PROJECT DESCRIPTION

APN: 0583-271-02
APPLICANT: ROYAL STREET COMMUNICATION FOR METRO pcs
ZONING: GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG)
PROPOSAL: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY CONSISTING OF ONE (1) GPS ANTENNA AND SIX (6) PANEL ANTENNAS MOUNTED ON A 60-FOOT HIGH MONOPALM CELL TOWER ALONG WITH FOUR (4) UTILITY CABINETS TO BE LOCATED WITHIN A 600 SQ FT EQUIPMENT SHELTER ON A PORTION OF 1.29 ACRES.

COMMUNITY: MORONGO VALLEY/3RD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT
LOCATION: NORTH SIDE OF 29 PALMS HIGHWAY, APPROXIMATELY 360 FEET WEST OF EAST DRIVE

JCS/INDEX: P201000506/CUP CELL TOWER
REP(S): CMH CONSULTING GROUP
STAFF: OXSO SHAHRARI, PLANNER

VICINITY MAP

133 Hearing Notices Sent On: March 06, 2012
P.C. Field Inspection Date: March 12, 2012
Report Prepared By: Oxso Shahriari
Field Inspected By: Commissioner Theresa Kwappenberg

SITE INFORMATION:
Parcel Size: 1.29 Acres
Terrain: Nearly flat
Vegetation: Site is mostly cleared.

SURROUNDING LAND DESCRIPTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>EXISTING LAND USE</th>
<th>OFFICIAL LAND USE DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Morongo Valley General Commercial (MV/CG) / Fire Safety Review Area 2 (FS2) / Scenic Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Morongo Valley/Multiple Residential (MV/RM) / FS2 / Scenic Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>Morongo Valley/General Commercial (MV/CG) / FS2 / Scenic Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Morongo Valley/General Commercial (MV/CG) / FS2 / Scenic Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Morongo Valley/General Commercial (MV/CG) / FS2 / Scenic Corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENCY          COMMENT
City Sphere of Influence/MAC/CAP: N/A       N/A
Water Service:  N/A       N/A
Septic/Sewer Service: N/A       N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit to establish a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of one (1) GPS antenna and six (6) panel antennas mounted on a 60-foot tall monopalm cell tower with four (4) utility cabinets enclosed within a 600-SQ FT equipment shelter on a portion of 1.29 acres.

In accordance with Section 86.08.010 of the Development Code action may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors.
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Aerial Map
Assessor Parcel Map
Land Use District Map
BACKGROUND:

The proposed project (Project) is a conditional use permit (CUP) to establish a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of one (1) GPS antenna and six (6) panel antennas mounted on a 60-foot tall monopalm cell tower along with four (4) utility cabinets to be enclosed within a 600-sq. ft. equipment shelter on a portion of 1.29 acres. The Project site is located in the south desert region. It is zoned CG (General Commercial) and is within Fire Safety Overlay Review Area Two (FS2). The Project site is located along the Twenty-nine Palms Highway (State Highway 62), nearly 360 feet west of East Drive and is within the Morongo Valley planning area, in the Third Supervisorial District. The Project proponent, Metro PCS, is a new carrier establishing a new network in the area. The Project site is situated near the center of the carrier’s proposed network for the area.

ANALYSIS:

PUBLIC INPUT. The Project has been noticed to 133 property owners within 1,000 feet of the Project site, as required by Development Code Section 84.27.070. Additionally, other inquiries received from local citizens, some from outside of the Project notification area, have been addressed by phone, email, and/or over the counter. Written and petitioned comments totaling 367 were received from area citizens and business owners in support of and opposition to the Project. Two letters and a petition bearing 69 signatures have been received in opposition to the Project. Sixteen letters and a petition bearing 280 signatures have been received in favor of the Project. The concerns expressed by opponents of the Project have revolved around the Project’s potential negative impact to visual and biological resources. Health concerns and impacts to property values have also been listed as areas of concern. Those concerns within the purview of the Planning Commission were evaluated during Project review and have resulted in design modifications of the cell tower and mitigation measures.

VISUAL IMPACT. The proposed Project is located on State Highway 62, a designated scenic corridor. The cell tower design has been modified substantially to blend with its surroundings by: a) reducing the tower height to 60 feet (where maximum height permitted is 120 feet); b) stealthing the tower through the use of monopalm design features; c) enclosing the support equipment located at the base of the monopalm; and d) requiring site landscaping. The proposed cell tower adopts a palm-tree-like appearance to camouflage its intended use and to ensure that the proposed Project does not unduly impede on the surrounding mountainous vista. Planting of four live palm trees has been required for further mitigation and to enhance the experience of the traveling public. All auxiliary equipment shall be housed in a cottage-like structure to screen this development from public view at the pedestrian level. The project is within the 200 foot(?) wide scenic corridor. However, since the site is devoid of substantial topography, locating the tower and equipment shelter to the rear of the property, outside of the referenced corridor, would not create any additional visual buffering. The proposed location will make the facility more readily accessible, thus reducing disturbance of the site during construction and periodic service/repair visits. Mitigation Measure I-1 addresses any potential adverse visual impact by requiring adequate enclosures incorporated in the facility design, and by requiring shrubbery around the lease area.

TRAFFIC. The Project is on State Highway 62 which provides sufficient vehicular access. Due to limited onsite activities associated with the proposed unmanned wireless telecommunication facility, no significant traffic impact is anticipated.

AIR QUALITY. Only a few trips to and from the site are anticipated per month, therefore no impact on air quality is anticipated from traffic. The equipment proposed for this Project does not generate long-term criteria pollutants and no Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are anticipated. Coating Restrictions and Dust Control Plans among other construction mitigation measures have been required to ensure a less than significant impact on air quality.
**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** The site is cleared except for occasional re-grown vegetation without presence of any sensitive plant species. The project site is located in Desert Tortoise Category 3 habitat area; however, based on previous disturbance caused by highway construction and commercial development, the site is not suitable habitat for any designated sensitive species. A Biological Resources Impact Analysis prepared by Michael Brandman Associates finds that the site is “not a suitable habitat for any sensitive plant or wildlife species”. Based on a site survey and literature review, the study finds no jurisdictional waters or wetlands present on or in the vicinity of the project site. The study concludes that no protected nesting birds are anticipated to be directly or indirectly impacted. Therefore, no potentially adverse biological impact is anticipated.

**PUBLIC HEALTH.** Wireless telecommunication facilities are required to comply with Federal Communication Commission regulations related to EMF (Electromagnetic field) emissions. These regulations preclude local jurisdictions from considering the alleged adverse impacts of EMF emissions when reviewing projects.

**INITIAL STUDY.** An Initial Study has been prepared for the Project, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Initial Study contains mitigation measures recommended to minimize potential impacts on aesthetic resources, air quality, cultural resources and noise levels. The Initial Study and the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration were circulated through the State Clearinghouse, and no comments were received during the public review period. Based on the referenced Initial Study, the proposed Project would not have significant adverse impacts with application of the proposed mitigation measures. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Planning Commission:

1. **ADOPT** the Mitigated Negative Declaration, based on a finding that the Initial Study was completed in compliance with CEQA, that it has been reviewed and considered prior to approval of the Project, and that the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County of San Bernardino;

2. **APPROVE** the Conditional Use Permit to establish a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of one (1) GPS antenna and six (6) panel antennas mounted on a 60-foot tall monopalm cell tower along with four (4) utility cabinets to be enclosed within a 600-sq. Ft. equipment shelter on a portion of 1.29 acres;

3. **ADOPT** the Findings as contained in the Staff Report; and

4. **FILE** a Notice of Determination.

**Attachments:**

- **EXHIBIT A:** Findings
- **EXHIBIT B:** Conditions of Approval
- **EXHIBIT C:** Initial Study
- **EXHIBIT D:** Site Plan
- **EXHIBIT E:** Site Photos & Simulations
- **EXHIBIT F:** Correspondence
FINDINGS: Conditional Use Permit – Wireless Facility

1. The site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed monopalm telecommunications tower and the support equipment, and is consistent with County development standards. In addition, the proposed facility complies — either by design or by application of mitigation measures — with the requirements established by County ordinances regarding the design and location of telecommunication facilities, the allowed maximum height and the need for minimizing visual impact. This project will not contribute to unnecessary proliferation of such facilities because the facility can be modified to permit collocation.

2. The project site for this facility has adequate legal and physical access by utilizing Highway 62. Therefore, the site will have adequate access for periodic inspection and maintenance to support the proposed unmanned facility.

3. The proposed telecommunication facility will not have a substantial adverse effect on abutting property or the permitted use thereof because the project site — itself zoned General Commercial (CG) — is partially surrounded by similar commercial parcels zoned Service Commercial (CS) and Neighborhood Commercial (CN). The use will not generate excessive noise, vibration, traffic or other disturbance unusual to its intended use and/or zoning. The site is also adjacent to a parcel zoned Multiple Residential (RM); therefore, camouflaging and screening measures have been incorporated into the design of the tower and related structures. In addition, the use will not substantially interfere with the present or future ability to use solar energy systems because it will not cast a significant sun-blocking shadow across a potential site for such solar energy system.

4. The proposed telecommunication facility and manner of development are consistent with the goals, policies, standards and maps of the County General Plan. The project specifically implements the following San Bernardino County General Plan goals and policies: Goal D-35; an intent to “maximize the use of telecommunications to reduce transportation and land use demands” and Policy ET-11 (e); an intent to “recognize and promote the increased use of telecommunication facilities, which can reduce the demand for transportation and vehicle trips”, thus reducing dependency on non-renewable energy resources.

5. There is supporting infrastructure, existing or available, consistent with the intensity of development, to accommodate the proposed development without significantly lowering service levels because the unmanned nature of the proposed project and its limited scope of activities will minimally increase service demands. Due to the occasional nature of inspection and maintenance trips created by this proposal, no significant adverse impact is anticipated.
6. The lawful conditions stated in the approval are deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare because this facility has been reviewed and conditioned by various County agencies to mitigate any potential impact and to ensure compliance with County development standards. The anticipated visual impact on surrounding properties and Highway 62 scenic resources has been mitigated by Conditions of Approval. The cell tower design has been modified by conditions of approval to blend with its surroundings. The cell tower will be designed to resemble a palm tree, to camouflage its intended use. All auxiliary equipment shall be screened from view. The conditions, when implemented, will mitigate any potential impacts to a level below significance.

7. The design of the site has considered the use of solar energy systems and passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities, however there is no practical manner by which this can be implemented to power the proposed facility.

8. The Environmental Initial Study has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and represents the independent judgment of the County acting as lead agency for the project. The project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment with the implementation of all the required conditions of approval and mitigation measures.
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
Royal Street Communications for Metro PCS
Conditional Use Permit

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

LAND USE SERVICES – Planning (760) 995-8140

1. **Project Approval Description.** A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is approved to be construction and operation of a wireless facility consisting of one (1) GPS antenna and six (6) panel antennas mounted on a 60-foot high monopalm cell tower along with four (4) utility cabinets to be located within a 600 SQ FT equipment shelter on a portion of 1.29 acres. The project shall be in compliance with the San Bernardino County Code (SBCC), the following conditions of approval, a complete signed and approved Telecom Facility Agreement (TFA), the approved site plan and any other required and approved reports and/or displays (e.g. elevations).

2. **Telecom Facility Agreement (TFA).** The developer shall sign and adhere to terms of a required Telecom Facility Agreement, to be completed to the satisfaction of County Counsel and in coordination with County Planning, before this approval is deemed vested for continuous effect and operation.

3. **Project Location.** The project is located on the north side of the 29 Palms Highway, approximately 360 feet west of East Drive, in Desert Region, within the Morongo Valley Planning Area. The project site is zoned Morongo Valley General Commercial (MV/CG) and is in the 3rd supervisoral district.

4. **Developer Defined.** The term developer as used in these conditions of approval for this project and for any development of this project site, includes all of the following: the applicant, the property owner and any lessee, tenant or sub-tenant, operator and/or any other agent or other interested party of the subject project and/or project site and/or any heir or any other successor in interest in the project site or project land use by sale or by lease of all or of a portion of the project site or project land uses and/or any other right given to conduct any land use in any or all of the project structures or any area on the project site.

