signature (prepared by Anthony DeLuca Contract Planner):

8-27-2018
Date


Signature: Heidi Duron, Supervising Planner

8/27/2018
Date

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| I. AESTHETICS - 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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): **County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007.**

- I a) **Less Than Significant.** A review of the applicable policies of the County General Plan typically associate impacts upon scenic vistas with the diminishment of the aesthetic value of lands adjacent to scenic highways. The project as proposed will not impact such designated lands. The project is not located within a formally designated state or federal scenic area and will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, as there are none identified within the vicinity of the project site that would be affected by the proposed development. The proposed project is consistent with other surrounding development in the area and is architecturally compatible with the visual character of the surrounding area. The scope of work and layout of the proposed development is compatible with the existing topography of the area, and the improvements associated with the project are consistent with the bulk, placement, and density characteristics of rural development found commonly within the County of San Bernardino. Impacts are considered less than significant.
- I b) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located on or within close proximity of a state scenic highway and therefore will not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. There are no existing rock outcroppings or historic buildings present on the site. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
- I c) **Less Than Significant.** 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 planned visual character of the area including landscaping and the provision of walls/fences, landscaping and screening of exterior mechanical equipment, loading and storage areas. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- I d) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area because all lighting proposed onsite will be designed in accordance with the County Development Code. These standards and code requirements will ensure that the project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare by requiring lighting to be shielded or hooded. A lighting plan will be required as a condition of approval for this project. Impacts are considered less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less than Significant No Impact

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 Department 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 Resourced 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): **County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program**

-
- a) **No Impact.** The subject property is not identified or designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide. Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. There are no agricultural uses on the site currently.
 - b) **No Impact.** The subject property is not designated or zoned for agricultural use and the proposed project does not conflict with any agricultural land use or Williamson Act land conservation contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
 - c) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). The proposed project area consists of an operational airfield and vacant land which has never been designated as forest land or timberland. No rezoning of the project site would be required as the proposed project is compatible with the current zoning designation. The proposed project would not cause the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
 - d) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The proposed project area consists of an operational airfield and vacant land, which has never been designated as forest land or timberland. The proposed project does not include forest land. The proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
 - e) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use, because the site is currently not used for agricultural purposes. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No 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: | | | | |
| 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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors 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): *California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod); MDAQMD Federal 8 Hour Ozone Attainment Plan; Final Mojave Desert Planning Area Federal Particulate Matter (PM 10) Attainment Plan. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Rule 403.2 Fugitive Dust Control for the Mojave Desert Planning Area. 1996. <http://222.mdaqmd.ca.gov> ; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan; San Bernardino County General Plan 2007*

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is within the Mojave Desert Air Basin and under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. Under the Federal Clean Air Act the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District has adopted a variety of attainment plans (i.e. "Air Quality Management Plans") for a variety of non-attainment pollutants. The Air Quality Management Plans applicable to the Project area are:

Final Mojave Desert Planning Area Federal Particulate Matter (PM 10) Attainment Plan July 31, 1995 and the MDAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-attainment Area), June 9, 2008.

The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District is responsible for maintaining and ensuring compliance with the above described Air Quality Management Plans. A project is non-conforming if it conflicts with or delays implementation of any applicable attainment or maintenance plan. A project may also be non-conforming if it increases the gross number of dwelling units, increases the number of trips, and/or increases the overall vehicle miles traveled in an affected area (relative to the applicable land use plan).

A project is conforming if it complies with all applicable Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District rules and regulations, complies with all proposed control measures that are not yet adopted from the applicable plan(s), and is consistent with the growth forecasts in the applicable plan(s) (or is directly included in the applicable plan).

The *Final Mojave Desert Planning Area Federal Particulate Matter (PM 10) Attainment Plan* PM₁₀ emission inventory for the Mojave Desert Planning Area is an estimate using planning area-wide assumptions, such as a single value for silt content, average vehicle speed, number of trips per mile, etc. The MDAQMD believes these assumptions are justified based on the large number of sources within each category; which allows individual differences to average out. These categories include: City and County Unpaved Road Travel: BLM Land Activity: City and County Unpaved Road Wind Erosion: Construction: Road Dust Entrainment: City and County Disturbed Areas: BLM Unpaved Road Wind Erosion: Stationary (Industrial) Sources.

The *MDAQMD Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-attainment Area)* includes the latest planning assumptions regarding population, vehicle activity and industrial activity. The plan addresses all existing and forecast ozone precursor producing activities within the MDAQMD through the year 2020.

The project must comply with all applicable Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District rules and regulations and all proposed control measures identified in both plans because these are mandatory requirements.

In addition, the project site encompasses approximately 800 acres and in the context of the Mojave Desert Planning Area. The MDAQMD covers more than 20,000 square miles and is not anticipated to change the land use assumptions used to prepare the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management Plans. Based on the consistency analysis presented above, the proposed project will not conflict with the applicable Mojave Desert Air Quality Management Plans described above.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Less than significant impacts to air quality may result from short term activities during construction such as fugitive dust from site preparation and grading, and emissions from equipment exhaust. The long-term operational impacts to air quality resulting from the expanded activities associated with the project-related scope of work is negligible as it relates to vehicular trips, and potential stationary source emissions from project-related energy consumption. The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) is responsible for administering the Basin and setting its annual emissions thresholds for the construction and operation phases of new development projects. Criteria pollutants and their corresponding annual thresholds for MDAQMD are described in Table 2. Air quality modeling was performed for both construction and operational phases of the project using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Software. The modeling performed is the basis of this summary.