5. **Development Standards/CG.** The project site zoning designation is General Commercial (CG). It is located in the Fire Safety Overlay FS-2. The following Development Standards for the Desert Region, CG Zoning District shall apply:
   a. Minimum Building Setbacks Lines (BSL) are:
      Front – 25 feet; Side Street – 25 feet; Side Interior – 10 feet; and Rear – 10 feet.
   b. Maximum building height shall be 35 feet.
   c. Maximum cell tower height shall be 120 feet; the height applied for 60 feet.
   d. Additional development standards can be found at:  
      [http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/landuseservices/devcode.htm](http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/landuseservices/devcode.htm)
6. Revisions. Any proposed change to the approved use/activity on the site (e.g. from monopole cell tower to a convenience store); or any increase in the developed area of the site or any expansion or modification to the approved facilities, including changes to structures, building locations, elevations, signs, parking allocations, landscaping, lighting, allowable number of occupants shall require an additional land use review and application subject to approval by the County. The developer shall prepare, submit with fees and obtain approval of the application prior to implementing any such revision or modification. (SBCC §86.06.070)

7. Indemnification. In compliance with SBCC §81.01.070, the developer shall agree, to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the County or its “indemnities” (herein collectively the County’s elected officials, appointed officials (including Planning Commissioners), Zoning Administrator, agents, officers, employees, volunteers, advisory agencies or committees, appeal boards or legislative body) from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its indemnities to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the County by an indemnity concerning a map or permit or any other action relating to or arising out of County approval, including the acts, errors or omissions of any person and for any costs or expenses incurred by the indemnities on account of any claim, except where such indemnification is prohibited by law. In the alternative, the developer may agree to relinquish such approval.

Any condition of approval imposed in compliance with the County Development Code or County General Plan shall include a requirement that the County acts reasonably to promptly notify the developer of any claim, action, or proceeding and that the County cooperates fully in the defense. The developer shall reimburse the County and its indemnities for all expenses resulting from such actions, including any court costs and attorney fees, which the County or its indemnities may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action.

The County may, at its sole discretion, participate at its own expense in the defense of any such action, but such participation shall not relieve the developer of their obligations under this condition to reimburse the County or its indemnities for all such expenses.

This indemnification provision shall apply regardless of the existence or degree of fault of indemnities. The developer's indemnification obligation applies to the indemnities' "passive" negligence but does not apply to the indemnities' "sole" or "active" negligence or "willful misconduct" within the meaning of Civil Code Section 2782.
8. **Continuous Effect/Revocation.** All of the conditions of this project approval are continuously in effect throughout the operative life of the project for all approved structures and approved land uses/activities. Failure of the property owner or developer to comply with any or all of the conditions at any time may result in a public hearing and possible revocation of the approved land use, provided adequate notice, time and opportunity is provided to the property owner, developer or other interested party to correct the non-complying situation.

9. **Enforcement.** If any County enforcement activities are required to enforce compliance with the conditions of approval, the property owner or developer shall be charged for such enforcement activities in accordance with the County Code Schedule of Fees.

10. **Expiration.** This project permit approval shall expire and become void if it is not “exercised” within three (3) years of the effective date of this approval, unless an extension of time is approved. The permit is deemed “exercised” when either:
   a. The permittee has commenced actual construction or alteration under a validly issued building permit, or
   b. The permittee has substantially commenced the approved land use or activity on the project site, for those portions of the project not requiring a building permit. (SBCC §86.06.060)
   c. Occupancy of approved land use occupancy of completed structures and operation of the approved and exercised land use remains valid continuously for the life of the project and the approval runs with the land, unless one of the following occurs:
      - Construction permits for all or part of the project are not issued or the construction permits expire before the structure is completed and the final inspection is approved.
      - The land use is determined by the County to be abandoned or non-conforming.
      - The land use is determined by the County to be not operating in compliance with these conditions of approval, the County Code, or other applicable laws, ordinances or regulations. In these cases, the land use may be subject to a revocation hearing and possible termination.

**PLEASE NOTE:** This will be the ONLY notice given of this approval’s expiration date. The developer is responsible to initiate any Extension of Time application.

11. **Extension of Time.** Extensions of time to the expiration date (listed above or as otherwise extended) may be granted in increments each not to exceed an additional three years beyond the current expiration date. An application to request consideration of an extension of time may be filed with the appropriate fees no less than thirty days before the expiration date. Extensions of time may be granted based on a review of the application, which includes a justification of the delay in construction and a plan of action for completion. The granting of such an extension request is a discretionary action that may be subject to additional or revised conditions of approval or site plan modifications. (SBCC §86.06.060)
12. **Notice of Determination.** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an environmental determination study be prepared for this project. This was completed and a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be issued indicating that the project will not have significant environmental impacts with the application of the required mitigation measures. A Notice of Determination along with the said Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be filed with the Clerk of the Board prior to this project approval along with appropriate State Fish & Game fee of $2,151.50 which includes a filing fee of $50.00.

13. **Project Account.** The Job Costing System (JCS) account number is P201000506. This is an actual cost project with a deposit account to which hourly charges are assessed by various county agency staff (e.g. Land Use Services, Public Works and County Counsel). Upon notice, the developer shall deposit additional funds to maintain or return the account to a positive balance. The developer is responsible for all expenses charged to this account. Processing of the project shall cease if it is determined that the account has a negative balance and that an additional deposit has not been made in a timely manner. A minimum balance of $1000.00 shall be in the project account at the time of project approval and the initiation of the Condition Compliance Review. Sufficient funds shall remain in the account to cover all estimated charges that may be made during each compliance review. All fees required for processing shall be paid in full prior to final inspection, occupancy and/or operation of each approved use in each approved structure or land use activity area. There shall be sufficient funds ($500.00) remaining in the account at the time final/occupancy permits are issued to properly fund file closure and any other required post-occupancy compliance review and inspection requirements (e.g. landscape performance).

14. **Development Impact Fees.** Additional fees may be required prior to issuance of development permits. Fees shall be paid as specified in adopted fee ordinances.

15. **Condition Compliance.** In order to obtain construction permits for grading, building, final inspection and tenant occupancy for each approved building, the developer shall process Condition Compliance Release Form(s) (CCRF) for this wireless facility through County Planning in accordance with the directions stated in the Approval letter. County Planning shall release its holds on each phase of development by providing to County Building and Safety the following:
   a. **Grading Permits:** A copy of the signed CCRF for grading/land disturbance and two "red" stamped and signed approved copies of the grading plans.
   b. **Building Permits:** A copy of the signed CCRF for building permits and three "red" stamped and signed approved copies of the final approved site plan.
   c. **Final Inspection:** A copy of the signed CCRF for final inspection, after an on-site compliance inspection by County Planning.
16. **Additional Permits.** The developer shall ascertain compliance with all laws, ordinances, regulations and any other requirements of Federal, State, County and Local agencies that may apply for the development and operation of the approved land use. These may include but not limited to:
   a. **FEDERAL:** None identified
   b. **STATE:** CalTrans, South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD), (Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQMB)).
   c. **COUNTY:** Land Use Services – Building and Safety/Code Enforcement, County Fire/HazMat; Public Health – Environmental Health Services, Public Works – Land Development and Traffic, County Surveyor, and
   d. **LOCAL:** Morongo Valley Fire Department.

17. **Continuous Maintenance.** The project developer shall continually maintain the property so that it is visually attractive and not dangerous to the health, safety and general welfare of both on- and off-site users (e.g. wireless company employees and visiting public to this tourism destination) and surrounding properties and residences. The developer shall ensure that all facets of the development are regularly inspected, maintained and repaired in a timely fashion. Elements to be maintained are but are not limited to:
   a. **Annual maintenance and repair** inspections shall be conducted for all structures, fencing/walls, walks, parking area, driveways, and signs to assure proper structural, electrical and mechanical safety and a properly operating irrigation system.
   b. **Graffiti and debris** shall be removed immediately with monthly maintenance.
   c. **Landscaping** shall be maintained in a continual healthy thriving manner at proper height for required screening. Drought-resistant, fire retardant vegetation shall be used where practicable. Where landscaped areas are irrigated it shall be done in a manner designed to conserve water, minimizing aerial spraying.
   d. **Fuel modification zones** shall be maintained annually to ensure on-going protection from wildland fire.
   e. **Erosion control** measures shall be maintained to reduce water runoff, siltation, and promote slope stability.
   f. **Architectural controls** shall be enforced by the developer to maintain compatibility of with the project approval.
   g. **External Storage,** loading, recycling and trash storage are **NOT** allowed.
   h. **Metal Storage Containers** are **NOT** allowed as part of this approval.
   i. **Screening** shall be visually attractive to ensure wireless facility, the lease area and supporting equipment are screened from public view from street level.
   j. **Signage** including posted area signs (e.g. “No Trespassing”) and all other on-site signs shall be maintained in a clean readable condition at all times and all graffiti and vandalism shall be removed on a regular basis.
   k. **Parking** on site shall be for wireless company employees ONLY while servicing the site limited to the designated area per approved site plan.
18. **Performance Standards.** The approved land uses shall operate in compliance with the general performance standards listed in the County Development Code Chapter 83.01, regarding air quality, electrical disturbance, fire hazards (storage of flammable or other hazardous materials), heat, noise, vibration and the disposal of liquid waste. In addition to these, none of the following shall be perceptible without instruments at any point outside the project boundaries at adjoining property lines:
   a. **Odors:** No offensive or objectionable odor
   b. **Emissions:** No emission of dirt, dust, fly ash, and other forms of particulate matter.
   c. **Smoke:** No smoke from any project source shall be emitted of a greater density than that described in No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart (as published currently by the United States Bureau of Mines)
   d. **Radiation:** No dangerous amount of radioactive emissions.
   e. **Toxic Gases:** No emission of toxic, noxious or corrosive fumes of gases.
   f. **Glare:** No intense glare that is not effectively screened from view at any point outside the project boundary.

19. **Lighting.** The glare from any luminous source, including on-site lighting shall not exceed one-half (0.5) foot-candle at property line. All lighting shall be limited to that necessary for maintenance activities and security purposes. This is to allow minimum obstruction of night sky remote area views. No light shall project onto adjacent roadways in a manner that interferes with on-coming traffic or into adjacent native vegetated areas that may disturb nocturnal wildlife. All signs proposed by this project shall only be lit by steady, stationary, shielded light directed at the sign, by light inside the sign, by direct stationary neon lighting or in the case of an approved electronic message center sign alternating no more than once every five seconds.

20. **Telecommunication Facility Time Limit.** The occupancy and use of the telecommunication facility is limited to a renewable 10 year period. The facility is subject to evaluation, renewal and extension in 10 year increments. Planning staff shall evaluate the applicability of current technology to determine if the facility should be required to be upgraded, continue as approved or be terminated. Planning staff will also evaluate whether the facility remains compatible with adjacent land uses and if any additional buffering and screening measures are appropriate. If planning staff determines that the use should be terminated then a public hearing before the Planning Commission shall be scheduled to validate the staff determination and to determine a reasonable amortization period. Should the Planning Commission act to terminate the telecommunication facility use, then it shall no longer be considered a valid legal use of the land after the established termination date. The wireless service provider will be granted a minimum of one year from the date of the Planning Commission action to terminate operations. Any unapproved use of the telecommunication facility beyond the termination date shall be an enforceable violation.
21. **Clear Sight Triangle.** Adequate visibility for vehicular and pedestrian traffic shall be provided at clear sight triangles at all intersections of public rights-of-way and private driveways. All signs, structures and landscaping located within any clear sight triangle shall comply with the height and location requirements specified by County Development Code (SBCC§ 83.02.030) or as otherwise required by County Traffic.

22. **Underground Utilities.** There shall be no new above ground power or communication lines extended to the site. All new utilities shall be placed underground in a manner, which avoids disturbing any existing/natural vegetation or the site appearance. Existing utilities around the site perimeter shall also be placed underground, where possible in coordination with the utility provider.

23. **Aesthetics.** In order to minimize any potential impact on the surrounding mountainous vista and the immediate surroundings of 29 Palms Highway in Morongo Valley, the following requirements shall apply:

   a. The monopalm shall be designed to have a natural tree like appearance to include shape, color and texture, and shall be subject to review and approval by County Planning.

   b. The equipment shelter shall be designed to appear as a small cottage to block from public view all utility cabinets and related equipment. The required cottage like structure shall be similar to those already existing on the parcel immediately to the north of the project site.

   c. To further blend with the immediate surroundings, a color and material pallet shall be required for equipment shelter to ensure that the shelter's walls and roof shall be consistent with the referenced structures to the north. Stucco walls and a tiled roof shall be required.

   d. Four field-dug, mature palm trees shall be planted in the immediate vicinity of the proposed monopalm as depicted on the approved site plan.

   e. The monopalm cell tower shall be camouflaged as a palm tree as reviewed and approved by County Planning as depicted in the color material palette provided specifically for this tower to blend-in with its surrounding environment.

   f. The camouflaged monopalm tree shall utilize simulated tree trunk bark, branches, needles, and antenna socks while forming a natural taper.

   g. Native drought tolerant shrubs shall be required and planted within outer 8-foot perimeter of the equipment shelter, to further minimize potential adverse impact on the 29 Palms Highway pedestrian viewedshed.

   h. A Landscape Maintenance Program shall be required to ensure thriving growth of the planted materials which may include offsite landscaping contractors with mobile watering capability to ensure timely watering, pruning, debris removal and maintenance of all planted materials.

   [Mitigation Measure I-1]
24. **Renewable Occupancy.** The occupancy and use of the telecommunication facility is limited to a renewable ten (10) year period. The facility is subject to evaluation, renewal and extension in ten (10) years increments. Planning staff shall evaluate the applicability of current technology to determine if the facility should be required to be upgraded, continue as approved or be terminated. Planning staff shall also evaluate whether the facility remains compatible with adjacent land uses and if any additional buffering and screening measures are appropriate. If planning staff determines that the use should be terminated then a public hearing before the Planning Commission shall be scheduled to validate the staff determination and to determine a reasonable amortization period. Should the Planning Commission act to terminate the telecommunication facility use, then it shall no longer be considered a valid legal use of the land after the established termination date. The owner shall be granted a minimum of one (1) year from the date of the Planning Commission action to terminate operations. Any unapproved use of the telecommunication facility beyond the termination date shall be an enforceable violation.

25. **FCC Conformance.** The developer of the telecommunication facility shall operate the proposed radio/telephone equipment in strict conformance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations at all times so as not to cause a Public Health and Safety Hazard or nuisance to nearby properties and their radio and television reception. If, in the future, the FCC adopts more stringent Radio Frequency (RF) emission regulations, the developer shall submit an application to the County of San Bernardino to modify the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in order to demonstrate compliance with the revised FCC regulations. Failure by the developer to apply for such a review of the subject CUP to conform to the FCC approval of revised RF emission regulations, shall subject this approval to possible revocation of the approval.

**LAND USE SERVICES – Code Enforcement (760) 995-8140**

26. **Weed Abatement.** The developer shall comply with San Bernardino County weed abatement regulations [SBCC§ 23.031-23.043] and periodically clear the site of all non-complying vegetation. This includes removal of all Russian thistle (tumbleweeds).

**PUBLIC WORKS – Land Development – Drainage (909) 387-8149**

27. **Infrequent Flood Hazards.** The site may be subject to infrequent flood hazards by reasons of overflow, erosion and debris deposition in the event of a major storm.

28. **FEMA Flood Zone.** The project is located within Flood Zone _A_ according to FEMA Panel Number 8850_H dated 08/28/2008 and will require the building pad to be elevated a minimum _2_ feet above natural highest adjacent ground in compliance with FEMA/SBC regulations.

29. **Tributary Drainage.** Adequate provisions should be made to intercept and conduct the tributary off site - on site drainage flows around and through the site in a manner, which will not adversely affect adjacent or downstream properties at the time the site is developed.
30. **Natural Drainage.** The natural drainage courses traversing the site shall not be occupied or obstructed.

31. **Additional Drainage Requirements.** In addition to drainage requirements stated herein, other "on-site" and/or "off-site" improvements may be required which cannot be determined from tentative plans at this time and would have to be reviewed after more complete improvement plans and profiles have been submitted to this office.

Caltrans (909) 383-4557

32. **Caltrans Review.** The project as proposed does not appear to have any major impacts to the State Highway System. The California Department of Transportation reserves the right to comment should this proposal be later modified and revised.

MORONGO VALLEY FIRE – Community Safety (760) 363-6211

33. **Jurisdiction.** The above referenced project is under the jurisdiction of the Morongo Valley Fire Department herein ("Fire Department"). Prior to any construction occurring on any parcel, the developer shall contact the 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.

34. **Additional Requirements.** In addition to the Fire requirements stated herein, other onsite and offsite improvements may be required which cannot be determined from tentative plans at this time and would have to be reviewed after more complete improvement plans and profiles have been submitted to this office.

35. **Certificate of Occupancy.** Permission to occupy or use the building (Certification of Occupancy or Shell Release) will not be granted until the Fire Department inspects, approves and signs off on the building and safety job card for "Final Fire".

36. **FS-2.** The County General Plan designates this property as being within the Fire Safety Review Area 2 and all future construction shall adhere to all applicable standards and requirements of this overlay district.

37. **PSTS Non-Interference.** Cell site installation and operation of the proposed system shall not cause harmful interference to the County's Public Safety Telecommunications System (PSTS). If it is determined that the system causes harmful interference with PSTS operations the cell tower operations shall cease immediately upon order of the Fire Chief or other County official.

38. **Code References.** The listed requirements and conditions for this project are based on the California Fire Code 2010.
39. **Driveway Approach or Emergency Vehicle Access.** Driveway Approach or Emergency Vehicle Access routes shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide. CFC 503.2.1

40. **Waste Accumulation.** Combustible waste material creating a fire hazard shall not be allowed to accumulate in buildings or structures or upon premises. CFC 304.1

41. **Address Identification.** New and existing buildings shall have approved address numbers, building numbers or approved building identification placed in a position that is plainly legible and visible from the street or road fronting the property. These numbers shall be Arabic numbers or alphabetical letters. Numbers shall be a minimum of 4 inches high with a minimum stroke width of 0.5 inch. Where access is by means of a private road and the building cannot be viewed from the public way, a monument, pole or other sign or means shall be used to identify the structure. CFC 505.1

42. **Fire Fee.** The required fire fee of $500.00 shall be paid to Morongo Valley Community Service District. This fee is in addition to other fees that may be required by other agencies in regards to this project.
PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS
OR LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITIES
The Following Shall Be Completed

LAND USE SERVICES – Building and Safety (760) 995-8140

43. **Tree Removal Plan.** A preconstruction inspection, tree removal plan and permit in compliance with the County's Plant Protection and Management Ordinance, shall be approved prior to any land disturbance and/or removal of any trees or plants.

44. **Grading Plan.** If grading exceeds fifty (50) cubic yards, approved plans will be required.

45. **SWPPP.** Submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

LAND USE SERVICES – Planning (760) 995-8140

46. **Air Quality – Dust Control Plan.** The developer shall submit to County Planning a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to the requirements of the DCP. The DCP shall include these elements to reduce dust production:
   a. Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist through a minimum of twice daily waterings to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities.
   b. Street sweeping shall be conducted when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped by construction vehicles.
   c. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday.
   d. Tires of vehicles will be washed before the vehicle leaves the project site and enters a paved road.
   e. All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.
   f. During high wind conditions (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 25 mph), areas with disturbed soil shall be watered hourly and activities on unpaved surfaces shall be terminated until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.
   g. Storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall either be: Sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, or covered with plastic or revegetated.

[Mitigation Measure III-1]
47. **Air Quality – Construction Mitigation.** The Developer shall submit written verification that all construction contracts and sub-contracts for the project contain provisions that require adherence to the following standards to reduce impacts to air quality: During construction, each contractor and subcontractor shall implement the following, whenever feasible:
   a. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts. For daily forecast, call (800) 367-4710 (San Bernardino & Riverside counties).
   b. Trucks/equipment shall not be left idling on site for periods in excess of 10 minutes.
   c. Provide temporary traffic control during all phases of construction.
   d. Substitute electric and gasoline-powered equipment for diesel-powered equipment.
   e. Onsite electrical power hook-ups shall be provided for electric construction tools to eliminate the need for diesel-powered electronic generators.
   f. Install storm water control systems to prevent mud deposition onto paved areas during construction.
   g. Contractors shall use low sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment as required by AQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2 to reduce the release of undesirable emissions.

[Mitigation Measure III-2]

48. **Air Quality – Coating Restrictions.** The developer shall submit a letter agreeing to these Coating Restrictions and to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to these requirements. These shall include, but are not be limited to:

   a. Architectural coatings with Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) shall not have content greater than 100 g/l.
   b. Architectural coating volume shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROG, which is 75 lbs./day and the combined daily ROC volume of architectural coatings and asphalt paving shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROC of 75 lbs. per day.
   c. High-Volume, Low Pressure (HVLP) spray guns will be used to apply coatings.

[Mitigation Measure III-3]
49. **Cultural Resources.** The developer shall prepare, submit for review and obtain approval of a letter agreeing to adhere to the following requirements and to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that project contractors adhere to the following requirements:

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

[Mitigation Measure V-1]

50. **Noise Mitigation.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval of an agreement letter that stipulates that all construction contracts/subcontracts contain as a requirement that the following noise attenuation measures be implemented:

a. Exterior construction activities shall be limited between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. There shall be no exterior construction activities on Sundays or National Holidays.

b. Interior construction activities may occur on any day and any time provided they comply with the County noise standards. (SBCC 83.01.080).

c. Construction equipment shall be muffled per manufacturer’s specifications.

d. All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

[Mitigation Measure XII-1]

PUBLIC WORKS – Land Development – Drainage (909) 387- 8145

51. **FEMA Flood Zone.** The project is located within Flood Zone _A_ according to FEMA Panel Number 8850 H dated 08/28/2008 and will require the building pad to be elevated a minimum _2_ feet above natural highest adjacent ground in compliance with FEMA/SBC regulations.

52. **Natural Drainage.** The natural drainage courses traversing the site shall not be occupied or obstructed.


**PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS**

*The Following Shall Be Completed*

**LAND USE SERVICES – Building and Safety (760) 995-8140**

53. **Erosion Control.** Prior to issuance of building permits, erosion control devices must be installed at all perimeter openings and slopes. No sediment is to leave the job site.

54. **Runoff Control.** All runoff must be held to pre-development levels per Section 82.13.080 of the San Bernardino County Development Code.

55. **Building Plans Approval.** Any building, sign, or structure to be constructed or located on site will require professional prepared plans approved by the Building and Safety Division.

56. **Flood Hazard Review.** A Flood Hazard Review approved by the Drainage Section - Land Development is required prior to any submittals to Building and Safety.

57. **Green Building Measures.** All new buildings shall be designed to include the “Green Building Measures” as outlined in the California Green Building Standards Code.

**LAND USE SERVICES – Planning (760) 995-8140**

58. **Facility Design.** Design of the proposed telecom facility shall comply with the criteria outlined in "Mitigating Measures I-1: Aesthetics". Samples materials and colors for use in all project components including the monopalm and the cottage like structure used as equipment shelter shall be submitted to County Planning for review and approval.

59. **Concealment Painting.** The developer shall submit project site photographs taken from various perspectives during a sunny day to establish the 'Predominant Viewing Background'. Support facilities and equipment shall be painted in non-reflective paint to provide concealment and to blend in with the 'predominant viewing background'. Suitable color palette and ‘paint chips’ shall be proposed and approved to ensure all concealments are consistent with the objectives of "Mitigating Measures I-1: Aesthetics”.

60. **Telecommunication Co-location Agreement.** The developer shall sign an agreement with the County that clearly establishes a commitment both in design and policy to allow for future joint use or co-location of other telecommunication facilities at this same Telecom/Cell Tower site. The document shall be reviewed and approved by County Planning Staff enforced through the required SUP and retained for future reference to allow coordination with future telecommunication providers/networks in this region.
61. **Termination Agreement.** The developer of the telecommunication facility and the property owner shall sign an agreement with the County which states that they:
   a. Agree to terminate the described land use within ten (10) years from its approval, OR as extended, OR before any termination date established through a public hearing before the Planning Commission.
   b. Agree that no vested right to such land use shall exist after such termination date is established.
   c. Agree not to transfer ownership of the described property or operation rights of this telecommunication facility without first notifying the prospective purchaser(s) of the provisions, limitations and these “Conditions of Approval” and the “Telecom Facility Agreement” signed to the satisfaction of County Counsel and Planning; and
   d. Agree that this agreement shall be enforced through a required Special Use Permit.

**PUBLIC WORKS – Land Development – Road (909) 387-8145**

62. **Road Dedication/Improvement.** The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from the County Public Works of the following dedications, plans and permits for the listed required improvements, designed by a Registered Civil Engineer (RCE), licensed in the State of California. These shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (DPW), located at 825 E. Third Street, San Bernardino CA 92415-0835. Phone: (909) 387-8145. 29 Palms Highway (Major Highway – 104')

63. **Road Dedication.** A 2-foot grant of easement is required to provide a half-width right-of-way of 52’.

64. **Caltrans Approval.** Obtain comments, approval and permits from Caltrans for access requirements and working within their right-of-way.

**PUBLIC WORKS / Traffic Division (909) 387-8186**

65. **Caltrans Comments.** Project fronts SH-62, which is within Caltrans jurisdiction. Please forward project to Caltrans for comments.