Table 2. MDAQMD Significance Thresholds

| Criteria Pollutant | Annual Threshold (tons) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) | 25 |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 100 |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) | 25 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Sulfur Oxides (SOx) | 25 |
| Particulate Matter Less than 10 Microns In Size (PM10) | 15 |
| Particulate Matter Less than 2.5 Microns in Size (PM25) | 12 |

Based on the data provided in the modeling, the construction phase of the proposed project will not result in any exceedance of MDAQMD significance thresholds. Therefore, no significant short-term air quality impacts are anticipated to result from the site preparation, grading, paving, and building construction phases of the project. Short-term construction emissions for the project were estimated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) output tables listed as "Unmitigated Construction." (Quarterly Construction impacts are shown in Table 3)

Table 3. Project Construction Emissions (Unmitigated)

| Pollutant | Quarterly Maximum Unmitigated (tons) | Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Annual Threshold (tons) | Exceeds Threshold? |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 1.0796 | 100 | NO |
| Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) | 2.8737 | 25 | NO |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC/ROG) | 0.2071 | 25 | NO |
| Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) | 3.9700e-003 | 25 | NO |
| Particulate Matter (PM10) | 0.4572 | 15 | NO |
| Particulate Matter (PM2.5) | 0.2020 | 12 | NO |

Source: Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

Table 4. Project Operational Emissions (Unmitigated)

| Pollutant | Quarterly Maximum Unmitigated (tons) | Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Annual Threshold (tons) | Exceeds Threshold? |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 0.2328 | 100 | NO |
| Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) | 0.5041 | 25 | NO |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC/ROG) | 0.0543 | 25 | NO |
| Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) | 8.2000e-004 | 25 | NO |
| Particulate Matter (PM10) | 0.0183 | 15 | NO |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----|----|
| Particulate Matter (PM2.5) | 0.0175 | 12 | NO |
|----------------------------|--------|----|----|

Source: Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

Table 5: Overall Annual Emissions Totals for Construction and Operation

| Pollutant | Annual Maximum Unmitigated (tons) | Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Annual Threshold (tons) | Exceeds Threshold? |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | 2.62265 | 100 | NO |
| Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) | 6.7559 | 25 | NO |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC/ROG) | 0.51704 | 25 | NO |
| Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) | 9.5000e-004 | 25 | NO |
| Particulate Matter (PM10) | 0.93408 | 15 | NO |
| Particulate Matter (PM2.5) | 0.42153 | 12 | NO |
| Source: Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District | | | |

Therefore, both short-term and long-term emissions from project will not exceed the MDAQMD established significance thresholds and the impacts are considered less than significant (see Table 5 above). The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use(s) do not exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the District.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** A project's air pollution emissions although individually limited, may be cumulatively considerable when taken in combination with past, present, and future development projects. In order to be considered significant, a project's air pollutant emissions must exceed the emission thresholds established by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and be inconsistent with growth associated with regional projections.

The results of the CalEEMod computer model prepared for the project determined that the thresholds for criteria pollutants will not be exceeded as a result of the project. (See Tables 3 and 4). Therefore, impacts from the project are not cumulatively considerable when included with other past, present, and future probable projects.

- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds and medical facilities are considered sensitive receptor land uses. The following project types proposed for sites within the specified distance to an existing or planned (zoned) sensitive receptor must not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- Any industrial project within 1000 feet;
- A distribution center (40 or more trucks per day) within 1000 feet;
- A major transportation project (50,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1000 feet;
- A dry cleaner using perchloroethylene within 500 feet;
- A gasoline dispensing facility within 300 feet.

The project does not alter the presence of industrial and fuel dispensing uses on the subject property. In addition, the project's air pollutant emissions will not exceed construction or operational emission thresholds. (See Tables above). Therefore, the project's emissions are in compliance with the thresholds established by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is not expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The proposal is part of an expansion of the existing El Mirage Airport facility in two phases. Phase I will include the construction of five (5) separate structures, consisting of a two-story office building alongside a new hangar, a shipping & receiving building, a maintenance building, a support building, and five (5) new shade structures. Phase II will include the permitting of eight (8) currently unpermitted permanent buildings, one (1) steel canopy, and four (4) fabric canopies, as well as thirty-nine (39) modular buildings. The construction and use of the proposed expansion under this permit is not anticipated to create any objectionable odors during construction, or operation. The facility will not accommodate tenants likely to create objectionable odors. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less than Significant No Impact

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) | Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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):

Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl and Mojave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resource Assessment for El Mirage Flight Operations Facility Expansion, August 2016, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc.

- IV a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is located within in the Biotic Resources Overly District which indicates potential impacts may occur if special status species are found on the site. A general biological survey was conducted by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants in August 2016 with additional focused surveys and trapping conducted in June 2017. The report concluded that no sensitive species were observed during the biological survey and no mitigation measures were recommended. However, due to the timing of when the survey was performed, additional pre-ground disturbance clearance surveys are necessary. As a standard practice, the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department requires follow-on reporting in the conditions of approval. Additionally, the project is subject to all applicable State and federal laws, including the California Endangered Species Act and Federal Endangered Species Act. If special status species are encountered at the time of construction all activities are required to cease and the developer is required to contact regulatory

agencies to determine the appropriate steps. No other special status species were encountered during the ground surveys.

- IV b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** This project will not 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. According to the general biological survey performed by Circle Mountain Biological Consultants (August 2016) no sensitive habitats (i.e. blue line channels, wetlands, etc.) or wildlife movement corridors were noted on the property. The project implementation would not have any significant impacts to sensitive or regulated habitat because the project site is devoid of native riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS). No significant impact is estimated based upon the review of the drainage study, the biological report as well as the review of the site plan and application, therefore no mitigation is required.
- IV c) **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 the project is not within an identified protected wetland.
- IV d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** 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, because according to the biological survey there are no established wildlife corridors on site or the immediately adjacent areas.
- IV e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance because future construction or land disturbance is required to adhere to the County's Tree & Plant Protection Ordinance. The project proponent will be required to obtain a Tree & Plant Removal Permit and/or document the removal prior to any land disturbance in alternately acceptable format for the removal of any Native Desert Plant listed in Chapter 88.01.060(c) of the Development Code and any removal or relocation of any Joshua Tree. Prior to any land disturbance, issuance of a grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, a Native Desert Plant Expert or certified arborist with experience with Joshua Trees must provide certification that the removal, replacement, or revegetation activities are appropriate, supportive of a healthy environment and in compliance with Chapter 88.01 of the Development Code and/or Food and Agriculture Code Section 80001 et seq). Only if one of the findings listed in Chapter 88.01.050(f)(1) and Chapter 88.01.050(f)(3) are made can any Desert Native Plant or Joshua Tree be removed.
- 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. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if the project is located in the Cultural or Paleontological Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review): ***Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report El Mirage Field Runway Extension Project, August 22, 2017, CRM Tech***

- V a) **Less than Significant Impact.** This project will not impact nor cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5 as verified by a review of the appropriate background report by the Planning Division. The report identifies several potential claims to historical prestige associated with the past use of the site, related to WWII-era military service and past ownership by Gus Briegleb (CRM Tech, 2017). As indicated in the report, the site does not retain sufficient integrity related to the presence of these activities to warrant inclusion on the California Register. The potential resources discussed in the report do not meet any of criteria for significance and do not qualify as historical resources as defined in §15064.5.
- V b) **Less than Significant Impact.** This project will not cause a substantial adverse change to any archaeological resource because no resources have been identified on the site and the project site is not in an area mapped to have previously had archaeological resources or believed to have archaeological resources. The appropriate methodology was employed by the consultant responsible for preparing the associated background report, and the field survey performed for the project did not identify any archeological resources. Inadvertent discovery requirements will be appropriately employed with the project conditions of approval for the project, therefore no mitigation will be required and no significant impact will occur.
- V c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because no resources have been identified on the site and no development is proposed. Inadvertent discovery requirements will be appropriately employed with the project conditions of approval for the project, therefore no mitigation will be required and no significant impact will occur.
- V d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** This project is not expected to 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 land disturbance or construction on this site, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner and County Museum for determination of appropriate measures. A Native American representative will be contacted, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin.

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of on-site wastewater treatment 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"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District): *Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500); Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Bryant, W. and E. Hart. 2007. Special Publication 42: Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California. California Geological Survey, Sacramento, California. <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>*

VI a) **Less Than Significant.** The entire San Bernardino County area is particularly susceptible to strong ground shaking and other geologic hazards. However, the proposed project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake fault zone. While the potential for onsite ground rupture cannot be totally discounted (e.g., unmapped faults could conceivably underlie the project corridor), the likelihood of such an occurrence is considered low due to the absence of known faults within the site. Therefore, impacts from proximity to fault zones are considered less than significant. The project site is expected to experience earthquake activity that is typical of the Southern California area. The site is beyond the limits of the liquefaction zone for the aforementioned earthquake faults. Therefore, impacts from liquefaction are considered less than significant. The proposed project would not have any risks associated with landslides. Landslides are the downslope movement of geologic materials. The stability

of slopes is related to a variety of factors, including the slope's steepness, the strength of geologic materials, and the characteristics of bedding planes, joints, faults, vegetation, surface water, and groundwater conditions. The project area is relatively flat terrain where landslides have not historically been an issue; therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated with respect to seismic-related (or other) landslide hazards.

- VI b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, because the site will be paved and landscaped. Erosion control plans will be required to be submitted, approved and implemented. Measures to reduce and control erosion of soil during construction and long term operation are required by MDAQMD through its Rule 403 for control of fugitive dust, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under its administration of the State's General Construction Permit, and the County of San Bernardino Public Works Department through its Storm Water Management Program. Implementation of requirements under MDAQMD Rule 403 for control of fugitive dust would reduce or eliminate the potential for soil erosion due to wind. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be included in the applicant's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), would reduce soil erosion due to storm water or water associated with construction.
- 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. Where a potential for these is identified a geology report is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Building and Safety Geologist, who will require implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, if any additional measures are required.
- VI d) **No Impact.** The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property.
- VI e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is subject to Environmental Health Services requirements for approved wastewater treatment device or connect to sewer service. No additional wastewater treatment facilities are required based upon a review of the project scope of work therefore less than significant impacts are expect to result from the completion of the project.

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod); Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Rule 403.2 Fugitive Dust Control for the Mojave Desert Planning Area. 1996. <http://222.mdaqmd.ca.gov>; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines, June 2007

VII a)

Less than Significant. The County's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan) was adopted on December 6, 2011 and became effective on January 6, 2012. An update to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions plan was implemented by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department in March 2015. The GHG Plan establishes a GHG emissions reduction target for the year 2020 that is 15 percent below 2007 emissions. The plan is consistent with AB 32 and sets the County on a path to achieve more substantial long-term reductions in the post-2020 period. Achieving this level of emissions will ensure that the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the GHG Plan will not be cumulatively considerable.

In 2007, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 97 (SB97) requiring that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include provisions addressing the effects and mitigation of GHG emissions. New CEQA Guidelines have been adopted that require: inclusion of a GHG analyses in CEQA documents; quantification of GHG emissions; a determination of significance for GHG emissions; and, adoption of feasible mitigation to address significant impacts. The CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code of Regulations Section 15083.5 (b)] also provide that the environmental analysis of specific projects may be tiered from a programmatic GHG plan that substantially lessens the cumulative effect of GHG emissions. If a public agency adopts such a programmatic GHG Plan, the environmental review of subsequent projects may be streamlined. A project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions will not be considered cumulatively significant if the project is consistent with the adopted GHG plan.