**MORONGO VALLEY FIRE – Community Safety (760) 363-6211**

66. **Cell Towers Fire Safety.** Cell towers that are proposed with a camouflaged covering (e.g. tree) shall submit three (3) sets of plans to the Fire Department for approval. These plans shall indicate that all such exterior camouflaged covering shall be of an approved fire resistive material. CFC 105.4

67. **Cell Site Building Plan Review.** The developer shall submit three (3) sets of building plans to the Fire Department for review and approval. CFC 105.4

*Project-specific conditions are italicized*

*Environmental mitigation measures are bold*
PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION OR OCCUPANCY
The Following Shall Be Completed

COUNTY FIRE – Hazardous Material (909) 386-8401

68. **Business Emergency Plan.** The operator shall submit a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan for emergency release or threatened release of hazardous materials and wastes or a letter of exemption. Contact office of the Fire Marshal, Hazardous Materials Division at (909) 386-8401.

69. **Hazardous Material Permits.** The developer shall be required to apply for one or more of the following: A Hazardous Materials Handler Permit, a Hazardous Waste Generator Permit, an Aboveground Storage Tank Permit, and/or an Underground Storage Tank Permit.

MORONGO VALLEY FIRE – Community Safety (760) 363-6211

70. **Key Boxes and Locks.** A Fire Department approved key box and/or locks are required to gain access to the building, gate or similar barriers for the purpose of life saving or firefighting. CFC 506.1 and 506.1.1

LAND USE SERVICES – Planning (760) 995-8140

71. **Screen Wall Installation.** The required enclosing screen wall shall be completely installed as shown on the approved site plan.

72. **Complete Installation.** All approved and required improvements including the monopole cell tower as shown on the approved site plan shall be installed in their entirety.

LAND USE SERVICES – Building and Safety (760) 995-8140

73. **Planning Approval.** Prior to occupancy, all Planning Division requirements and sign-offs shall be completed.

LAND USE SERVICES – Code Enforcement (760) 995-8140

74. **Special Use Permit.** The developer shall submit for review and gain approval for a Special Use Permit (SUP). Thereafter, the SUP shall be renewed annually subject to annual inspections. The annual SUP inspections shall review & confirm continuing compliance with the listed conditions of approval, including all mitigation measures. This comprehensive compliance review shall include evaluation of the maintenance of all storage areas, landscaping, screening and buffering. Failure to comply shall cause enforcement actions against the developer. Such actions may cause a hearing or an action that could result in revocation of this approval and imposition of additional sanctions and/or penalties in accordance with established land use enforcement procedures. Any additional inspections that are deemed necessary by the Code Enforcement Supervisor shall constitute a special inspection and shall be charged at a rate in accordance with the County Fee Schedule, including travel time, not to exceed three (3) hours per inspection.
75. **Telecommunication Facility Maintenance.** All required landscaping, screening, buffering, painting, and project camouflaging shall be maintained in good standing.

76. **Telecommunication Facility Time Limit.** Ten (10) years from the effective date of this approval, County Code Enforcement shall review and consider granting of a land use approval renewal for another 10-year term based on available technology and land use compatibility at the time of the review.

77. **Continued Compliance.** Special Use Permit shall authorize and ensure continued compliance in areas of telecommunication facility FCC-RF regulation reevaluation, site restoration upon project abandonment, termination and co-location agreements.

78. **Telecom Tower Removal Surety.** Surety in a form and manner determined acceptable to County Counsel and the Land Use Services Director shall be required for the complete removal of the telecommunication tower and other elements of the facility. The developer shall either:
   a. Post a performance or other equivalent surety bond issued by an admitted surety insurer to guarantee the complete removal of the telecommunication tower and other elements of the facility in a form or manner determined acceptable to County Counsel and the Land Use Services Director in an amount equal to 120% of the cost estimate generated by a licensed civil engineer and approved by the Land Use Services Director; OR
   b. Cause the issuance of a certificate of deposit or an irrevocable letter of credit payable to the County of San Bernardino issued by a bank or savings association authorized to do business in this state and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the purpose of guaranteeing the complete removal of the telecommunication tower and other elements of the facility in a form or manner determined acceptable to County Counsel and the Land Use Services Director in an amount equal to 120% of the cost estimate generated by a licensed civil engineer and approved by the Land Use Services Director.

End of Conditions
INITIAL STUDY
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

PROJECT LABEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN:</th>
<th>0583-271-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT:</td>
<td>ROYAL STREET COMMUNICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING:</td>
<td>GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PROPOSAL: | CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTABLISH A WIRELESS FACILITY CONSISTING OF ONE (1) GPS ANTE 
NNA AND SIX (6) PANEL ANTENNAS MOUNTED ON A 60-FOOT HIGH MONOPALM CELL TOWER ALONG WITH 
FOUR (4) UTILITY CABINETS TO BE LOCATED WITHIN A 600 SQ FT EQUIPMENT SHELTER ON A PORTION OF 1.29 ACRES. |
| COMMUNITY: LOCATION: | MORONGO VALLEY/3RD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT NORTH SIDE OF 29 PALMS HIGHWAY, APPROXIMATELY 360 FEET WEST OF EAST DRIVE P20100365/CUP CELL TOWER |
| PROJECT #: | |
| REP(5): | CMH CONSULTING GROUP |
| STAFF: | OXSO SHAHRARI, PLANNER |

USGS Quad: Morongo Valley

T, R, Section: T1S R4E Sec. 28 SW 1/4

Thomas Bros.: 615-J5
Planning Area: Morongo Valley

LUD: GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG)
Overlays: Fire Safety FS-2, Scenic Overlay, and Low-Moderate Liquefaction Susceptibility 29 Palms HWY Scenic Corridor

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead Agency: County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue; First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Contact Person: Oxsu Shahrari, Planner
Phone No: (760) 995-8156 / (760) 995-8140
Fax No: (760) 995-8170
E-mail: oshahrari@lusd.sbcounty.gov

Project Sponsor: Royal Street Communications
350 Commerce, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92602
(858) 602-6380

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is a Conditional Use Permit to establish a wireless telecommunication facility consisting of one (1) GPS antenna and six (6) panel antennas mounted on a 60-foot high monopalm along with four (4) utility cabinets to be located within a 600 SQ FT equipment shelter on a portion of 1.29 acres.

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project is located at the northern side of 29 Palms HWY, approximately 360 feet west of East Drive. The project site is zoned Morongo Valley General Commercial (MV/CG). The site is cleared of any vegetation and contains no indigenous plants of concern. The project site is cleared of any vegetation and contains no indigenous plants of concern. The project site is within FS2 Fire Safety for which it has been reviewed and conditioned by County Fire. The site is also within the 29 Palms Highway Scenic Resources Overlay. Any potential negative impact in the area of aesthetics is mitigated by the requirements included in Mitigation Measure I-1: Aesthetics.
Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Federal: None; State of California: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fish and Game; County of San Bernardino: Land Use Services – Code Enforcement; Building and Safety, Public Health-Environmental Health Services, Special Districts, Public Works & County Fire. Local: Morongo Valley Fire Department (MVFD)
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 eighteen (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 Impact | 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.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities / Service Systems
- [ ] Agriculture Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hydrology / Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology / Soils
- [ ] Land Use / Planning
- [ ] Population / Housing
- [ ] Transportation / Traffic

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): Oxso Shahriari, Planner  Date: 06/06/2011

Signature: Matt Slowik, Principal Planner  Date: 06/06/2011
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I. **AESTHETICS** - Would the project
   
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I a) The project site sits directly on the 29 Palms Highway which is a designated Scenic Corridor. The project site is exposed to the vehicular and pedestrian traffic traveling along the 29 Palms Highway especially at the south-southeast corner. The proposed project has the potential to negatively impact the visual resources of the Morongo Valley both aerially and at the pedestrian level. Mitigation measures tailored specifically for this project shall be applied to minimize any potential impact to

The monopalm’s design shall be reviewed and approved by County Planning to ensure that the tree-like appearance, natural colors and textures are installed as proposed. Field-dug palm trees and drought tolerant shrubbery shall be required and are anticipated to further enhance the site and mitigate any potential aesthetic/visual impacts. With the natural growth of the newly planted palm trees and shrubbery, appropriate density of vegetation shall be accomplished to mitigate any potential visual impact on the surrounding properties and on scenic resources. As a condition of approval, all the required landscaping components shall be kept in the thriving conditions throughout the life of the project.

I b) The proposed project has the potential to substantially damage scenic resources. However, the mitigation measure I-1 shall be required to ensure any potential impact is minimized to less than significant. The monopalm shall adhere to a tree-like appearance bearing natural colors and textures to camouflage its intended use to ensure it does not impede on the surrounding vista. There are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings on the site.

I c) The proposed project has the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. However the project will be conditioned to ensure it is consistent with its context and the similar uses in the area. The project shall incorporate camouflaging and landscaping to screen the equipment shelter and the lease area to further minimize any potential impact to less than significant. Additionally, the equipments shelter shall take a cottage-like appearance.
I d) The proposed project's onsite lighting will be designed in accordance with standards defined in the County Development Code. Due to the nature of this proposed project, no significant impact is anticipated at this time.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measure is required as a condition of approval to reduce potential impacts to below level of significance.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

I-1 Aesthetics. In order to minimize any potential impact on the surrounding mountainous vista and the immediate surroundings of 29 Palms Highway in Morongo Valley, the following requirements shall apply:

a. The monopalm shall be designed to have a natural tree like appearance to include shape, color and texture, and shall be subject to review and approval by County Planning.

b. The equipment shelter shall be designed to appear as a small cottage to block from public view all utility cabinets and related equipment. The required cottage like structure shall be similar to those already existing on the parcel immediately to the north of the project site.

c. To further blend with the immediate surroundings, a color and material pallet shall be required for equipment shelter to ensure that the shelter's walls and roof shall be consistent with the referenced structures to the north. Stucco walls and a tiled roof shall be required.

d. Four field-dug, mature palm trees shall be planted in the immediate vicinity of the proposed monopalm as depicted on the approved site plan.

e. The monopalm cell tower shall be camouflaged as a palm tree as reviewed and approved by County Planning as depicted in the color material palette provided specifically for this tower to blend-in with its surrounding environment.

f. The camouflaged monopalm tree shall utilize simulated tree trunk bark, branches, needles, and antenna socks while forming a natural taper.

g. Native drought tolerant shrubs shall be required and planted within outer 8-foot perimeter of the equipment shelter, to further minimize potential adverse impact on the 29 Palms Highway pedestrian viewsed.

h. A Landscape Maintenance Program shall be required to ensure thriving growth of the planted materials which may include offsite landscaping contractors with mobile watering capability to ensure timely watering, pruning, debris removal and maintenance of all planted materials.

[Mitigation Measure I-1]
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 the 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? □ □ □ □ ☒

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

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? □ □ □ ☒

d) Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use? □ □ □ ☒

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 forestland to non-forest use? □ □ □ ☒
SUBSTANTIATION  (Check □ if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

II a) 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. Therefore, proposed development will not negate any agricultural uses on the site.

II b) The proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract because the subject property is not zoned for agricultural use.

II c) The proposed use does not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Prime Farmland, to a non-agricultural use because no agricultural use exist on the project site or the general vicinity. Also, the designated land use zoning district does not associate with agricultural use.

II d) The proposed use does not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use because the project proposal does not involve forest land or timberland?

II e) The proposed use does not involve 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 forestland to non-forest use because the project site does not meet the definitions of farmland or forestland.

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

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? □ ☒ □ □ □

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)? □ □ □ ☒ □

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? □ □ □ ☒ □

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? □ □ □ ☒ □

SUBSTANTIATION (Discuss conformity with the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

III a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, because the proposed uses do not exceed the established air quality thresholds. Traffic increase will be minimal due to the unmanned nature of the proposed use, therefore no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measure is deemed necessary.

III b) The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use does not exceed thresholds of concern as established by the District. However, Air Quality Dust Control, Construction, and Coating Restriction Plans shall be required as mitigation measures to limit fugitive dust and regulate construction activities. Upon completion, the site will be paved and landscaped which will mean little or no wind-blown dust or particulate matter will leave the site. The equipment proposed for this project is deemed incapable of generating long term criteria pollutant and no Green House Gas (GHG) emissions are anticipated.
III c) The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), because the proposed uses do not exceed established thresholds of concern. The equipment proposed for this project does not generate criteria pollutants and the minimal energy consumption of the project clearly will not approach the threshold of potentially significant Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. Therefore no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

III d) The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because there are no identified concentrations of substantial pollutants and the project is not located within ¼ mile of a use considered a sensitive receptor.