Implementation of the County's GHG Plan is achieved through the Development Review Process by applying appropriate reduction requirements to projects, which reduce GHG emissions. All new development is required to quantify the project's GHG emissions and adopt feasible mitigation to reduce project emissions below a level of significance. A review standard of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO_{2e}) per year is used to identify and mitigate project emissions. Based on CalEEMod modeling, the project is not projected to generate more than 3,000 MTCO_{2e}. For projects exceeding 3,000 MTCO_{2e} per year of GHG emissions, the developer may use the GHG Plan Screening Tables as a tool to assist with calculating GHG reduction measures and the determination of a significance finding. Projects that garner 100 or more points in the Screening Tables do not require quantification of project-specific GHG emissions. The point system was devised to ensure project compliance with the reduction measures in the GHG Plan such that the GHG emissions from new development, when considered together with those from existing development, will allow the County to meet its 2020 target and support longer-term reductions in GHG emissions beyond 2020. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, such

projects are consistent with the Plan and therefore will be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

The proposed project falls below the 3,000 MTCO_{2e} threshold, and as a result, the project is considered to be consistent with the GHG Plan and is therefore determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

- VII b) **Less than Significant Impact.** 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. In January of 2012, the County of San Bernardino adopted a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan). The proposed project falls below the 3,000 MTCO_{2e} threshold, and as a result, the project is considered to be consistent with the GHG Plan and is therefore determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| VIII. 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) 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"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998. California Environmental Protection Agency, Cortese List Data Resources*

VIII a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Hazardous Material means any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to hazardous substances and hazardous waste. The site presently dispenses fuel and handles materials subject to the jurisdiction of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. The type and quantity of these materials is not considered a significant hazard. Upon evaluation of the site plan and surrounding land uses, no significant

constraints or risks have been identified. The existing site and its operations are subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

- VIII b) **Less Than Significant 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 County Fire Department. The site presently dispenses fuel and handles materials subject to the jurisdiction of the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Best practices and compliance with the regulations of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Building and Safety Division, and the County Fire Department presently implemented for the operations of the existing facility are sufficient for monitoring and address impacts related to this area of concern. No significant impact will result from the implementation of the project as proposed, and no mitigation measures are required.
- VIII c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** All existing and proposed schools are more than 1/4 mile away from the project site. As discussed in the responses to Questions VIIIa and VIIIb above, the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials in large quantities. The Project is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.
- VIII 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.
- VIII e) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport or public use airfield. The nearest public airport is the Southern California Logistics Airport, which is located approximately 11 miles southeast of the project site. The project is not located within 2 miles of any neighboring public use airport
- VIII f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The El Mirage Field Adelanto Airport is a private use airport, owned and operated by General Atomics, Aero Systems, Inc. for the purposes of operating and testing both manned and unmanned aircraft. The nearest neighboring private airstrip is Hansen Airfield, which is located approximately 2.5 miles west of the project site. Based upon review of the surrounding zoning and land uses, no significant conflict with the existing and potential land uses on surrounding properties is expected to occur. No mitigation measures are proposed, and no significant impact will occur.
- VIII 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.
- VIII h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not 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 lands because future development will have to meet the Fire Department development standards for construction. Prior to any construction occurring on any parcel, 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.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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)? | <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, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *Preliminary Drainage Report El Mirage Airport Facility Expansion, Kimley Horn, June 2018; County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; San Bernardino County Storm Water Program, Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance, May 1, 2012.*

- IX a) **Less Than Significant.** The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because any future on-site wastewater treatment systems associated with the project development must be approved by the Environmental Health Services Division based on requirements of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. A drainage study has been review and accepted by the Land Use Services Department. No significant impact will result from construction of the proposed project and no mitigation measures are required.
- IX b) **Less Than Significant.** 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. The project is already presently served by an onsite well. The changes implemented under proposed scope of work will not alter or intensifies the need for domestic water use. Accordingly, a less significant impact will occur and no mitigation measures are proposed.
- IX c) **Less Than Significant.** 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 or off-site. Proposed development, grading and land disturbance will be required to adhere to County ordinances for erosion control and Best Management Practices shall be implemented. Accordingly, a less significant impact will occur and no mitigation measures are proposed.
- IX d) **Less Than Significant.** 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 or off-site. A condition of approval shall state, "a Registered Civil Engineer is required to investigate and design adequate drainage improvements to intercept and conduct the off-site and on-site drainage flows around and through the site in a manner, which will not adversely affect adjacent or downstream properties".
- IX e) **Less Than Significant.** The project will not 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 because development will be required to submit a complete Water Quality Management Plan and the report shall adhere to the latest requirements established by the Mojave River Watershed Region. Prior to any development the applicant is required to provide drainage improvements and a drainage study to the Land Development Division.
- IX f) **Less Than Significant.** The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because the project is subject to the local requirements for drainage study review and erosion control measures at the time of construction. The review and measures reviewed at the time of construction document checking will be sufficient for a project with this scope to verify that a less than significant impact occurs.

-
- IX g, h) **Less Than Significant.** This project lies within the Flood Zone D according to FEMA Panel Number 5100H. Flood hazards are undetermined in this area but possible. A requirement that a drainage study and most current Flood Map shall be submitted to the County Land Development Division prior to the issuance of a grading permit will be noted as a Condition of Approval. The result of the drainage study may cause changes to the drainage improvement requirements.
- IX i) **Less Than Significant.** 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. The project site is in an area with undetermined flood hazards, a requirement for a drainage study to be submitted is a condition of approval for future development to determine no flood hazards are present or that modifications to building design, grading or drainage improvements is required.
- IX j) **No Impact.** The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami or is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; County of San Bernardino Development Code 2007*

- X 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 proposed project establish uses that conform to the IN and RL land use districts regulations.
- X 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. The project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code, General Plan. The project complies with all hazard protection, resource preservation, and land use modifying Overlay District regulations.
- X 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 on the project site or within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchased as mitigation for the proposed project.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located within the Mineral Resource Zone Overlay): **County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007**