III e) The project will not create odors affecting a substantial number of people because there are no identified potential uses that will result in the production of objectionable odors.

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

**MM# Mitigation Measures**

**III-1 Air Quality – Dust Control Plan.** The developer shall submit to County Planning a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to the requirements of the DCP. The DCP shall include these elements to reduce dust production:

a. Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist through a minimum of twice daily waterings to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities.

b. Street sweeping shall be conducted when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roads to remove dirt dropped by construction vehicles.

c. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday.

d. Tires of vehicles will be washed before the vehicle leaves the project site and enters a paved road.

e. Any truck hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.

f. During high wind conditions (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 25 mph), areas with disturbed soil shall be watered hourly and activities on unpaved surfaces shall be terminated until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.

g. Storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall either be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, or covered with plastic or revegetated.

[MITIGATION MEASURE III-1]
III-2 Air Quality – Construction Plan. Developer shall submit written verification that all construction contracts and sub-contracts for the project contain provisions that require adherence to the following standards to reduce impacts to air quality. During construction, each contractor and subcontractor shall implement the following, whenever feasible:

a. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts. For daily forecast, call (800) 367-4710 (San Bernardino and Riverside counties).

b. Trucks/equipment shall not be left idling on site for periods in excess of 10 minutes.

c. Provide temporary traffic control during all phases of construction.

d. Substitute diesel-powered equipment with electric and gasoline-powered equipment.

e. Onsite electrical power hook-ups shall be provided for electric construction tools to eliminate the need for diesel-powered electronic generators.

f. Install storm water control systems to prevent mud deposition onto paved areas during construction.

g. Contractors shall use low sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment as required by AQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2 to reduce the release of undesirable emissions.

[Mitigation Measure III-2]

III-3 Air Quality – Coating Restriction Plan. The developer shall submit a letter agreeing to these Coating Restrictions and to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to these requirements. These shall include, but are not be limited to:

a. Architectural coatings with Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) shall not have a content greater than 100 g/l.

b. Architectural coating volume shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROG, which is 75 lbs./day and the combined daily ROC volume of architectural coatings and asphalt paving shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROC of 75 lbs. per day.

c. High-Volume, Low Pressure (HVLP) spray guns will be used to apply coatings.

[Mitigation Measure III-3]
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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

IV a) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, because possible impact to the biological resources is deemed minimal due to the site’s considerable prior disturbance, highway construction and road improvements in the immediate vicinity.
A Biological Resources Impact Analysis prepared by Michael Brandman Associates finds that the site is not a suitable habitat for any sensitive plant or wildlife species. Based on a site survey and literature review, the study finds no jurisdictional waters or wetlands present on or in the vicinity of the project site. The study concludes that no protected nesting birds are anticipated to be directly or indirectly impacted. Therefore, no potentially adverse biological impact is anticipated.

IV b) 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service because no such biological resources, riparian habitat or sensitive natural community are identified on site.

IV c) 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 located within an identified protected wetland.

IV d) 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 the substantial prior disturbance of the site and infrastructure improvements in the immediate vicinity have rendered any possible negative impact less than significant.

IV e) This project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources because the proposed project site has been substantially disturbed with grading which along with highway construction and local road improvement activities have rendered any possible impact less than likely in this area.

IV f) 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 identified on this project site.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

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

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

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

V a) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, because there are no such resources that have been identified in the vicinity of the project. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a precautionary mitigation shall be added to the project conditions that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate excavation and recovery actions mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.

V b) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource, because there are no such resources that have been identified in the vicinity of the project. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a precautionary mitigation shall be added to the project conditions that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate excavation and recovery actions, if any finds are made during project construction.

V c) This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because there are no such resources that have been identified in the vicinity of the project. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a precautionary mitigation shall be added to the project conditions that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate excavation and recovery actions, if any finds are made during project construction.

V d) This project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, because there are no such burial grounds that have been identified in the vicinity of the project. If any human remains are discovered, during construction of this project, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner and County Museum for determination of appropriate excavation and recovery actions; and a Native American representative, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin.
Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated. As a precautionary measure to further reduce any potential for impacts, the following requirement will apply:

**MM# Mitigation Measures**

**V-1 Cultural Resources.** The “developer” shall prepare, submit for review and obtain approval of a letter agreeing to adhere to the following requirements and to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that project contractors adhere to the following requirements:

If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease immediately until written clearance by County Planning is provided indicating that satisfactory resource excavation and recovery has been implemented. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend appropriate action. The developer shall implement any such additional action to the satisfaction of County Planning and the County Museum.

If human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find. If the remains or cultural artifacts are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall also be notified.

[Mitigation Measure V1]
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

   □ □ □ ☒ □

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

   iv) Landslides?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

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

   □ □ □ ▒ □

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?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

   □ □ □ ▒ □

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

VI a) (i-iv) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or iv) Landslides, because there are no such geologic hazards identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The monopalm shall be reviewed and conditioned by County Building & Safety Division; and subsequently constructed with appropriate seismic standards.
VI b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the scope of construction activities of the wireless facility proposed will not require further substantial disturbance of the site.

VI c) The project is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

VI d) The project site is not located in an area that has been identified as having the potential for expansive soils; therefore it will not create substantial risks to life or property.

VI e) The proposed development will not have wastewater disposal needs; therefore no significant impact is anticipated.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISIONS - Would the project:

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

□ □ ☒ □

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

□ □ ☒ □

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

VII a, b) As discussed in Air Quality section of this document, the proposed project’s primary contribution to air emissions is attributable to construction activities. Project construction shall result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the following construction related sources: (1) construction equipment emissions and (2) emissions from construction workers personal vehicles traveling to and from the construction site. Construction-related GHG emissions vary depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, types of equipment, and number of personnel. The Air Quality – Construction Mitigation condition will address the air quality and GHG emission concerns for construction activities including equipment and trucks visiting the site.

The primary emissions that would result from the proposed project occur as carbon dioxide (CO₂) from gasoline and diesel combustion, with more limited vehicle tailpipe emissions of nitrous oxide (N₂O) and methane (CH₄), as well as other GHG emissions related to vehicle cooling systems. Although construction emissions are a one-time event, GHG emissions such as CO₂ can persist in the atmosphere.

On December 6, 2011, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors adopted the County Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction Plan. Once built and operational, this project will be an unmanned site with periodic maintenance trips. The project must adhere with the standard requirements contained within the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan. For these reasons, it is unlikely that this project would impede the state’s ability to meet the reduction targets of AB32. Therefore, any impact in this area of concern will be less than significant.

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

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

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?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

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

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

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?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐  Potential Significant Impact  ☐  Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.  ☒  Less than Significant  ☐  No Impact
SUBSTANTIATION

VII a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because the use proposed is not anticipated to involve such activities. If such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department, and in some instances, to additional land use review.

VII b) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

VII c) The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials and all existing and proposed schools are more than one-quarter mile away from the project site. If such uses are proposed in the future on this site, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department and in some instances additional land use review.

VII d) The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

VII e) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport.

VII f) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip.

VII g) 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 the 29 Palms Highway.

VII h) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, because building drawings shall be submitted to County Fire for review and approval. The proposed wireless facility and its associated cabinets are located in FS-2 Safety Overlay; therefore all construction shall adhere to all applicable standards and requirements of this overlay as conditioned by County Fire. The much needed coverage in the area will contribute to better communication overall and better public safety by increasing access to emergency services when needed. Therefore, no adverse impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

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)?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

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?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

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?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure that would impede or redirect flood flows?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

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?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  
   - Potentially Significant Impact: □   - Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.: □   - Less than Significant: □   - No Impact: □
SUBSTANTIATION

VIII a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because. Landscaping maintenance shall include offsite servicing contractors with mobile watering capability to meet landscape watering needs. A minimal amount of water will be used to establish the plant material. Upon establishment of native plants, no additional water is anticipated.

VIII b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level because Landscaping maintenance shall include offsite servicing contractors with mobile watering capability to meet landscape watering needs, which are anticipated to be very minimal to establish the plant material.

VIII c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including 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 because only minimal grading associated with project construction is necessary; and there are no rivers or streams on site.

VIII d) 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 flooding on- or off-site because no river or stream has been identified on the project site.

VIII e) The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff because no runoff water will be generated on the project site.

VIII f) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures for water quality protection and erosion control have been required.

VIII g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map because the project is not within identified flood hazard areas and it does not involve residential housing development.

VIII h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. The project is located within Flood Zone “A” (according to FEMA Panel Number 8850-H dated 08/28/2008) and will be required to elevate the building pad a minimum two (2) feet above highest natural adjacent ground in compliance with Development Code regulations.

VIII i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.

VIII j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☑ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☑ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☑ ☒ ☐

SUBSTANTIATION

IX a) The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned land uses, therefore no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

IX b) The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, because the project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and General Plan.

IX c) The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, because there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchased as mitigation for the proposed project.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
X. 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? □□☒□

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? □□☒□

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

X a) 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.

X b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the project site.

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

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

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?

**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):

XI a-c) The proposed project will not include uses that will exceed San Bernardino County Noise Standards and those of County Development Code. Vehicular noise due to increased number of occasional service trips to and from the proposed use will be minimal based on the scope and nature of the use proposed. Therefore, no significant impact is anticipated in this area and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

XI d) The project may generate substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project due to construction activities which may include excavations, grading, and building erection/ modification on the project site. Mitigation measures to reduce the impact of these temporary construction activities will be incorporated into the "Conditions of Approval" to reduce impacts to less than significant.
XI e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public/public use airport.

XI f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

**MM# Mitigation Measures**

**XI-1 Noise Mitigation.** The “developer” shall submit for review and obtain approval of an agreement letter that stipulates that all construction contracts/subcontracts contain as a requirement that the following noise attenuation measures be implemented:

a) Exterior construction activities shall be limited between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. There shall be no exterior construction activities on Sundays or National Holidays.

b) Interior construction activities may occur on any day and any time provided they comply with the County noise standards. (SBCC 83.01.080).

c) Construction equipment shall be muffled per manufacturer’s specifications.

d) All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

[Mitigation Measure XI-1]
XII. 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)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

SUBSTANTIATION

XII a) The project will not induce population growth in the area either directly or indirectly because the project will only expand specific cellular use capabilities in the region. The project is not proposing any new residential development and will make use of the existing roads and hospital infrastructure, therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.

XII b) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing because the project's proposed use is for a cellular monopalm tower; therefore no significant impact is anticipated.

XII c) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people because the project site is within a previously disturbed lot zoned for General Commercial therefore it will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XIII. 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? □ □ ☒ □
- Police Protection? □ □ ☒ □
- Schools? □ □ ☒ □
- Parks? □ □ ☒ □
- Other Public Facilities? □ □ ☒ □

SUBSTANTIATION

XIII a) 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 because the proposed development is expected to contribute to overall business tax revenues to provide a source of funding for such governmental facilities and public services which is deemed sufficient to offset any demand increases by this project. Therefore, no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

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

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?

SUBSTANTIATION

XIV a) 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 of the project does not involve residential development and will not cause impacts associated with an increase in populations.

XIV b) This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the proposed development will not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities, therefore no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

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?

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

SUBSTANTIATION

XV a-b) The propose project will not cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections because County Traffic Division has reviewed and determined that the minimal increase in traffic will fall short of County thresholds of impact.

XV c) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, because there are no airports in the vicinity of the project and there is no anticipated notable impact on air traffic volumes by passengers or freight generated by the proposed use and no new air traffic facilities are proposed.

XV d) 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, the 29 Palms HWY and has adequate physical access with appropriate sight distance and properly controlled intersections.
XV e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access, because the project will be conditioned to provide adequate access points, designed to accommodate emergency vehicles, therefore no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

XV f) The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity, because the project involves minimal, intermittent service and maintenance visits only; therefore, no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

XV g) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks), because the scope and nature of the proposed project will not add any substantial transportation needs and/or burden to the existing infrastructure, therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

SUBSTANTIATION

XVI a) The proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board because the project will not have any direct wastewater needs. The project will neither connect nor contribute to any wastewater system. Therefore no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

XVI b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, because the project will have no substantial direct water or wastewater needs. Landscaping maintenance shall include offsite servicing contractors with mobile watering capability to meet landscape watering needs. Therefore no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.
XVI c) 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 because the project will not contribute to generation of additional storm water and/or runoffs due to the project’s minimal site disturbance and/or redirection of natural topography.

XVI d) The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve its operation from existing entitlements and resources the project will not require any water use. No water line extension is required, applied for or approved. Landscaping maintenance shall include offsite servicing contractors with mobile watering capability to meet landscape watering needs.