- XI a) **No Impact.** 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 does not lie within a mineral resource overlay. There are no known mineral occurrences on the site.
- XI b) **No Impact.** The project will not result in the loss of availability or 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.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XII. NOISE - Would the project: | | | | |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project 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"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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): ***El Mirage Airport Runway Extension Noise Analysis and Assessment Study, CSDA Design Group, May 15, 2017; County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007***

XII a), c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is not expected to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The project is not expected to generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project. Modeling was performed by CSDA Design Group and determined that the present and future noise associated with the El Mirage Airport and its expansion meet the County's Acoustical Criteria. Potential impact can occur if the project-associated mobile noise sources (such as aircraft) exceed interior noise standard of Ldn (DNL) or CNEL2 of 45 dBA and an exterior noise standard of DNL or CNEL of 60 dBA as stipulated in the San Bernardino County Development Code. The potential for an increase in noise levels may occur anywhere within the airport traffic pattern and anywhere air traffic is below 500 feet. Based upon the modeling performed, exterior aircraft noise exposure in excess of the 60dBA will not occur, therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation is required. Application of standard policies and building plan review will ensure that any proposed building construction within the vicinity of the project will be built to abate aircraft noise exposure for the interior of any new structures designed for human habitation. Additionally, the noise study determined that existing sensitive receivers within the vicinity of the project will not be impacted beyond the interior noise standard of Ldn (DNL) or CNEL2 of 45 dBA standard.

-
- XII b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. The project will have to adhere to the County Development Code for grading and construction noise. The project location is not in the surrounding area of any industries or activities that generate excessive ground borne vibration.

 - XII d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the project will temporarily increase ambient noise levels primarily due to construction activities. Construction noise is exempt from County Noise Standards during 7:00am and 7:00pm except Sundays and federal holidays. Thus, temporary construction noise impacts will be less than significant.

 - XII e) **No Impact.** This airfield opened in 1942 as a satellite field for the Victorville AAF and was used as a training facility during World War II. After WWII, the field was used as a civil airfield. From the 1980's to present day the El Mirage Field is used by General Atomics as their unmanned air vehicle flight test center. The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two (2) miles of a public/private use airport.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007*

- XIII a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project will not induce substantial population growth in the area either directly (it does not propose housing) or indirectly (it does not create a significant number of new jobs). The Project will serve the existing population in the area. Jobs and employment opportunities created would most likely be absorbed by the employment needs of the existing residents of the area.
- XIII b) **No Impact.** The proposed use will not displace any housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing because no housing units are proposed to be demolished as a result of this proposal.
- XIII 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.

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

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less than Significant No Impact

XIV. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other Public Facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007.*

XIV a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will not 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, including fire and police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. Construction of the project will increase property tax revenues to provide a source of funding that is sufficient to offset any increases in the anticipated demands for public services generated by this project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------|

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) | Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) | Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007.*

- XV a) **Less than Significant Impact.** This project will not 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, because the project will not generate any new residential units and the impacts to parks generated by the employees of this project will be minimal. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- XV b) **Less than Significant Impact.** This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which 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. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *Traffic Impact Study; General Atomic's Expansion, David Evans and Associates, Inc. November 7, 2017 (Updated August 22, 2018); County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007.*

XVI a), b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, nor will the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The Land Use Services Department and the Department of Public Works have reviewed the scope of work and project profile, and have determined that a project specific traffic analysis is warranted. This determination means that the project improvements could result in an increase to traffic, or conflict with any Level of Service standard established for the County of San Bernardino. According to the Traffic Impact Study prepared by David Evans and Associates, the project as presented will not cause significant long term negative impacts to the surrounding street system which includes future conditions that address impacts due to ambient growth up to the buildout year within the study area, combined with implementation of the project. The majority of the southbound traffic on El Mirage Airport Road is employees leaving the site at the end of their work shift. Based on the project use, most of the employees leave at the same time. This end of workday results in a 15 minute burst of traffic at the intersection causing the LOS F at the critical movement the southbound direction. As a result, of a 15 minute disbursement of the traffic, it is recommended that the advance warning signs be upgraded to include LED flashing yellow

beacons. The LED flashing yellow beacons would operate during the end of workday period. The street system with proposed mitigation and regional improvements will be adequate to handle the estimated project traffic, and a less than significant impact is anticipated.

- XVI c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not result in a substantial change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a significant change in location of air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks. The project involves the new construction of five (5) buildings, and the permanent permitting of thirty-nine (39) modular buildings currently under temporary use permits, on the site of an existing private airfield. The El Mirage Field Adelanto Airport is a private use airport, owned and operated by General Atomics, Aero Systems, Inc. for the purposes of operating and testing both manned and unmanned aircraft. Permitting through the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics has been initiated for the project runway improvements. While no single agency exercises authority over private use airports, the site safety issues related to the air traffic pattern will be the subject of notification requirements through the FAA. Flight Patterns for the proposed facility were documented in the project Noise Analysis. A less than significant impact is anticipated.
- XVI d) **Less than Significant 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. A less than significant impact is anticipated.
- XVI e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project will not result in inadequate emergency access, because the site is adjacent to public roads, and will be required to provide a secondary emergency access point as a condition from County Fire. Plans for this emergency access road are in review with County Fire, and upon approval will provide sufficient access to address public safety concerns.
- XVI f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

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

- TRA-1 Prior to occupancy, convert the intersection of El Mirage Road at El Mirage Airport Road to an All Way Stop Control (AWSC).
- TRA-2 Prior to occupancy, upgrade the advanced warning signs with LED flashing yellow beacons.