XVI e) The proposed project will not have any wastewater needs due to the nature of its development. Any future development or expansion that will demonstrate such needs will be subject to DEHS’ approval; therefore no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

XVI f) The proposed project will not have solid waste disposal needs due to the nature of the activities typical of wireless facilities.

XVI g) The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No solid waste needs are anticipated with the proposed wireless facility.

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

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)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly Or indirectly?

SUBSTANTIATION

XVII a) The project will 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 because any possible impact to the biological resources is deemed minimal due to the site’s considerable prior disturbance, highway construction and local road improvements in the immediate vicinity. A Biological Resources Impact Analysis prepared by Michael Brandman Associates finds that the site is not a suitable habitat for any sensitive plant or wildlife species. Based on a site survey and literature review, the study finds no jurisdictional waters or wetlands present on or in the vicinity of the project site. The study concludes that no protected nesting birds are anticipated to be directly or indirectly impacted. Therefore, no potentially adverse biological impact is anticipated.

The equipment proposed for this project is deemed incapable of generating long term criteria pollutant and no Green House Gas (GHG) emissions are anticipated. The Air Quality – Construction Mitigation condition will address the GHG emission concerns for construction activities including equipment and trucks visiting the site.
Additionally, there are no identified historic or prehistoric resources identified on this site. If any archaeological or paleontological resources are identified during land disturbance and/or project construction, the project is conditioned to stop and identify appropriate authorities, which will properly record and/or remove for classification any such finds.

XVII b) The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The other project sites 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 are capable of absorbing such uses without generating any cumulatively significant impacts.

XVII c) The project will not have other environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, as there are no such impacts identified by the studies conducted for this project or identified by review of the design of the proposed project. The project will be conditioned to ensure that all necessary mitigation measures are followed prior to occupancy.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XVIII. MITIGATION MEASURES
(Any mitigation measures, which are not 'self-monitoring shall have a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared and adopted at time of project approval)

SELF MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES: (Condition compliance will be verified by existing procedure)

MM# Mitigation Measures

I-1 Aesthetics. In order to minimize any potential impact on the surrounding mountainous vista and the immediate surroundings of 29 Palms Highway in Morongo Valley, the following requirements shall apply:

a. The monopalm shall be designed to have a natural tree like appearance to include shape, color and texture, and shall be subject to review and approval by County Planning.

b. The equipment shelter shall be designed to appear as a small cottage to block from public view all utility cabinets and related equipment. The required cottage like structure shall be similar to those already existing on the parcel immediately to the north of the project site.

c. To further blend with the immediate surroundings, a color and material pallet shall be required for equipment shelter to ensure that the shelter’s walls and roof shall be consistent with the referenced structures to the north. Stucco walls and a tiled roof shall be required.

d. Four field-dug, mature palm trees shall be planted in the immediate vicinity of the proposed monopalm as depicted on the approved site plan.

e. The monopalm cell tower shall be camouflaged as a palm tree as reviewed and approved by County Planning as depicted in the color material palette provided specifically for this tower to blend-in with its surrounding environment.

f. The camouflaged monopalm tree shall utilize simulated tree trunk bark, branches, needles, and antenna socks while forming a natural taper.

g. Native drought tolerant shrubs shall be required and planted within outer 8-foot perimeter of the equipment shelter, to further minimize potential adverse impact on the 29 Palms Highway pedestrian viewed.

h. A Landscape Maintenance Program shall be required to ensure thriving growth of the planted materials which may include offsite landscaping contractors with mobile watering capability to ensure timely watering, pruning, debris removal and maintenance of all planted materials.

[Mitigation Measure I-1]
Air Quality – Dust Control Plan. The developer shall submit to County Planning a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to the requirements of the DCP. The DCP shall include these elements to reduce dust production:

a. Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist through a minimum of twice daily waterings to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities.

b. Street sweeping shall be conducted when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped by construction vehicles.

c. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday.

d. Tires of vehicles will be washed before the vehicle leaves the project site and enters a paved road.

e. Any truck hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered

f. During high wind conditions (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 25 mph), areas with disturbed soil shall be watered hourly and activities on unpaved surfaces shall be terminated until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.

g. Storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall either be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, or covered with plastic or revegetated.

[Mitigation Measure III-1]
III-2 Air Quality – Construction Plan. Developer shall submit written verification that all construction contracts and sub-contracts for the project contain provisions that require adherence to the following standards to reduce impacts to air quality. During construction, each contractor and subcontractor shall implement the following, whenever feasible:

a. Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts. For daily forecast, call (800) 367-4710 (San Bernardino and Riverside counties).

b. Trucks/equipment shall not be left idling on site for periods in excess of 10 minutes.

c. Provide temporary traffic control during all phases of construction.

d. Substitute diesel-powered equipment with electric and gasoline-powered equipment.

e. Onsite electrical power hook-ups shall be provided for electric construction tools to eliminate the need for diesel-powered electronic generators.

f. Install storm water control systems to prevent mud deposition onto paved areas during construction.

g. Contractors shall use low sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment as required by AQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2 to reduce the release of undesirable emissions.

[Mitigation Measure III-2]

III-3 Air Quality – Coating Restriction Plan. The developer shall submit a letter agreeing to these Coating Restrictions and to include in any construction contracts and/or subcontracts a requirement that the contractors adhere to these requirements. These shall include, but are not be limited to:

a. Architectural coating volume shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROG, which is 75 lbs./day and the combined daily ROC volume of architectural coatings and asphalt paving shall not exceed the significance threshold for ROC of 75 lbs. per day

b. Architectural coatings with Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) shall not have a content greater than 100 g/l.

c. High-Volume, Low Pressure (HVLP) spray guns will be used to apply coatings.

[Mitigation Measure III-3]
V-1 Cultural Resources. The “developer” shall prepare, submit for review and obtain approval of a letter agreeing to adhere to the following requirements and to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that project contractors adhere to the following requirements:

If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease immediately until written clearance by County Planning is provided indicating that satisfactory resource excavation and recovery has been implemented. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend appropriate action. The developer shall implement any such additional action to the satisfaction of County Planning and the County Museum. If human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find. If the remains or cultural artifacts are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall also be notified.

[Mitigation Measure V1]

XI-1 Noise Mitigation. The “developer” shall submit for review and obtain approval of an agreement letter that stipulates that all construction contracts/subcontracts contain as a requirement that the following noise attenuation measures be implemented:

a. Exterior construction activities shall be limited between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. There shall be no exterior construction activities on Sundays or National Holidays.

b. Interior construction activities may occur on any day and any time provided they comply with the County noise standards. (SBCC 83.01.080).

c. Construction equipment shall be muffled per manufacturer’s specifications.

d. All stationary construction equipment shall be placed in a manner so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