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less than Significant No Impact

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES - 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:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION: *Confidential Phase I Cultural Resources Overlay submitted by the Applicant in response to information request from interested tribes.*

XVII **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** Assembly Bill (AB) 52 took effect on July 1, 2015. a),b) AB 52 requires a lead agency to make best efforts to avoid, preserve, and protect tribal cultural resources. The bill states that tribal cultural resources are:

1. Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or included in a local register of historical resources;
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1(c);
3. A cultural landscape that meets one of the criteria of 1) above, and is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; and/or
4. A historical resource described in PRC 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource described in PRC 21083.2(g), or a non-unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC 21083(h) if it conforms with the criteria of 1), above.

Prior to the release of the CEQA document for a project, AB 52 requires the lead agency to initiate consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project if: (1) the California Native American tribe requested the lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through formal notification of proposed project in the geographic area that is traditionally and through formal notification of proposed projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe, and (2) the California Native American tribe responds, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification, and requests the consultation.

As the lead agency under CEQA, the County is responsible for and will be performing formal government-to-government consultation with Native American Tribes under California Assembly Bill 52.

The project does have the potential to impact resources defined Public Resources Code section 21074. While there are no known resources identified in the area of disturbance, earth-moving activities such as grading and excavation associated with the construction of new buildings and shade structures, the installation of the facility drainage improvements, and construction of the internal access roads do possess the potential to impact resources described above through inadvertent discovery. The Project lies in proximity to El Mirage Dry Lake, which possesses a high potential for subsurface deposit of prehistoric cultural remains. With the participation of affected California Native Tribes, it has been determined that a significant impact can be avoided with onsite tribal monitoring during such earth-moving activities. The County of San Bernardino ("Lead Agency") will continue to conduct Government-to-Government consultation in accordance with, CEQA, AB52, and/or SB18 for the life of the Project, including the timely and comprehensive dissemination of all project-related information and documentation to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians ("SMBMI"). The following mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant level:

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

TCR-1 Tribal Monitoring: Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, Tribal monitor representing SMBMI shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project APE (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation (benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.), and archaeological surveys, testing, and data recovery. A Tribal monitor shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage.

The Lead Agency shall inform the Project developer/applicant of its responsibility to provide compensation (hourly wages, per diem, mileage, lodging, etc.) for all archaeological and Tribal monitors and the services these individuals provide as part of the monitoring effort for the Project and the need for a Monitoring Plan to be developed prior to the issuance of permits.

Prior to the issuance of any ground disturbance-related permits (such as grading permits), the Lead Agency shall contact and coordinate with SMBMI to facilitate communications with the Project developer/applicant so that all Parties can develop a mutually-acceptable Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Plan. This Plan shall be approved and adopted by the Lead Agency prior to the issuance of any ground disturbance-related permits. The Plan's implementation in the field shall be enforced by the Lead Agency for the life of the Project.

TRC-2 Discovery Protocol and Treatment: If an archaeological deposit or tribal cultural resource is discovered within the Project area, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s) and an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier constructed. Representatives from SMBMI, the Archaeological Monitor, the Project applicant/developer, and the Lead Agency shall confer regarding treatment of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared, reviewed and adopted by all Parties, and then implemented to protect the identified resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design to evaluate the resource for significance under both NHPA and CEQA criteria. This research design shall (1) acknowledge the necessity for additional, internal Tribal deliberations and culturally-appropriate treatments for all tribal cultural resources and (2) for archaeological resources, include fieldwork and

sampling procedures appropriate to ascertain the boundaries, nature, and content of the resource in accordance with current, professional archaeological best practices, as agreed upon by SMBMI.

Should the resource be determined to be significant under either federal- or state-level criteria, avoidance and preservation in place shall be the preferred treatment. Should the resource not be a candidate for avoidance or preservation in place, a resource-specific mitigation plan shall be developed, reviewed by all Parties, and implemented. Should the mitigation plan include archaeological data recovery, a research design shall be developed that exhausts the research potential of the resource in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. Any mitigation plan that results in the removal of cultural resources (artifacts, ecofacts, features, etc.) from their original provenience shall also include a comprehensive discussion of resource processing, analysis, curation, and reporting protocols and obligations.

a. All mitigation, treatment, and data recovery plans shall be developed in consultation with SMBMI.

b. All fieldwork related to treatment, mitigation, and data recovery plans shall require monitoring by an SMBMI Tribal Monitor.

c. All draft reports containing the significance and treatment findings and data recovery results shall be prepared by an SOI-qualified archaeologist hired by the applicant/developer and submitted to the Lead Agency and SMBMI for their review and comment.

d. All final reports are to be submitted to the local CHRIS Information Center, the Lead Agency, and SMBMI.

TCR-3 Treatment and Disposition of Artifacts, Ecofacts, Cultural Deposits: SMBMI requests that culturally-appropriate and professionally proper procedures shall be followed with respect to all artifacts and remains affiliated with Native peoples—whether prehistoric, protohistoric, or historic.

a. Any sacred/ceremonial objects or objects of cultural patrimony discovered within the project area are to be offered to the MLD of record for appropriate treatment and all claims of ownership to such materials waived by the applicant/developer/landowner.

b. SMBMI requests that all other artifacts be permitted to be either (1) left in situ should avoidance or protection in place be guaranteed or (2) reburied, on site, in a location that will be protected from future disturbance. A fully executed reburial agreement shall be developed with SMBMI. This agreement shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts (vis a vis project plans, conservation/preservation easements, deed riders, etc.). Reburial shall not occur until all ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project have been completed, all monitoring has ceased, all cataloguing and basic recordation of cultural resources have been completed, and a final monitoring report has been issued to Lead Agency, CHRIS, and SMBMI.