[Mitigation Measure XI-1]
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PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Swarat</td>
<td>8847 Ramina Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W. Swarat</td>
<td>8977 Ramona Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Dubois</td>
<td>8989 Beldeymirna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramona CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaker J Adams</td>
<td>4918 Hibiscus Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Scott</td>
<td>14013 Tempo Cir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne Bernstein</td>
<td>4905 Paradise Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline VonFlue</td>
<td>PO Box 1409 MV</td>
<td>Caroline VonFlue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Milligan</td>
<td>1175 Knoch Ave MV</td>
<td>Mary E. Milligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korynthea Blaine</td>
<td>58856 Meredith Ct</td>
<td>Korynthea Blaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Haden</td>
<td>10734 Hess Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salline Hainen</td>
<td>10934 Hess Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley Madden</td>
<td>10934 Hess Blvd</td>
<td>Harley Madden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Madden</td>
<td>10934 Hess Blvd</td>
<td>Tracey Madden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Crotzenburg</td>
<td>P.O. Box 485 YV</td>
<td>Laura Crotzenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Crotzenburg</td>
<td>P.O. Box 485 YV</td>
<td>Tony Crotzenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Lundy</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1501 YV</td>
<td>Deborah Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Rodriguez</td>
<td>2982 Sunset Ave ACE</td>
<td>Alex Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Yakimov</td>
<td>48851 Mudge Dr</td>
<td>Rebecca Yakimov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen McIntyre</td>
<td>49-242 Mojave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Dean McIntyre</td>
<td>49-242 Mojave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante L.</td>
<td>75-56 Renfro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F.</td>
<td>10377 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Dussel</td>
<td>10672 NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Martin</td>
<td>47609 Paradise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Villanueva</td>
<td>49099 Buena Vista</td>
<td>Cynthia Villanueva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenny Phillips</td>
<td>10888 W 62nd Pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Lenninger</td>
<td>10888 W 62nd Pl</td>
<td>Lisa Lenninger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Lenninger</td>
<td>(</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Rawson</td>
<td>52-390 Alameda</td>
<td>Richard Rawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ryan</td>
<td>49258 Paradise Ave</td>
<td>John Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Torres</td>
<td>498342 Palms</td>
<td>U. Torres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Grant</td>
<td>41900 Corvette</td>
<td>Nick Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Wick</td>
<td>11058 S Fontana</td>
<td>Diana Wick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Zunser</td>
<td>47315 81/2 Ave</td>
<td>Marcus Zunser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Green</td>
<td>49099 Corvette</td>
<td>Rick Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Schuster</td>
<td>11441 Chouffe Ave</td>
<td>Glenn Schuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Eden</td>
<td>8348 Rose Eden</td>
<td>Rose Eden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to every day life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Taylor</td>
<td>9820 Rawson Rd</td>
<td>Jimmy Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Taylor</td>
<td>9820 Rawson Rd</td>
<td>Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Shores</td>
<td>10250 Junipier Ave</td>
<td>Kathy Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Shores</td>
<td>10232 Junipier Ave</td>
<td>Lee Shores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hale</td>
<td>10436 Piner</td>
<td>Dennis Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Warstler</td>
<td>49135 Paradise Ave</td>
<td>Penny Warstler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teena Hale</td>
<td>10436 Piner Vista</td>
<td>Teena Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Snowden</td>
<td>49009 Buena Vista</td>
<td>Debra Snowden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Riegel</td>
<td>48955 Park Ave</td>
<td>Patricia Riegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Rehn</td>
<td>9330 Oakmont</td>
<td>Marilyn Rehn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Rehn</td>
<td>3255 Ave Alvera</td>
<td>Shelly Rehn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Frazier</td>
<td>5639 T Joshua Dr</td>
<td>Chris Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Pessa</td>
<td>7575 Lucerne Vista Yu</td>
<td>Rebecca Pessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEANA R Wilson</td>
<td>52125 Desert Ave Rd FT0282</td>
<td>DEANA R Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Pitt</td>
<td>57732 Juanz</td>
<td>Andy Pitts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Soares</td>
<td>58347 Taos Trl</td>
<td>Brad Soares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schultz</td>
<td>7804 Jemez Trl, Yu</td>
<td>Michael Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Schultz</td>
<td>7804 Jemez Trl, Yu</td>
<td>Grace Schultz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21st century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Alwine</td>
<td>48975 Mockingbird Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Medcalf</td>
<td>58437 Campawa Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Lewis</td>
<td>57746 San Andreas Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Casasoa</td>
<td>67305 Quipo Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven G.</td>
<td>59064 Sun Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanda Bearlson</td>
<td>8550 Golden Meadows, Yucca Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Smith</td>
<td>5537 E. Vineyard, Pocatello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelie Sellard</td>
<td>6301 Tamarack Dr, Yucca Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hart</td>
<td>7411 Canyon Rd, Yucca Valley, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Carole Chick</td>
<td>1463 Sunset Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Graham</td>
<td>5608 Desert Breeze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Hicks</td>
<td>56765 Arizona Dr, Yucca Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Hicks</td>
<td>7405 Cream St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark środkow</td>
<td>87205 Silver Rd, Yucca Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lawton</td>
<td>54400 Sanddollar Dr, Yucca Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Snyder</td>
<td>9830 T-Circle Dr, Moreno Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Anderson</td>
<td>10888 west Dr, Moreno Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Ferris</td>
<td>74897 Chippewa, Yucca Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21st century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jackson</td>
<td>91115 Palmesans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Cooper</td>
<td>2916 La Crescent Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Anderson</td>
<td>340 N. Delgada YV 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>821 27 8201 Hu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brittney M.</td>
<td>7021 Balsa</td>
<td>B. Mckay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanna Webster</td>
<td>7021 Balsa Ave</td>
<td>Shane White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Soza</td>
<td>55500 29 Palms Dr</td>
<td>Gabriel Sosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Green</td>
<td>56131 29 Palms St</td>
<td>Frank green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Garcia</td>
<td>555 1st Ave</td>
<td>Rose Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Hughes</td>
<td>6536 29 Palms Dr</td>
<td>Valerie Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonce Eugene</td>
<td>2627 Bldg #2</td>
<td>Alphonce Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2627 Bldg #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Collins</td>
<td>3575 Saddle St</td>
<td>Sue Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trane Campos</td>
<td>6069 Tamarisk Dr</td>
<td>Trane Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2407 Pine Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Kelly</td>
<td>7422 Barberry Dr</td>
<td>Mario Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angerita Borda</td>
<td>3073 Parked St</td>
<td>Angerita Borda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3073 Parked St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth H. Schnellinger</td>
<td>56878 Field</td>
<td>Kenneth H. Schnellinger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avis Cowan</td>
<td>0923-016 M.V.</td>
<td>Avis Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lopez</td>
<td>52869 Antelope Trl</td>
<td>Robert Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Marin</td>
<td>0923 016 M.V</td>
<td>Michael Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bushbee</td>
<td>56467 Antelope Trl</td>
<td>Matthew Bushbee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Schermer</td>
<td>49177 Vista Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Geeson</td>
<td>16441 Hill Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Gordon</td>
<td>19541 Paradise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Valenzuela</td>
<td>49541 Paradise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Burr</td>
<td>49132 Hespero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorrain Burr</td>
<td>49132 Hespero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Rodriguez</td>
<td>6929 Apache St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia Prinistien</td>
<td>49131 Ricendo</td>
<td>Mr. Garcia Prinistien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Brook</td>
<td>9006 Navajo Trail</td>
<td>Kristine Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Sigwell</td>
<td>11460 Amanda Dr.</td>
<td>Jane E. Sigwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Harris</td>
<td>49365 Lauer Dr.</td>
<td>Debbie Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Harris</td>
<td>49365 Lauer Dr.</td>
<td>Chuck Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Talbert</td>
<td>48986 Park Ave</td>
<td>Johnny J. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbi Talbert</td>
<td>48986 Park Ave</td>
<td>Bobbi Talbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Norford</td>
<td>48474 Park Ave</td>
<td>Jim Norford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Norford</td>
<td>48474 Park Ave</td>
<td>Joyce Norford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Cioffi</td>
<td>2320 Cypress Rv.</td>
<td>Charlene Cioffi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Kester</td>
<td>PO Box 636</td>
<td>Carole Kester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Francis</td>
<td>48701 MacArthur Rd.</td>
<td>Tracey Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rodriguez</td>
<td>6929 Anchic</td>
<td>Mike Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Murilloz</td>
<td>58371 Pueblo Tr.</td>
<td>John Murilloz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normie Murilloz</td>
<td>58371 Pueblo Tr.</td>
<td>Normie Murilloz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred DelRei</td>
<td>56806 CAULFIELD</td>
<td>Fred DelRei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolki DelRei</td>
<td>56806 1440 W.</td>
<td>Yolki DelRei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therese Hone</td>
<td>49209 Recoverdon</td>
<td>Therese JHone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Matthews</td>
<td>10731 Morongo Way</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Wronse</td>
<td>10731 Morongo Way</td>
<td>Donald JHronse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William P. Coners</td>
<td>1187 Pear St</td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>10441 Hill Ave, Murray, UT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Wilson</td>
<td>10441 Hill Ave, Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Wilson</td>
<td>7501 Palm Ave, #27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Anderson</td>
<td>58859 Camp Rd, Yuma Valley, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Valdez</td>
<td>7501 Palm Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Anderson</td>
<td>58859 Camp Rd, Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Stevie Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementine Njegovec</td>
<td>58347 Tao Tr., Yuma</td>
<td>Steve Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Sullivan</td>
<td>6370 Mission Dr, Yuma Valley, CA</td>
<td>Tony Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Thorne</td>
<td>6147 S. 5th Ave, Yuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Days</td>
<td>5159 S. Norset, Yuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bottin</td>
<td>58709 Caminito, Yuma Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Bottin</td>
<td>58909 Caminito, Yuma Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenny Nicholson</td>
<td>8437 Emerson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia Nicholson</td>
<td>8437 House, Yuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Carson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21st century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>8428 Ole Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hap</td>
<td>Morongo Valley CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry V. Andrich</td>
<td>49188 Power Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Recently</td>
<td>11537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leeson</td>
<td>McCallister, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul N. Leeson</td>
<td>49955 MT View, NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erma L. Geeson</td>
<td>11537 Jumper</td>
<td>Erma L. Geeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Geeson</td>
<td>50309 24 Palms Hwy</td>
<td>Philip Geeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay L. Geeson</td>
<td>50309 24 Palms Hwy</td>
<td>Gay L. Geeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Geeson</td>
<td>10988 Hw</td>
<td>Nancy Geeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Derw</td>
<td>7767 Chaparral Dr</td>
<td>Dawn Derw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Capwell</td>
<td>7649 Hanford Ave</td>
<td>Kelly Capwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Noeeman</td>
<td>7300 Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Pat Noeeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Chartrand</td>
<td>55595 Desert Gold</td>
<td>Brenda Chartrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Firestone</td>
<td>53700 Daisy Ave</td>
<td>Mary Firestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Chartrand</td>
<td>55595 Desert Gold Dr</td>
<td>Nicole Chartrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Tenny</td>
<td>7234 Sunfield Rd</td>
<td>Sarah Tenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Desert</td>
<td>9448 Palms Ave</td>
<td>Linda Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Geeson</td>
<td>49955 Mt. View Dr</td>
<td>Laurie Geeson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Ratcliff</td>
<td>10945 San Jacinto</td>
<td>Jean Ratcliff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Smalley</td>
<td>55315 Santa Fe</td>
<td>Stephanie Smalley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Jordan</td>
<td>11568 Pine, Morongo Valley</td>
<td>Cheryl Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Jordan</td>
<td>11568 Pine, MV 92256</td>
<td>Craig Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Kobaly</td>
<td>10122 Pine Place, MV 92256</td>
<td>Jana Kobaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Kobaly</td>
<td>10122 Pine Place, MV 92256</td>
<td>Dan Kobaly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose Cabreva</td>
<td>489 52 Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Bransky</td>
<td>11534 Rosewood Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reema Embani</td>
<td>49191 Edna Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Learning</td>
<td>49 9 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Mackenzie</td>
<td>11414 Isopo Dr.</td>
<td>Janet Mackenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Kishi</td>
<td>1101 5201 Big</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Weeding</td>
<td>49063 Paradise Ave, MN</td>
<td>Lorraine Weeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Alpin</td>
<td>7354 Rubidoux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Alpin</td>
<td>7354 Rubidoux</td>
<td>Julie Alpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael J. Francis</td>
<td>48091 Measuringdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Alinsky</td>
<td>42678 Rosewood Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Collins</td>
<td>49418 Mojave Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Bushing</td>
<td>53 8 1 Wallaby</td>
<td>Ben Bushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Bushing</td>
<td>5307 7 Wallaby</td>
<td>Marco Bushing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Harris</td>
<td>57617 OLO MILL RD</td>
<td>YV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Harris</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis L. Liddicoit</td>
<td>48936 Vista Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Liddicoit</td>
<td>51949 Martinez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Market</td>
<td>10121 Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Stephens</td>
<td>10121 Mission Pl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Sanford</td>
<td>58145 Buela Vista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Theune</td>
<td>57914 La Brisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Anna White</td>
<td>10669799 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Gonzalez</td>
<td>11242 Pinon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Grunewell</td>
<td>57918 Twin Creek Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Reid</td>
<td>52540 Carlyle Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deana Shilbach</td>
<td>847 Barrack Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandi Murphy</td>
<td>56205 View Till</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Ming</td>
<td>5856 Twain Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deming Jones</td>
<td>11242 Pinon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Burr</td>
<td>49132 4th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Bur</td>
<td>11150 Morrison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Reichard</td>
<td>11511 Moreno Verde Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill残疾</td>
<td>58836 Meadowlawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Leeante</td>
<td>32363 Westchester Dr. Thousand Oaks, CA 92276</td>
<td>John Leeante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Wyland</td>
<td>217 Lei do PS 92264</td>
<td>Dee Wyland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. D. Williams</td>
<td>14030 Ranch</td>
<td>R. D. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Tramell</td>
<td>Morongo Valley, CA</td>
<td>Anna Tramell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Galtjos</td>
<td>49605 Paradise Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loween</td>
<td>Woodrun Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Oliver</td>
<td>4966 North Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hantu</td>
<td>5789 LA Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>6837 Harvard St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to every day life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty McColley</td>
<td>Lindbergh Plane</td>
<td>Betty McColley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine E. Stoker</td>
<td>Yuca Valley</td>
<td>ErwinCEEStoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Wilcox</td>
<td>Yucca Valley</td>
<td>Rhonda Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Sanchez</td>
<td>60458 La Mirada, Tel.</td>
<td>Richard Sanchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resident</td>
<td>Address of Resident</td>
<td>Signature of Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENDA HAWKINS</td>
<td>38524 Prodmont Dr</td>
<td>Brenda Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKY ARNOLD</td>
<td>56630 Y2</td>
<td>Rocky Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILBERT RIOS</td>
<td>7946 Palm Ave, Yucca Valley CA 92284</td>
<td>Gilbert Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Rendo</td>
<td>4615 Palm Dr, Yel</td>
<td>Bruce Rendo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Ann Gardin</td>
<td>7632 Vista Rd</td>
<td>Gardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID REYES</td>
<td>7310 Pioneertown Rd</td>
<td>Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bean</td>
<td>7548 Rockefeller Rd</td>
<td>Robert Bean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Usher</td>
<td>60345 Alto Mesa Dr</td>
<td>Donna Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Smith</td>
<td>6729 Linda Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Marr</td>
<td>6603 Desert Quail Dr</td>
<td>Alfredo Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Haff</td>
<td>10723 Hess Blvd, NV</td>
<td>Autumn Haff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocen Duvall</td>
<td>7345 7th Ave</td>
<td>Duvall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Hacker</td>
<td>55155 Carlyle Dr</td>
<td>Tim Hacker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION

MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21 century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dina Moore</td>
<td>3711 Desert Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Herring</td>
<td>61923 Place Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Herring</td>
<td>62666 N.E. Dunlop Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina Herring</td>
<td>56274 N. Valley Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127 of 160
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Dreiting</td>
<td>49545 Rosella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Miller</td>
<td>41044 Ironwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Thomas</td>
<td>10075 Sams Th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wieser</td>
<td>48823 Tamarack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathi Wieser</td>
<td>48823 Tamarack MV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Romleski</td>
<td>10366 San Gorgonio Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>10366 San Gorgonio Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Jancer</td>
<td>10945 Jenner Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49513 Magnolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PETITION
MORONGO VALLEY, CA

The purpose of this petition is to inform the County of San Bernardino that certain residents feel that a 65 foot high mono palm communications facility, located on parcel number 0583-271-02, west of Willy Boy's restaurant on Highway 62, AS PROPOSED by Royal Street Communications, is not suitable in its current form. The proposed facility has three major flaws:

1. Height - 65 feet is too tall
2. Limited landscaping - two live trees is not sufficient landscaping
3. Microwave dish - no microwave dish should be located on the facility

We in this high desert community believe that mobile communications are vital to everyday life in the 21st century. However, we need to preserve the beauty of our surroundings. Therefore, to balance these issues, WE DO FAVOR A COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

1. Lower the overall height to 55 feet.
2. Plant six live palm trees, at least 37 feet tall.
3. NO microwave dish located at the facility.

The following residents of this high desert community support this petition.

Name of Resident          Address of Resident          Signature of Resident
hisap Pitts              57732 Jover                John Pitts
Craig Holt               7671 Joshua View
Sociey Holt              7671 Joshua View
Cynthia Harris           58350 Carlyle Dr
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resident</th>
<th>Address of Resident</th>
<th>Signature of Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEAN HARSHAW</td>
<td>5835 Carlyle Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYNTHIA SPINNING</td>
<td>4946 Counr Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWN STEPHENS</td>
<td>4946 Goleta Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHANIE EPPS</td>
<td>8704 Frontier Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD EPPS</td>
<td>8704 Frontier Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE ROTSTEIN</td>
<td>4916 Paradise Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY ALVIM</td>
<td>12907 Valleyland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRI WEITZ</td>
<td>12907 Valleyland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 10, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree Street
Hesperia, Calif 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I am a longtime Morongo resident and also a business owner. I would like to put my support behind the new cell tower being installed beside the Willie Boy restaurant.

Thank you,

Danny Kobaly
Kobaly Tax Service
49863 29 Palms Highway
Morongo Valley, Ca 92256
January 12, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner  
San Bernardino County  
Land Use Services/Planning Division  
15900 Smoke Tree St  
Hesperia  
California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

My husband and I own two businesses in Morongo Valley, Cactus Mart and the Morongo Valley Hardware Store. We also live in the valley.