c. Should it occur that avoidance, preservation in place, or on-site reburial are not an option for some artifacts, SMBMI requests that the landowner relinquish all ownership and rights to this material and consult with the Tribes to identify an American Association of Museums (AAM)-accredited facility within San Bernardino County that can accession the materials into their permanent collections and provide for the proper care of these objects in accordance with the 1993 CA Curation Guidelines. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository shall be developed between the landowner and museum that legally and physically transfers the collections and associated records to the facility. This agreement shall stipulate the payment of fees necessary for permanent curation of the collections and associated records and the obligation of the Project developer/applicant to pay for those fees.

d. Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance by SMBMI, the SOI-qualified archaeologist hired by the applicant/developer may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes (including, but not limited to, shell, non-human bone, ceramic, stone) if required by CEQA, the Project's mitigation measures, and/or conditions of approval for the Project. Upon completion of authorized and mandatory analyses, the applicant/developer shall provide said artifacts to SMBMI for reburial on site or to the aforementioned, identified curation facility within sixty (60) days from the completion of analyses and not to exceed one hundred and twenty (120) days after the initial recovery of the items from the field.

TCR-4 Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains: The Lead Agency and the applicant/developer shall immediately contact the San Bernardino County Coroner and SMBMI in the event that any human remains are discovered during implementation of the Project. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c).

The NAHC-identified Most Likely Descendant (MLD), shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and funerary objects shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity. The MLD, applicant/developer/landowner, and Lead Agency agree to discuss in good faith what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes.

The MLD shall complete its inspection and make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving notification from either the Developer or the NAHC, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the applicant/developer/landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects.

All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects, as well as ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near, the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.

The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because some local Tribes' traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains and funerary objects. Funerary objects are those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites. These items, and other funerary remnants and their ashes, are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact.

It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new, or expanded, entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION *County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan; Utility and Service purveyors for Community of El Mirage*

XVIII a,b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Domestic water will be treated and disposed of through multiple onsite treatment systems subject to permit and review requirements of the County of San Bernardino Division of Environmental Health Services and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board). Considering the above discussion, no significant adverse impacts will result from the proposed wastewater treatment systems and no mitigation measures are required.

XVIII c) **Less than Significant 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. As stated in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this document, the proposed project will not create any additional impacts on downstream storm drain facilities that will necessitate expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities.

XVIII d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

-
- XVIII e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The County's Division of Environmental Health Services (DEHS) will approve and oversee any new request for OWTS. Septic system pumpers must be approved by DEHS. Septage, the waste or sewage in a septic tank, is accepted at the Barstow Sanitary Landfill which is approximately 30 miles northeast of the site.
- XVIII f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is served by the Victorville Sanitary Landfill, which has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed project's future solid waste disposal needs.
- XVIII g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

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

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

DETERMINATION

- XVIII a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** 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 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. Additionally, no significant historic or prehistoric resources have been identified on this site. No special status species were observed during the biological site survey conducted for the Project. The Project proposes to relocate Joshua Trees found on site in compliance with County ordinance. Due to the absence of special status species as well as the absence of significant historical resources on the subject property or within the area of potential impact, implementation and operation of the proposed development will have a less than significant impact upon the identified areas of concern.
- XVIII b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** 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.
- XVIII c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The incorporation of design measures, County policies, standards, and guidelines would ensure that there would be no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

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.)

TRA TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

- TRA-1** Prior to occupancy, convert the intersection of El Mirage Road at El Mirage Airport Road to an All Way Stop Control (AWSC).
- TRA-2** Prior to occupancy, upgrade the advanced warning signs with LED flashing yellow beacons at intersection of El Mirage Road at El Mirage Airport Road.

TCR TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- TCR-1** **Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring:** Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, both an archaeological monitor that meets Secretary of Interior (SOI) qualifications for archaeology and Tribal monitors representing SMBMI shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project APE (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation (benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.), and archaeological surveys, testing, and data recovery. A sufficient number of archaeological and Tribal monitors shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage.

The Lead Agency shall inform the Project developer/applicant of its responsibility to provide compensation (hourly wages, per diem, mileage, lodging, etc.) for all archaeological and Tribal monitors and the services these individuals provide as part of the monitoring effort for the Project and the need for a Monitoring Plan to be developed prior to the issuance of permits.

Prior to the issuance of any ground disturbance-related permits (such as grading permits), the Lead Agency shall contact and coordinate with SMBMI to facilitate communications with the Project developer/applicant so that all Parties can develop a mutually-acceptable Archaeological and Tribal Monitoring Plan. This Plan shall be approved and adopted by the Lead Agency prior to the issuance of any ground disturbance-related permits. The Plan's implementation in the field shall be enforced by the Lead Agency for the life of the Project.

- TRC-2** **Discovery Protocol and Treatment:** If an archaeological deposit or tribal cultural resource is discovered within the Project area, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s) and an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier constructed. Representatives from SMBMI, the Archaeological Monitor, the Project applicant/developer, and the Lead Agency shall confer regarding treatment of the discovered resource(s). A treatment plan shall be prepared, reviewed and adopted by all Parties, and then implemented to protect the identified resources from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design to evaluate the resource for significance under both NHPA and CEQA criteria. This research design shall (1) acknowledge the necessity for additional, internal Tribal deliberations and culturally-appropriate treatments for all tribal cultural resources and (2) for archaeological resources, include fieldwork and sampling procedures appropriate to ascertain the boundaries, nature, and content of the resource in accordance with current, professional archaeological best practices, as agreed upon by SMBMI.

Should the resource be determined to be significant under either federal- or state-level criteria, avoidance and preservation in place shall be the preferred treatment. Should the resource not be a candidate for avoidance or preservation in place, a resource-specific mitigation plan shall be developed, reviewed by all Parties, and implemented. Should the mitigation plan include archaeological data recovery, a research design shall be developed that exhausts the research potential of the resource in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. Any mitigation plan that results in the removal of cultural resources (artifacts, ecofacts, features, etc.) from their original provenience shall also include a comprehensive discussion of resource processing, analysis, curation, and reporting protocols and obligations.

- a) All mitigation, treatment, and data recovery plans shall be developed in consultation with SMBMI.
- b) All fieldwork related to treatment, mitigation, and data recovery plans shall require monitoring by an SMBMI Tribal Monitor.
- c) All draft reports containing the significance and treatment findings and data recovery results shall be prepared by an SOI-qualified archaeologist hired by the applicant/developer and submitted to the Lead Agency and SMBMI for their review and comment.
- d) All final reports are to be submitted to the local CHRIS Information Center, the Lead Agency, and SMBMI.

TCR-3 Treatment and Disposition of Artifacts, Ecofacts, Cultural Deposits: SMBMI requests that culturally-appropriate and professionally proper procedures shall be followed with respect to all artifacts and remains affiliated with Native peoples—whether prehistoric, protohistoric, or historic.

- a) Any sacred/ceremonial objects or objects of cultural patrimony discovered within the project area are to be offered to the MLD of record for appropriate treatment and all claims of ownership to such materials waived by the applicant/developer/landowner.
- b) SMBMI requests that all other artifacts be permitted to be either (1) left in situ should avoidance or protection in place be guaranteed or (2) reburied, on site, in a location that will be protected from future disturbance. A fully executed reburial agreement shall be developed with SMBMI. This agreement shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts (vis a vis project plans, conservation/preservation easements, deed riders, etc.). Reburial shall not occur until all ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project have been completed, all monitoring has ceased, all cataloguing and basic recordation of cultural resources have been completed, and a final monitoring report has been issued to Lead Agency, CHRIS, and SMBMI.
- c) Should it occur that avoidance, preservation in place, or on-site reburial are not an option for some artifacts, SMBMI requests that the landowner relinquish all ownership and rights to this material and consult with the Tribes to identify an American Association of Museums (AAM)-accredited facility within San Bernardino County that can accession the materials into their permanent collections and provide for the proper care of these objects in accordance with the 1993 CA Curation Guidelines. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository shall be developed between the landowner and museum that legally and physically transfers the collections and associated records to the facility. This agreement shall stipulate the payment of fees necessary for permanent curation of the collections and associated records and the obligation of the Project developer/applicant to pay for those fees.
- d) Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance by SMBMI, the SOI-qualified archaeologist hired by the applicant/developer may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes (including, but not limited to, shell, non-human bone, ceramic, stone) if required by CEQA, the Project's mitigation measures, and/or

conditions of approval for the Project. Upon completion of authorized and mandatory analyses, the applicant/developer shall provide said artifacts to SMBMI for reburial on site or to the aforementioned, identified curation facility within sixty (60) days from the completion of analyses and not to exceed one hundred and twenty (120) days after the initial recovery of the items from the field.

TCR-4 Discovery and Treatment of Human Remains: The Lead Agency and the applicant/developer shall immediately contact the San Bernardino County Coroner and SMBMI in the event that any human remains are discovered during implementation of the Project. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c).

The NAHC-identified Most Likely Descendant (MLD), shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and funerary objects shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity. The MLD, applicant/developer/landowner, and Lead Agency agree to discuss in good faith what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes.

The MLD shall complete its inspection and make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving notification from either the Developer or the NAHC, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the applicant/developer/landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects.

All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects, as well as ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near, the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.

The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because some local Tribes' traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains and funerary objects. Funerary objects are those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites. These items, and other funerary remnants and their ashes, are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact.

It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

GENERAL REFERENCES

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

Bryant, W. and E. Hart. 2007. *Special Publication 42: Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California*. California Geological Survey. Sacramento, California. <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sp/Sp42.pdf>

California Department of Conservation. 2016. *San Bernardino County Important Farmland, Sheet 1 of 2*. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/sbd16_no.pdf

California Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation System Information. 2008. *2008 California Motor Vehicle Stock, Travel, and Fuel Forecast*. California Department of Transportation. Sacramento, California. <http://www.dot.ca.gov>

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

California Environmental Protection Agency, Cortese List Data Resources

CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G

California Standard Specifications, July 1992

County of San Bernardino Museum, Archaeological Information Center

County of San Bernardino, Circulation and Infrastructure Background Report, February 21, 2006

County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, 2007 Fire-Year Review Report, December 2007

County of San Bernardino. 2007. *County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code*. <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/DevelopmentCode.aspx>

County of San Bernardino. 2007. *County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan*. <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/GeneralPlan.aspx>

County of San Bernardino. General Plan, Land Use Element Map

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

County of San Bernardino, *San Bernardino County Storm Water Program, Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance*, May 1, 2012.

County of San Bernardino Road Planning and Design Standards, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/dpw/transportation/tr_standards.asp

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, *Mojave Desert Planning Area – Federal Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) Attainment Plan*, July 1995

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, *Rule 403.2 Fugitive Dust Control for the Mojave Desert Planning Area*. 1996. <http://222.mdaqmd.ca.gov>

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, *2004 Ozone Attainment Plan*

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines*, June 2007

PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCES

California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2016.03.2, August 23, 2018

Focused Survey for Agassiz's Desert Tortoise Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl and Mojave Ground Squirrel, and General Biological Resource Assessment for El Mirage Flight Operations Facility Expansion, August 2016, Circle Mountain Biological Consultants, Inc.

Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey; Report El Mirage Field Runway Extension Project, August 22, 2017, CRM Tech

Noise Analysis and Assessment Study; El Mirage Airport Runway Extension, May 15, 2017, CSDA Design Group

Preliminary Drainage Report, El Mirage Facility Expansion, Kimley-Horn, June 2018

Traffic Impact Study; General Atomics Expansion David Evans and Associates, Inc. November 7, 2017