We understand that there is a cell tower proposed for the business area and we would like you to know that we are in full favor of the installation of one.

Cell service is at best “spotty” throughout the valley and a tower could do nothing but help the situation.

Thank you for your time,

[Signature]

Leslie Potstein
January 11, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree Street
Hesperia, Calif 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I understand that a new cell company is planning on putting in a cell tower in our business section. I fully support their endeavor because my cell service leaves much to be desired.

I sure hope that they are going to have an AT&T antenna on it so I can finally get service at my house. I can see the property from my place so I assume I will be able to benefit from it.

Thanks,

[Signature]
January 25, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Mr. Conner,

I own a business in Yucca Valley and drive down to the low desert two or three times a week. My cell phone does not work in many spots as I am driving through Morongo Valley and because I am a business man I do need to be able to use my phone, always hands free of course.

I am a big supporter of a cell tower being installed in Morongo Valley as soon as possible.

Thanks,

Chris Frascher
Frascher Photography
January 20, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a business owner and resident in Morongo Valley. I am also a member of the local Chamber of Commerce. I am in favor of the new proposed cell tower to be installed west of Willy Boy’s restaurant on Highway 62.

Any progress with such minimal disturbance to the natural beauty of our community is welcome.

Sincerely,

Tish (Patricia) Miller
HK Lane Real Estate
Res: 49164 Hibiscus Drive
Bus: 49634 – 29 Palms Highway
Morongo Valley, CA 92256
January 15, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner  
San Bernardino County  
Land Use Services/Planning Division  
15900 Smoke Tree St  
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I moved from the low desert to Morongo Valley last year and I have been very disappointed in the cell phone reception in comparison to the Coachella Valley. I now understand there is a proposal to install one on Hwy 62 in Morongo. Please put me down as a yes vote.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
January 10, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I have lived in Morongo Valley for several years and I have a home based business Hap the Videoman.

I have heard that there is a proposed cell tower going in on the highway in our business section. I fully support the installation of such a tower hoping that it will provide better service so I won’t have to go outside of my house to use my cell phone.

I don’t think that there are any cell towers in our valley now and it is about time we get into the twenty-first century.

Thank you for your help in this matter,

Hap Trowbridge
“Hap the Videoman”
January 13, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I moved to Morongo Valley last year and was very disappointed that my cell phone does not work for the most part while I am in the valley. I know that the next town up from ours, Yucca Valley, is allowing permits for several cell towers but that does not help me down here.

I support the installation of any and all cell towers in Morongo Valley, the sooner the better.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
January 20, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a business owner and resident in Morongo Valley. I am also a member of the local Chamber of Commerce. I am in favor of the new proposed cell tower to be installed west of Willy Boy’s restaurant on Highway 62.

Any progress with such minimal disturbance to the natural beauty of our community is welcome.

Sincerely,

John Brudvik
Owner Monument Bar & Grill
49827 – 29 Palms Highway
Owner Morongo Café
49780 – 29 Palms Highway
Morongo Valley
January 13, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

My family has lived in Morongo Valley for over 50 years and we have seen many changes over those years. The telephone was here back then, “party lines” which we were thrilled with. The cell phone has definitely changed our lives, partly for the good and some things not so good like the grandkids always texting on them.

Here in the valley the service areas are very spotty. We have Verizon and it is better than most of the others but still not perfect.

I understand that the company installing a new one along the highway will offer more affordable service and that is surely something that is needed in this economy.

Please put me down as one of the folks that support the new cell tower.

Sincerely,

Paul N. Geeson
January 15, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Mr. Conner,

I bought a business in Morongo Valley from my grandmother and have had it for about 5 years now.

I have a cell phone but I am not happy with the service. I understand from folks talking in our eatery that there is a proposed cell tower down the highway from the Happy Cooker, our business, and I am so happy to hear about it.

I don't know if my cell servicer will be a part of the tower but just getting one here must mean that reception will be getting better.

Please put my name down on the list of people that are for the installation.

Thanks so much,

[Signature]
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January 13, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I visit Covington Park here in Morongo several times a week. I also walk in the Big Morongo Canyon Preserve as often as I can. There have been several instances when I or someone else needs the use of a public phone but there are none available at either park. That leaves us with our cell phones which don't work very well, or at all in the parks.

We've all heard that there is the possibility of a cell phone tower being put up near the Willie Boy restaurant and we say HURRAH, at last! The location seems a perfect place to provide service to both parks, maybe even down through the lower canyon of the Preserve.

Please hurry the process; you never know when there might be an emergency and we will need good cell service.

Thanks,

[Signature]
January 9, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia
California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,
I am a single lady and have lived in Morongo Valley for 3 years now and I love it. There is only thing that could make it perfect and that is if my cell phone worked better. I have heard that a company is planning on putting in a cell tower near the new restaurant, Willie Boy’s, and I think it is very much needed. Please put my name on the YES list.

Thank you,

[Signature]
January 15, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I recently heard about a possible cell tower being erected in Morongo Valley. The person who told me also had a petition against it. I would not sign it since I think the information he has is wrong. I know that there are no micro waves coming from the tower and birds will not be killed. I personally think it is about time that Morongo got good cell service.

Sign me up as in favor of the installation.

Sincerely,

[Laurie's signature]
January 15, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services/Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I made a mistake and signed a petition against the installation of a cell tower next to Willie Boy’s Restaurant here in Morongo Valley. I was given false information and once I talked to some more knowledgeable people I realized that I shouldn’t have signed it.

For the record I am for the installing of a cell tower here in Morongo Valley.

Thanks,

Glen Shepherd

[Signature]
January 13, 2011

Mr. Chris Conner, Planner  
San Bernardino County  
Land Use Services/Planning Division  
15900 Smoke Tree St  
Hesperia, California 92344

Dear Mr. Conner,

I would like to put my name as being in favor of the new cell tower in Morongo Valley.

Thank you,

[Signature]
71 total signatures
in opposition to the project:

69 Petitioned signatures
2 letters
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOWNED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

[Signatures and addresses of supporters]

Petition #10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Rosemary Mellett</td>
<td>16121 Pine Pl Mv</td>
<td>M Mellett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Dimitri Hogan</td>
<td>48800 Ran Vista Dr Mv</td>
<td>D Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Jerry Giansutis</td>
<td>48800 Paradise Ave Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Brigitte Valdez</td>
<td>48853 Artesia Way Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Justin Valdez</td>
<td>48853 Artesia way Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Alan Shinkle</td>
<td>10121 Pine Pl Mv</td>
<td>A Shinkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Wayne S. Herr</td>
<td>1010 Pine Dr Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>James H. Herr</td>
<td>10121 Pine Pl Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Peter Zeller</td>
<td>1000 Pine Dr Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Vivetta Hendyville</td>
<td>1000 Pine Dr Mv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Michael Tennant</td>
<td>49905 Tamarisk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/11</td>
<td>Delania Thorne</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yucca Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:
A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NEEDED, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOWED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

By Alex Soto
1-08-11
Morongo Valley CA

By Mike Soto
1-05-11
Morongo Valley, CA

By M. Wolfe
1-08-11
Morongo Valley CA

By C. Foster
1-08-11
Morongo Valley CA

By Mike Gonzalez
1-09-11
Morongo V Ca

By Olivia Gonzalez
1-09-11
Morongo V, Ca
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOVATED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harri Mueg</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>49961 29 Palms Hwy</td>
<td>8364 B Little Morongo Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cichro Xandar</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>8364 Little Morongo Rd.</td>
<td>92550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile Sandoz</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>1638 Helen Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Lowry</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>51000 Cajon Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Carter</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>51000 Canyon Rd, Morongo Valley CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Krey</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>7511 Apache Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Calvert</td>
<td>01-10-11</td>
<td>51912 Hesperia Rd, YV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW
NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES
THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT
COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS
NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL
TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS
AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW.
RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE
PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY,
AND OUR WORLD-RENOWED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL
 ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

1.
David & Virginia Clark
49198 Vista dr.
Morongo Valley CA
92256
1/8/11
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahria!
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRTIC ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENNOWNED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE. WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

1. Victoria Vodon
   48919 Palo Verde Rd
   Morongo Valley, CA 92256
   1/9/2011

2. Barbara Christin
   10223 Jupitor Rd
   Morongo Valley, CA 92256
   1/9/2011
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOWNED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

Jeff Kern
52601 Meccard. Morongo Valley CA 92256

1-8-11
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:

A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOWNED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE, WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

Dr. Donna Yerman
PO Box 1410 MV 760 363-9933
49545 Aspen #160
KanaumDeci@email.com
Kandy Fenske  
Kandy Fenske  
7379 Sherwood Rd.  
Joshua Tree CA 92252

Maria Pritchard  
Maria Pritchard  
9504 Meela  
Morongo Valley, CA 92256

Dining Lago  
CJara Lago  
48980 Dining V.S.  
Morongo Valley CA 92256

4/10/11
STOP MICROWAVE TOWER CONSTRUCTION PETITION

TO:
San Bernardino Planning Office
Oxso Shahriari
385 N Arrowhead Ave 1st Fl.
San Bernardino, Calif 92415-0182

FROM: THE CONCERNED CITIZENS OF MORONGO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA.

FOR:
A MORATORIUM ON CELL TOWER CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WILL ALLOW NEEDED TIME TO STUDY THE ISSUE AND ENACT STRICT ORDINANCES THAT WILL REQUIRE THE CELL PHONE INDUSTRY TO RESPECT COMMUNITY DESIRE: SUCH AS BUILDING THE MINIMUM TOWERS NECESSARY, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS. DURING THIS TIME, CELL TOWER MASTER PLANS WILL BE CREATED TO HELP PROTECT THE RIGHTS AND HEALTH OF CITIZENS, WHILE COMPLYING WITH THE LAW. RESEARCH WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE STEPS NECESSARY TO ASSURE PROTECTION OF OUR SCENIC SR62, THE TWENTY-NINE PALMS HIGHWAY, AND OUR WORLD-RENOWED BIG MORONGO WILDLIFE PRESERVE. WILL ALSO BE CONDUCTED DURING THIS MORATORIUM.

Wyle Abbas 44727 29 palms M.V. 1-11-11
Fern Riviere 61151 Herr St. Miramar, CA 1-11-11
Brandy Marquez 50480 29 Palms Hwy M.V. CA 92256 1-11-11
Theresa Fox 99660 Fox Trail M.V. CA 92256
Kathy Litzy 92540 Eldorado Dr. CA
Kevin Casey 6637 Balsam Ave CA
January 11, 2011

Dear Mr. Shahriari:

As residents of Morongo Valley we are writing to protest the installation of a cell tower on Highway 62 near Willie Boy’s Bar and Saloon. Highway 62 is a scenic highway and as the route for tourists to our Big Morongo Preserve and Joshua Tree National Park does not need the additional blight of a cell tower.

We would like to request a public hearing on this matter that will detrimentally impact our community.

Sincerely,

Bob and Linda Bailey
P. O. Box 878 (mail)
48910 Hibiscus Drive
Morongo Valley, CA 92256
Lbhere@verizon.net
Shahriari, Oxso - LUS

From: Linda Christian [drichristian@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 7:24 PM
To: Shahriari, Oxso - LUS
Subject: RE: cell tower Morongo Valley 11-21-2011

thank you
-----Original Message-----
From: "Shahriari, Oxso - LUS"
Sent: Nov 21, 2011 11:23 AM
To: 'Linda Christian'
Cc: "Slowik, Matt - LUS"
Subject: RE: cell tower Morongo Valley 11-21-2011

Good morning Linda;
Hope all is well. We are hoping to take this project to a Planning Commission hearing in the December/January timeframe. In that hearing, you may express your opposition and present your case for any alteration to the proposal. Planning Commissioners will then consider all inputs and make their recommendations known. I’ll provide you a hearing date and notice very soon.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Thank you.

Oxso Shahriari, Planner
County of San Bernardino
LAND USE SERVICES Planning Division
(760) 955-8156 Phone
(760) 955-8170 Fax

Please send all mail correspondence to:
Attn: Oxso Shahriari
Co. of San Bernardino Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree Street
Hesperia, CA 92345

From: Linda Christian [mailto:drichristian@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 6:57 AM
To: Shahriari, Oxso - LUS; cell tower
Cc: Eric Barbour; Brittany Barbour
Subject: cell tower Morongo Valley

Hi Oxso,
We only have a couple of considerations for the proposed cell tower. I figure to save time maybe we could handle these easily and they could move forward quickly

No microwave dish
No palm trees
Water tower would be great
300’ from any future residence

If these changes can be implemented there will be no problems. If not, there will be alot of opposition. Let me know how to proceed please thank you Linda 760-363-6300